

party man ; not at all. I expect certainly to be able during the session to vote at times in favour of the Government, when the measures brought forward by the Government are such good measures that they will command my vote. You know, Mr. Speaker, that I represent a county which requires justice from the Government, and the doctrine which is being taught, and which no later than last Sunday I heard announced on a public platform by one who was closely connected with the Government, is that the only thing to do is to support the Government and get the Government favour. Perhaps my course, hitherto, has not been such as to warrant the Government in bestowing much favour upon me ; but I wish to say that I am not voting against the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Mackintosh) because it is brought forward by him—not at all ; nor because it is one that may receive the favour of the Government. I know that there is much sense in that amendment and that it will command a large vote in this House ; but still I think the House and the country have had ample time during the many years that have elapsed since this question was first brought forward, to study it carefully and fully, and I, therefore, feel the time has come for referring it to a vote of the people. Believing that this should be our course, I will with much pleasure vote in that sense when the amendment proposing it is brought forward, and against the amendment now before the House.

House divided on motion to adjourn debate (Mr. Gillies) :

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| Adams, | Langevin (Sir Hector), |
| Baker, | Léger, |
| Barnard, | Lépine, |
| Bergeron, | Lippé, |
| Bergin, | Macdonald (Sir John), |
| Bowell, | Macdonald (King's), |
| Burns, | Macdonald (Winnipeg), |
| Cameron (Inverness), | Macdowall, |
| Carignan, | Mackintosh, |
| Carpenter, | McAlister, |
| Caron (Sir Adolphe), | McCarthy, |
| Cleveland, | McDonald (Victoria), |
| Coatsworth, | McDougald (Pietou), |
| Cochrane, | McDougall (Cape Breton), |
| Cockburn, | McKay, |
| Corby, | McLennan, |
| Costigan, | McLeod, |
| Craig, | Madill, |
| Curran, | Mara, |
| Daly, | Marshall, |
| Daoust, | Masson, |
| Davin, | Miller, |
| Davis, | Mills (Annapolis), |
| Denison, | Montague, |
| Desjardins (Hochelega), | Quinet, |
| Desjardins (L'Islet), | Patterson (Colchester), |
| Dewdney, | Pelletier, |
| Dickey, | Pope, |
| Dugas, | Prior, |
| Dupont, | Putnam, |
| Dyer, | Robillard, |
| Earle, | Roome, |
| Fairbairn, | Ross (Dundas), |
| Ferguson (Leeds & Gren.), | Ryckman, |
| Ferguson (Renfrew), | Sproule, |
| Foster, | Stairs, |
| Fréchette, | Stevenson, |
| Gillies, | Taylor, |
| Gordon, | Temple, |
| Haggart, | Thompson (Sir John), |
| Hazen, | Tupper, |
| Henderson, | Tyrwhitt, |
| Hodgins, | Wallace, |
| Hutchins, | Weldon, |

Ingram,
Ives,
Joncas,
Kaulbach,
Kirkpatrick.

White (Cardwell),
White (Shelburne),
Wilmot,
Wood (Brookville),
Wood (Westmoreland).—95.

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| Allan, | Gillmor, |
| Allison, | Godbout, |
| Amyot, | Grieve, |
| Armstrong, | Guay, |
| Bain, | Hargraft, |
| Barron, | Harwood, |
| Beausoleil, | Hyman, |
| Bechard, | Innes, |
| Beith, | Jamieson, |
| Bernier, | King, |
| Bowers, | Landerkin, |
| Bowman, | Lavergne, |
| Brodeur, | Leduc, |
| Brown (Chateauguay), | Lister, |
| Brown (Monck), | Macdonald (Huron), |
| Burdett, | McGregor, |
| Campbell, | McMullen, |
| Carroll, | Mignault, |
| Cartwright (Sir Richard), | Mills (Bothwell), |
| Casey, | Mousseau, |
| Charlton, | Mulock, |
| Chiquette, | Murray, |
| Christie, | Paterson (Brant), |
| Colter, | Perry, |
| Davidson, | Proulx, |
| Davies, | Rider, |
| Dawson, | Rinfret, |
| Delisle, | Rowand, |
| Devlin, | Saborn, |
| Edgar, | Savard, |
| Fauvel, | Semple, |
| Featherson, | Somerville, |
| Flint, | Sutherland, |
| Forbes, | Tarte, |
| Fraser, | Trow, |
| Frémont, | Truax, |
| Gauthier, | Vaillancourt, |
| Geoffrion, | Watson, |
| German, | Welsh, |
| Gibson, | Yeo.—80. |

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. TROW. I notice that the member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) has not voted.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I paired with Mr. McNeill, otherwise I should have voted against the motion.

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

Motion agreed to ; and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 22nd May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT—QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved :

That when this House adjourns to-day it shall remain adjourned till Tuesday next, at three o'clock, p.m.

Motion agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF RULE 52.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved :

That the 52nd Rule of this House be suspended so far as it respects the petition of Sir Donald Smith and others for an Act of incorporation under the name of the New York

and Ontario Bridge Company, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 60) respecting the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Denison.)

Bill (No. 61) respecting the St. Catharines and Niagara Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Carpenter.)

Bill (No. 62) to enable the Victoria and North American Railway Company to run a ferry between Becher Bay, in the Province of British Columbia, and a point in the Straits of Fuca, within the United States of America.—(Mr. Earle.)

Bill (No. 63) respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Berlin and Canadian Pacific Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Montreal and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

Bill (No. 66) to confirm a lease made between the Guelph Junction Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Henderson.)

Bill No. 67) respecting the Victoria, Saanich and New Westminster Railway Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 68) to amend the Act to incorporate the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Prior.)

Bill (No. 69) to confirm an indenture made between the New Brunswick Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

Bill (No. 70) to incorporate the Buffalo and Fort Erie Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Brighton, Warkworth and Norwood Railway Company.—(Mr. Cochrane.)

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Peterborough, Sudbury and Sault Ste. Marie Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 73) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Sutherland.)

Bill (No. 75) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)

C. P. R. CO.'S ACT OF 1889.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) further to amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1889.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Explain.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. This is to give them a right to issue some further debenture stock, and concerns the application of the stock. It also provides for the acquisition of the Souris Branch Line bonds, the acquisition of the bonds of the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Company, the Manitoba South-Western Railway Company, the Lake Temiscamingue Railway Company, and the construction of the Saskatoon and Saskatchewan Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.

PICTOU BANK.

Mr. McDUGGALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 76) to authorize and provide for the winding up of the Pictou Bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would enquire of the Finance Minister if we have any interest in that bank? I think they are slightly indebted to us.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think we have much live interest in it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A part of our assets, is it?

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTION OF DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of Sir John A. Macdonald, I have much pleasure in moving, seconded by Mr. Chapleau, that Joseph G. H. Bergeron, member for the Electoral District of the County of Beauharnois, be appointed Chairman of Committees of the Whole House.

Mr. LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, the necessity of having a Deputy Speaker might very well, I think be questioned, but the House has settled and affirmed already its decision in favour of that office, and, therefore, I do not see any necessity for testing the sense of the House any longer on the policy. As to the choice of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), I can only say, speaking not only personally but also on behalf of the Opposition, that we heartily concur in the selection offered. Personally, I certainly congratulate my hon. friend with great pleasure upon his accession to this office, and it is a pleasure for me to recollect that for a great many years I have been with him on terms of personal friendship. In matters not political we always agree, and it is still a greater pleasure for me to remember that sometimes in matters political we agree. I remember that on a most important occasion, a solemn occasion, he and I arraigned the Government for an act which I thought under the circumstances was cruel and unjustifiable. I think it is an indication, since the Government have now placed in his hands more power, that they have come to the conclusion that my hon. friend was right and they were wrong. I congratulate them on their repentance, late though it be. It is consoling to reflect on this additional evidence that not only in the next world but in this world virtue is rewarded.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I might take a different view from that presented by the leader of the Opposition in the observation which he has just offered; but, at all events, he will agree with me that this might be further testimony that the important position of Deputy Speaker, which implies the impartiality of the hon. gentleman occupying that position, will be recognized, not only by this side of the House, but by hon. gentlemen opposite, and that my hon. friend's independence fits him for the position he has been selected to occupy.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Seeing there is still a difference on the question referred to between the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. Secretary of State as to the propriety of the course taken by the hon. member who is named for this office,

it will be interesting now to know with which hon. gentleman the hon. member agrees.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. One says virtue is rewarded, and the other one might say that it is always well to repent.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO MUNICIPALITIES' DEPUTATION.

Mr. TROW. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring a matter before the House. A large and influential deputation of representative men, wardens, reeves of municipalities and municipal officers, numbering one hundred and fifty, from various parts of Ontario, and forming one of the best informed deputations that ever visited the Capital, appeared here yesterday with respect to a matter connected with their municipalities, asking for a refund or for money compensation in return for money expended by their municipalities for railway purposes. I notice the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) introduced the deputation very politely to the Minister; and I heard from many of the deputation that they were treated by the leader of the Government, and also by the Minister of Finance, with the greatest courtesy, and they were perfectly satisfied with what had been said to them by the members of the Government. Yet I notice to-day in the *Montreal Gazette* an article headed: "A Treasury Raid Balked.—The Ontario Municipalities' Claims for the Refund of Bonuses.—Plain Talk by Sir John, who tells the Raiders that their demands are absurd and unreasonable." I understand the First Minister told the delegates nothing of the kind; but treated them, or at least a dozen of them told me so, with the greatest degree of courtesy. I merely mention this because it is unfortunate there should appear in the press of the country such very absurd and unguarded expressions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Perhaps I may be permitted to say, in answer to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), that I am now attending only to my legislative duties, and that during the session I have no connection with the *Gazette*. I regret very much as he can the unfortunate and, I think, the unguarded head line which appears above the report, a head line that is not borne out by the report itself. For my part I may be permitted to disclaim responsibility for anything that appears in that journal during the session, and to add that I was not aware any such language would appear.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS—TRANSLATION.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, I would desire to call the attention of the House, especially the attention of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Lavergne), to some remarks made by that hon. gentleman, and which will be found in *Hansard* of May 14, which remarks convey an accusation against one of the officers of the House, that is unjust, and I am sure, after the matter has been brought to the attention of the hon. gentleman, he will at once declare his charge was not warranted. I find the following in *Hansard*:

"M. le Président, avant de passer à l'ordre du jour, je désire attirer votre attention et l'attention de cette chambre sur la manière dont les procès-verbaux et les

procédés en général de cette chambre sont traduits. Je n'ai pas l'occasion de me lever souvent dans cette chambre, mais en regardant la traduction des propositions que j'ai pu faire quelque fois, ou des discours que j'ai pu prononcer, je me suis toujours aperçu qu'elle ne rendait pas l'idée que j'avais eu l'intention d'exprimer. J'ai toujours cherché à parler le langage de la majorité afin d'être mieux compris, mais la traduction de ce que j'ai dit n'a aucun bon sens, et s'il fallait envoyer cette traduction à quelqu'un qui connaît un peu le français, je passerais pour ridicule si l'on supposait que j'ai prononcé ces paroles dans ma langue maternelle. Ainsi, pour donner un exemple de cette traduction, je vais prendre l'interpellation que j'ai faite aujourd'hui. J'ai posé tout à l'heure au gouvernement une question qui se lit comme suit: "whether the Government is aware of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line formerly known as the South Eastern Railway." On a traduit les mots "L'Avenir Branch of their line" par les mots "l'embranchement sur L'Avenir de sa ligne".

"Eh bien! M. le Président, c'est simplement ridicule; et ce n'est pas la première fois que je remarque de semblables erreurs."

The hon. gentleman asked in his notice of motion whether the Government was aware the Canadian Pacific Railway was refusing to operate the L'Avenir Branch of their line, formerly known as the South-Eastern Railway. The hon. gentleman said this had been translated into French by these words: "L'embranchement sur L'Avenir de sa ligne comme sous le nom de ligne du "South Eastern." My hon. friend said this was a ridiculous and improper translation. I must tell him that, so far as I know, and I think I am well informed, the translation was a very proper one; and the only French translation that could be given of the motion as it was prepared. I will refer the hon. member to the reports of the French Railways, where a branch has been translated as "embranchement sur tel point." If my hon. friend wishes it I will quote him: "La Grande Encyclopédie" under the word Canada, vol. VIII, page 1170, col. 2, where the expression: branch line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway respectively is used as follows: "avec embranchement sur Québec et sur Montréal." I refer my hon. friend also to the dictionary of P. Larousse, art. "Chemins de fer," page 1131 and 1133, col. 4. Also to the following technical works and authors: "Annales des Ponts et Chaussées; Vallée, Delafontaine, Perdonnet, Jacquin; "Portefeuille de l'Ingénieur," and other authorities, where the words "embranchement sur" is always used when a railway branch to a certain locality is spoken of. I should not have alluded to this matter, which is comparatively a very small one, except that it stands in our debates. I hold in my hand a newspaper from Quebec which says that the translations are very peculiar and absurd, and that there is no means of getting the work better done because it is done under higher authority, namely, those who control the House and the translation department. This is unjust to the painstaking officer who has charge of the translation of the Votes and Proceedings of the House. I am sure that, having heard my observations, my hon. friend (Mr. Lavergne) will be the first one to see his mistake. It is true that the translation may have appeared inaccurate on account of the word "L'Avenir," which is the name of a village in Drummond and Arthabaska, (having been named after a newspaper edited by L'Enfant Terrible. Mr. Dorion, a former member for Drummond and Arthabaska.) The word L'Avenir means "future."

and the translation would look like "a branch in the future." It is not our fault, however, that the name of the parish lends itself to a *jeu de mots*. The translation is not only correct in French, but it is the only translation that could be given.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I am certainly ready to apologize if I have acted wrongly in this matter, but, as regards the construction of the sentence in French, I maintain my opinion. I advised the gentleman who made that translation to correct it, but he would not correct it, and did not correct it. I told him I did not pretend to be a linguist, but I thought that the question construed in that form would not be understood, and would not serve the purpose I had in view. He evidently was not willing to correct it, taking the ground that he was right and he would stick to it. I may mention that last year faults occurred in the translation which could not be defended on any grounds. If I had had a few days' notice that the Minister intended to bring up this matter, I would be prepared to support by proof what I said the other day, and we might have been able to settle the matter between ourselves. I must say, however, that I have nothing to take back.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg to remind my hon. friend that I did not make my remarks in any spirit of hostility, but only to come to his assistance, and to prevent leaving on the records of this House a remark that was not warranted. I am not myself a great grammarian, but I know the expression was correct and should not have been altered.

Mr. LAVERGNE. I may also point out that my complaint was justified because the word "formerly" was altogether omitted in the translation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is another thing.

Mr. LAVERGNE. When I brought that to the notice of the translator it was corrected the next day. The name "L'Avenir" was also badly written.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is the fault of the printer and not of the translator.

THE POWERS OF THE AUDITOR GENERAL.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Government Orders are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance, and also of the Minister of Justice, to a matter which I find alluded to on page 14 of the Auditor General's Report, and which is of some importance to the administration of that Department. It is in the form of a letter addressed to the Minister of Finance, but it involves a legal question which, I presume, has been brought under the attention of the Minister of Justice. I may state to the House that our intention, when this Audit Act was created, was to make the Auditor General as far as possible independent of all other Departments, and, as the House is aware, every precaution in this direction was taken, and the Auditor General holds office under a tenure similar, if I remember aright, to that under which office is held by judges of the Crown. For the purpose of enabling him the better to discharge his duties, the control of the officers within the Department was expressly given to him. It was given in the original Act, which was passed under the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), introduced, I think, by myself, Mr. CHAPLEAU.

and it was confirmed again under the Act of 1885. From this letter I refer to, it would appear that doubt is now thrown on the question whether the Auditor General has power to promote within his Department, and that doubt, as I read the letter, arises from some words having been left out in the consolidation of the statutes which took place some two or three years ago. The matter was never mooted in Parliament; if it had been, I think the sense of the House would have been as in 1885 and on previous occasions, that this power had better be left in the hands of the Auditor General. I would be glad to know from the Minister of Justice in the first place, whether the law has been so altered as to deprive the Auditor General of the power to promote? And I would like to know from himself or the hon. Minister of Finance, if the law has been so altered, whether the Government intends to restore this power to the Auditor General? I think it is a power which ought not to have been taken away without the attention of Parliament having been expressly called to it, and it is perfectly clear the attention of Parliament has not been called to it. The Auditor General, in this letter to which I refer, appears to think it was an accidental change, but there is no doubt it is a change of some moment, and I think, if made at all, it should have been made only after full notice to the House, whose servant the Auditor General is in a very special sense.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the spur of the moment I am hardly in a position to say that the law has been altered in the direction the hon. member for South Oxford indicates; but I am able to say, from an examination of the subject which took place when the Auditor General wrote this letter and conferred with me in regard to it, that the law does not now authorize him to make promotions, and I hesitate to say that it was changed in that regard, because I am not sure that the original Act confers that power. But it is a full answer to one part of the hon. gentleman's question, to say that the present state of the law does not permit the Auditor General to promote without the authority of the Governor in Council. I understand that the question, so far as its practical importance is concerned, has been disposed of. The Auditor wrote this letter with regard to certain promotions which, according to his opinion, he was given the power to make by Parliament having, in the first place, voted the salaries to admit of their being made. The Governor in Council having changed the theoretical organization and sanctioned the promotions, the practical difficulty has been in that way disposed of; but the fact is, as I have intimated, that the statute as it now stands does not confer that power upon the Auditor. I think it very likely that the change did occur, as the hon. gentleman understands it to have occurred, in the revision of the statutes. Some alteration in that regard was made at that time. The revisers, so far as I can ascertain, were under the impression that the law even as revised would continue to confer that power on the Auditor General; such, I think, however, is clearly not the case. In moving the adoption of the Revised Statutes, I was certainly under the impression that the revisers had simply consolidated and harmonized the statutes, and that there were no alterations made of any importance whatever; otherwise the attention of Parliament

must have been called to the fact, and any alterations of a substantial character would have been made the subject of a substantive act. The revision was scrutinized, as the hon. gentleman will remember, by a committee which sat on the subject a good while and examined every alteration that was made; but this alteration seems to have escaped their attention. Whether or not it might be desirable to introduce an Act to give the Auditor power to make promotions in his Department requires some consideration. The statute relating to the Civil Service, I think, undoubtedly gives the Ministerial head of each Department power to make promotions from time to time. The Auditor claims that from analogy he is the head of his Department, and should have the like power; as a matter of fact, however, the power of promotion is never exercised by the Minister, but every appointment to the Civil Service, and every promotion is made by the Governor in Council. First of all comes the vote of Parliament creating the office, and then comes the Order in Council to enable the appointment to be made; and even the recommendation for a promotion comes to the Council itself. It may be a subject for careful consideration whether the power of promotion should be conferred on the Auditor General which, although theoretically now vested in the heads of the other Departments, is entirely disused.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just say, in answer to the hon. Minister of Justice, that the matter was very fully considered, as he will see, if he looks at the Debates at the time the Audit Office was created; and after full consideration it was decided in the case of that particular office that, looking at its peculiar functions, it was desirable that the Auditor General should have full power. The words in clause 13 are these:

"The Auditor General shall have power to promote, suspend or remove any of the officers, clerks or others, employed therein."

As to the rules, regulations and forms which he may use, these must be approved by the Treasury Board. Now, if the Government thought fit to alter that law, that was for them to decide; but I think it ought not to have been altered, and in that the hon. Minister appears to agree with me, without having been the subject of a specific act of the House; and it also appears to me that if by accident it was altered from the law of 1878, which I understood was confirmed by the law of 1885, action should be taken to put it back, unless the Government were of opinion that the law should be formally altered.

SUPPLY—ENQUIRY FOR PAPERS.

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

Mr. EDGAR. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to have to bring up again the subject, which I mentioned here last Monday, of the non-production by a Department of the Government of papers which have been ordered by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and for which, as a member of that Committee, I have been making search in the office of the clerk of the Committee, where they were to be brought. The Committee a week ago to-day made an order for the production by the Department of Public Works or other Departments of the Government, of papers connected with some half-dozen different public

contracts or matters that were under the investigation of that Committee. On the same day an order was made for the production by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners of papers in their control relating to some of those matters. Strange to say, the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, although at a great distance, have managed to send their secretary up here with the papers, which were in the Committee room yesterday for the inspection of the members of the Committee. Another Department of the Government has sent the Committee some other papers, but we are without a single document from the Department of Public Works. Now, if there is any Department in the Government that should be vigilant in satisfying the requirements of the Committee, it is the Department of Public Works. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, when I brought this matter up before, said the motion was a general one and not divided. Well, there were half a dozen different contracts mentioned in it, and surely the hon. Minister cannot pretend that the Committee expected he would not bring down any papers until every paper required could be procured and tabulated and arranged. Should such a course be followed, we may have to wait until the end of the session, and I do not think the House or the Committee would be satisfied to wait until then. No corporation or individual would have dared to treat the order of the Committee as it has been treated by the Department of Public Works. If any desire existed on the part of the Department to furnish the papers, some of them could have been laid before the Committee before this, and the hands of the Committee would not be tied as they are. The session, I am sure, will be prolonged if this delay continues, because I do not think its business will be brought to a close until the work of the Committee has also reached its conclusion; and the longer the production of these papers is delayed, the longer the investigations of the Committee will take, and the longer will the session be prolonged. Surely, if the hon. Minister of Public Works does not deem this matter of sufficient importance to save us this delay, some of his colleagues or his leader will. At any rate, on the next occasion the House meets, if the papers are not brought down, I shall certainly in some way test the opinion of the House as to the method followed by the Department in its disregard of the order of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If the hon. gentleman had only asked me whether I could give some information to the House concerning these papers, he would have been saved the trouble of making the speech he did.

Mr. EDGAR. I made the enquiry from the Clerk of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman enquired the other day, and I gave him the only answer I could that day. The Committee gave their order on Friday; they sent their order to the Public Works Department on Saturday, and it was on Tuesday, at three o'clock, that the hon. gentleman put his question, or one day and a-half after the order had been received by the Department. When the hon. gentleman sees the number of documents which have to be brought down in answer to the order, he will see that the Department could not take less time than it has taken to

produce them. Every day, I urge the Deputy head of my Department, to hasten the collection of papers, and the copying of such documents as could not be brought down otherwise. He told me he would do so, and gave me a statement then, which I asked him to put in writing, so that I might read it to the House. His statement is as follows:—

“ DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS,
“ OTTAWA, 21st May, 1891,

“ The Hon. Sir HECTOR L. LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.,
“ Minister of Public Works.

“ SIR.—With reference to the production of the papers called for by the Committee on Privileges and Elections covering correspondence, plans, &c., respecting works at Quebec Harbour, Lévis and Esquimalt Graving Docks, I beg to state that since the letter of the clerk of said Committee was placed in my hands for action, I have caused searches to be made at once for the papers, which searches are now being pushed without loss of time under my personal supervision. You will kindly note that such correspondence dates back to 1877, and can only be found and put together by a careful examination of all the books and journals of this Department since that time, and that the work in question, in order to be complete, must necessarily take some time. I expect to be in a position to send the first instalment of papers to-morrow afternoon (Friday) and the balance next day or Monday next.”

With reference to the production of the papers called for by the Committee, the hon. gentleman will see that no time has been lost in bringing them down. For example, we could not cut up the books of the Department, but have to get copies made of the portions required, because the books are wanted for the daily work of the Department. All we could do has been done.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the hon. gentleman's explanations are at all satisfactory. The hon. gentleman appears to me not to realize the gravity of the enquiry now pending with reference to these charges preferred by an hon. gentleman in this House. The hon. gentleman knows that when these charges were made as soon as the Committee met, the gentleman who made them stated explicitly that in order to prove them it was absolutely essential a number of public documents under the control of the Minister of Public Works should be put in the hands of the Committee. Now, if the hon. Minister was unable to procure all the vouchers and documents required, he certainly was able to procure some of them. These charges distinctly refer to several specific alleged offences. The hon. Minister knows they refer to the Quebec graving dock, the Lévis graving dock and the graving dock at Esquimalt, B.C. The papers relating to these are not at all mixed together, and those relating to each dock could be brought down separately, so that some progress might be made by the Committee. The hon. Minister of Public Works does not appear to me to appreciate the gravity of these proceedings at all. And I must protest in the very strongest language I can use against serious charges such as have been made against a Minister of the Crown, amounting to high crimes and misdemeanours, being treated in this off-hand manner. I do not suppose that in the history of this Parliament charges so grave were ever preferred before by any hon. member of this House against a Minister of the Crown; and I cannot conceive, when charges of such a serious character are preferred, that I will not say such negligence, but such carelessness and inattention should be shown in respect of them, as has been shown, with the consent of hon. gentlemen on

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

the Treasury benches, by the Minister implicated. The hon. Minister seems to think the only charge is that against an employé of his Department, but a charge of a most serious nature has been preferred against the hon. Minister himself. I do not think that in the history of parliamentary institutions a charge of such a grave character ever was preferred against a Minister of the Crown, namely, that certain members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. paid and caused to be paid large sums of money to the hon. the Minister of Public Works out of the proceeds of their public contracts, and that entries of the said payments were made in the books of that firm. The charges are such as, if proved to be true in whole or in part, will necessitate the hon. gentleman stepping down and out from the high position he occupies and retiring in disgrace. And in what position do we stand here to-day? We stand here to-day hoping that the hon. gentleman's innocence will be proved, but I am bound to say that the hon. gentleman has taken a course which is not calculated to promote that belief. The hon. gentleman took the responsibility of reading, from his seat in this House, his answer to that charge, but did not take the responsibility of denying that it is true. He does not deny that he received the money; he does not deny that he received it at the times and in the manner charged; he does not deny that he received it in his capacity of Minister of Public Works; but he simply denies that he received it for his own personal use and benefit. And I say that a denial of that most serious charge, made in that lame, and halting, and qualified manner, puts the matter before this House in such a position as to throw the responsibility upon the hon. gentleman and upon his colleagues of seeing that greater promptness is exhibited in the production of the documents required. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman himself did not take care, by his own personal orders, that the documents should be brought down the very next day. He cannot have been unaware that these charges, although not formally and officially preferred, had been hanging in the air for some time. He could not have been unaware that the hon. gentleman who took the responsibility of publishing them in the public press proposed to make the charge formally against him, and, although I would be the last to say that a Minister of the Crown is bound officially to notice every charge made against him in the public press, still, when a charge of the kind made against the Minister of Public Works in the public press, is renewed on his responsibility by a member of this House against a Minister of the Crown, I say it behooves him to take steps to show that his conduct is pure and his skirts are clear. When, still further, an hon. member says he requires documents in connection with the charge against the Minister which are under the custody of the hon. gentleman himself, in order to prove the charge, I say that his duty, his stern duty, his uncompromising duty, is to give up every other business which might take his attention and to devote his mind to the production of these documents; provided only he did not feel inclined to accept the suggestion which was already made from this side of the House, to relieve himself of any further control of these documents, and to hand them over to one of his colleagues. If the hon. gentleman had taken that course, and one of

his colleagues who was not charged in this way had said he was devoting all his time in order to bring down these documents, the House might have been satisfied. I am only speaking my own mind in this matter, but I say that I am not satisfied. I believe these charges are being treated in a very light way, and that the gravity of them is not appreciated by the hon. gentleman. Certainly the course which the hon. gentleman takes is not such as to lead us to assume that innocence on his part which we would be otherwise glad to do.

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

(In the Committee.)

Department of Public Works..... \$47,607.50

Mr. DEVLIN. Does that item cover a salary of \$1,200 for Mr. Horace Talbot, who is employed in the Department, and resides, I believe, at Gatineau Point?

Mr. FOSTER. This is not for the outside service.

Mr. DEVLIN. He is in the inside service. I find by the Auditor General's Report that Horace Talbot was paid a salary of \$1,200 for twelve months up to the 30th June last. I suppose that amount comes under this heading?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes; his salary is included in this vote.

Mr. DEVLIN. Might I ask what are his occupations?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He is one of the clerks in the Department.

Mr. DEVLIN. And I suppose he has been employed for several years?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN. I do not want to make any special charge, but I do say that this employé of the Government, instead of discharging the duties for which he is paid, is generally found during an election time upon the public platform; and I call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that this same gentleman waged incessant warfare against us in the County of Ottawa, not only during the last election but during the local election in May and June last. I do not think it fair that we should pay salaries to officials who are away from their offices for four, five and six weeks at a time. I have been the victim in the County of Ottawa of this kind of work. It is known that the employés of the Departments have been allowed to go out into that county and do all they could against the Liberal candidates. When questioned regarding this matter, they stated previous to the local election that they had tendered their resignation to the Minister of Public Works. We were somewhat astonished to find the same gentlemen in the Dominion election, and we asked if they had been re-appointed after the local election. The answer was, "yes." Then, what are you doing here now? "Oh, we have resigned again," was the reply. Some time ago fault was found with the conduct of Messrs. Poirier and Tremblay, and they were dismissed because they had actively interfered in a political fight when they were officers of this House; but here are employés of the Government who go out day after day, evening after evening, and are allowed to be absent from their offices for weeks at a time, receiving their pay during that time, and they are not treating candidates in a gentleman-like

way. I do not think it is fair that we should be asked to vote such sums of money to these men. The gentleman to whom I have alluded was not only actively engaged in the County of Ottawa, but I believe he was in Sherbrooke, and also in the County of Richelieu working for the Minister of Public Works himself; and it is said that his name was mentioned as a candidate in the County of Montmagny. This is the work we have to put up with, and yet, if an employé known to have Liberal views were to go out at all to take part in a contest, he would be summarily dismissed. I think we should have fair-play in this matter, and that the Minister of Public Works should explain the conduct of these employés.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister has heard the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin), and I notice that this same Horace Talbot was paid twelve months full salary up to the 30th June, which covers a part of the time my hon. friend refers to. If that is so, if he has received twelve months' pay for services rendered to the people only during a portion of that time, the Minister is bound to explain why leave of absence was granted to him to stump the country, either in the interests of the candidates for the Local Legislature or in his own interests. There is no reduction made in his pay for absence on special service. It is possible that we may find that this gentleman was also compensated in other ways. I would recommend my hon. friend to look carefully into the list of those who are receiving double pay to see whether the name of Mr. Horace Talbot figures there. In any case, I submit that the Minister of Public Works is bound to offer some explanation of the reasons which induced him to send the officers of his Department to electioneer for the benefit of the local candidates during the late provincial elections.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not aware that Mr. Talbot had interfered in the elections, as the hon. gentleman says he has. I understand that Mr. Talbot resides at Gatineau Point, and being a resident of the County of Ottawa, he may have taken part in the elections. But, of course, he was not sent by me or by my Department. Whether he spoke or took any part in the elections, I do not personally know.

Mr. DEVLIN. He certainly did take part in the election; he spoke on a public platform on the 3rd day of March last, two days before the election—spoke bitterly. He was not only there, but he was in the County of Richelieu taking part, I understand, in the election; he was certainly in the County of Montmagny. Another one whose name I may mention is Mr. Chas. Leduc, who, in the month of May last, and the latter part of June, was absent three or four weeks, taking part in the local election in the County of Ottawa, and he was able to go from his office here and proceed to Maniwaki, 100 miles, and returning from there, to come down to the lower end of the county and in fact stump it from one end to the other, to interfere actively in the election, notwithstanding that previous to that time, and since that time, he has been an employé of one of the Departments. We have got to put up with his conduct, but if one of our own friends were to do the same thing, he would be summarily dismissed. The state of affairs now

is such that our friends in the service are actually afraid to say for whom they might vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the subject is deserving of the serious consideration of the House. We have adopted here, to a very large extent, the English practice of permanent officials in the public service. Now, it is of the first consequence, if that system is to be maintained in this country, that those officials should abstain from actual participation in the political affairs of the country. We would not tolerate for a moment any active canvassing on the part of the judges of any of our courts, and it is just as necessary that those who are employed in the political service of the country, and who are paid by moneys that are taken from all classes of the population, should be equally neutral in politics. It is impossible that a public official can be an active politician and at the same time a faithful official. A man who will take the public platform in favour of the Ministry by whom he is employed, is an official who will intrigue against his political opponents, should they be placed in charge of the Administration; and so it will come to this, that the leaders of any party who may take charge of the Government of the country for the time being, in order to be assured of faithful public service, will find it necessary to dismiss from office all those who are politically opposed to them. So you will have the rule that to the victors belong the spoils, and that there must be a change of officials in every department of government with every change of administration. Now, Sir, these men were paid for a certain public service; they are required to undergo an examination; they are appointed in consequence of personal qualification to discharge certain duties, and if a Minister of the Crown takes an official out of his Department and sends him away for a month or six weeks to engage actively in canvassing the country, at the same time this official is receiving his salary from the public treasury, it is clear either that there must be a larger number of persons employed in order efficiently to carry on the Administration, or that there must be great neglect of the public service. It does seem to me that we must take the opinion of the House on the question; and say whether it shall be open to the Administration to enlist men from the public Departments of the country, who are receiving salaries out of the public treasury, to engage in political canvassing as the heads of a party. I do not think that should be tolerated. It is clear from the statement made by the hon. member for Ottawa County, that this is a practice which prevails, at all events, in the Department of Public Works. We shall no doubt learn, before these Estimates are voted, how far this practice obtains in other Departments of the public service.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend has laid down quite correctly, I think, the constitutional rule that prevails in England. I have myself always believed that it would be in the interest of the public service that civil servants should not vote; that is my individual opinion, but I am aware that the House, on two or three occasions, has pronounced against it. In any case, I am clear on this point, that no public servant ought to be allowed to do more than vote. I would not in the slightest degree excuse a public servant who interfered on our side, any more than I would the

Mr. DEVLIN.

public servant who interfered in behalf of hon. gentlemen opposite. My hon. friend is perfectly right in stating that, if this kind of thing is permitted, or is winked at, or is not punished, by hon. gentlemen opposite, their friends will only have them to blame if, in the event of any change of Government, extremely sweeping alterations should be found necessary to be made in the Civil Service. I have myself always been extremely adverse to introducing what is known as the American system, holding that it results in greater mischief to the public service. But it is absolutely necessary, if this is to be avoided, that cases like this should not be permitted to occur. I think my hon. friend stated that this gentleman, Mr. Horace Talbot, has been habitually and systematically in the habit of interfering with elections.

Mr. DEVLIN. He is only one of several.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt of that. This gentleman has been receiving money from the public service, and he has been using it for purposes which were never contemplated when the grant was made—at least, never contemplated, as we must suppose, by the House. There is another reason. If a Minister of the Crown chooses to put himself under obligations of a political kind to an officer of his Department, everybody knows that that gentleman becomes, to a certain extent, his master's master; everybody knows that promotion in such cases will go by favour, not by merit; and it very often happens that this person who has performed political services for the Administration, establishes claims which render it perfectly easy for him to neglect his duties. I have heard of a good many cases in which that has been done, and in which the Minister has been tongue-tied, has been unable to act, because he had seen fit, on various occasions, to ask one of his subordinates to interfere in election contests. Whether that has been the case, what salary Mr. Talbot is receiving, what his grade of promotion, etc., my hon. friend may, perhaps, find it necessary to enquire. But there is no doubt that you will assuredly pave the way for the introduction of the American system, and for the dismissal of a great number of officers, in the event of a change of Government, if this kind of thing is permitted to go on, and to go unpunished.

The CHAIRMAN. Shall the resolution be adopted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; it is not carried. I am not going to waste any more time on Mr. Horace Talbot at the present moment. I observe that in course of the late discussion, at which I was not able to assist myself, that a question was raised as to the Chief Engineer of Public Works, Mr. Perley. I desire to know whether Mr. Perley has been suspended or whether he still continues to act in this Department?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. He has not been suspended and he still continues to act as Chief Engineer.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is exceedingly improper that we should be asked to pass this item to pay Mr. Perley's salary, and allow him to remain in the position he now occupies. It appears to me, from the course adopted by the Government, that a very grave question arises, and it is this, whether Mr. Perley is chief in command, and whether the

Minister under whom he serves, dare dismiss him under the circumstances, or not. That is the conclusion to which anyone must arrive. Very serious charges have been made; they have been preferred by an hon. member in his place in Parliament. When the resolution was before the House, three or four days ago, a very extended discussion took place in regard to it, and in the midst of the discussion the First Minister asked for an adjournment. The Opposition were quite justified in coming to the conclusion that when the item was again reached the Government would be able to announce they had suspended Mr. Perley, and the House would then be asked to pass the item. We have reached the item, but we are in precisely the same position as we were before. No change has been made, notwithstanding the very pronounced opposition in the House to passing the item under the existing circumstances, and in view of the very grave charges that stand recorded against that man by a member of this House; and yet the Government come before the House, under the same conditions as then existed, and ask its consent to the passing of the item. It is not showing proper courtesy, to say nothing more, to the Opposition to ask hon. members to consent to it. This is a very grave question, and it is one which the Opposition have a perfect right to discuss and criticize thoroughly, together with the course which the Government seem determined to pursue. A very serious question has also been brought forward by my hon. friend near me, with regard to the active efforts put forward by civil servants in opposing him in his constituency. This practice is carried out to a very considerable extent. On the discussion of another item some days ago, when the Minister of Finance asked for an increase of \$200 to the salary of an official, it was pointed out by another hon. gentleman that the civil servant was down in a constituency, I believe in the constituency of the Minister of Finance, discharging very important duties in his behalf at the late election. No doubt the \$200 increase of salary has been adled as a thank-offering for the earnest, devoted and zealous efforts put forward to secure the Minister's return. And we have the same practice going on from one Department to another. We have examples of civil servants drawing, not the money of the Government, but the money of the people, the money of Reformers as well as Conservatives, pocketing round salaries each year, and then having the daring to go into constituencies and oppose the return of men brought out to represent the people. I repeat that it is extremely discourteous to ask the Opposition, in face of all the charges made against Mr. Perley, in face of the fact that he stands under a cloud next to the Minister of Public Works himself, to pass this item and to consent to the passage of this item of \$4,000 to keep this man in his place and continue him in the public service notwithstanding the charges against him. It is exceedingly discreditable to the Government to ask us to assent to this item.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the statement by my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and my hon. friend from South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the subject would be brought up as to the extent to which it is legitimate for civil servants to interfere in politi-

cal contests, I have nothing to say just now. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) says that it is very discourteous for us to move this vote for the salary of the Chief Engineer of Public Works from the 1st July next until the 1st July, 1892. The reason why the vote was postponed the other night was that the House was exceedingly thin, and by a sort of arrangement across the floor we agreed that the Committee should rise and report progress and that the question on this vote should remain as it was. Now, however, it comes up in the ordinary way. As I have already taken occasion to say, this is not a question of Mr. Perley personally at all; it is a question of whether Parliament will provide a salary for the Chief Engineer of Public Works. That Department must have such an officer, and that salary is to be given to the officer who happens to be the Chief Engineer on the 1st July next. It is to be understood that Mr. Perley's conduct is to be under review this session by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I hope that long before the 1st of July next, the truth or falsehood of the statements concerning Mr. Perley will be investigated and decided upon by the Committee in the first place, and by the House in the second place. If any improprieties are proven against Mr. Perley the House will deal with that, and another Chief Engineer will be appointed; but there must be a Chief Engineer, and this is not a vote for Mr. Perley, but for whoever happens to be Chief Engineer at the time. Now, as to the question of suspension I at once say that I will never agree to suspend a respectable man who hitherto has had a good character, who still holds a responsible position and who has been trusted for years, because charges are brought against him and not yet proven. I would not keep my place for a moment if that were done, and if such a practice is introduced, it must be introduced by a Government of which I am not a member. I will stick to the English practice, that every man should be considered innocent until he is proven guilty.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I am rather surprised at the last proposition laid down by the Prime Minister. Certainly, the appropriation we are now asked to vote is an appropriation to be paid after the 1st July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To be "earned" after the 1st July.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Yes, "earned" after the 1st July, and it may be earned by someone else than Mr. Perley. There is no doubt that no one is disputing that proposition, but the proposition in which the House is interested is to know what action the Government have taken with regard to a person who if he remains in office will earn this salary of Chief Engineer. The First Minister has just stated that until the truth of this charge is established he will not suspend Mr. Perley; but supposing Mr. Perley were charged with murder, would the hon. gentleman apply that rule—how would it be in that case?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If he were charged with murder he would be charged before a magistrate and there would be sworn evidence against him, and he would be put upon his trial and he could not perform his duties.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). But he might be bailed out, and I suppose that if he should be bailed the hon. gentleman would still continue him in office. I do not understand the English rule to be as the hon. gentleman has laid down. What makes the matter important in this particular is that Mr. Perley is charged with certain acts which affect him in his character as Chief Engineer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not seen such charges.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Well, I understand such charges have been made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman does not know the charges, and yet he asks for a suspension. He does not know what the charges are, or whether there are any charges at all.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The charges are before the House, and it is pretty clear the First Minister has not read them. Now, what is the English practice. I will take the case of Lord Melville. In 1805 Lord Melville, who was then First Lord of the Admiralty, was impeached by the House of Commons for certain irregularities committed while holding the office of Treasurer of the Navy. After a criminatory vote had been carried by the House, Lord Melville resigned his position as a Minister of the Crown, although his trial had not yet taken place. The rule that a man is to be considered innocent until guilt is established did not prevent his resignation, and it was deemed expedient to erase his name from the list of Privy Councillors, although he was afterwards acquitted of the charge preferred against him. That is the English rule.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was first the criminatory vote.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was just such a vote as was given here.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It was just such a vote as might follow condemnation by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and Lord Melville did not resign until then.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It was a vote which put Lord Melville, better known as Sir Henry Dundas, on his trial. We have certain charges made against persons here, and the question has been referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the enquiry of the Committee is exactly such an enquiry as takes place upon an impeachment.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh!

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). The hon. gentleman says "Oh!" but I say that is the case. It is for the purpose of ascertaining whether the party is guilty or innocent of the charge. It is a preliminary trial, for the Committee on Privileges and Elections have no power to punish. They report to this House, they perform the particular functions that are performed by the House of Lords in the case of impeachment, but the fact that they have not power to give an effective judgment with a view to punishment does not at all alter the case in this particular. I stated to the House the other day, and I stated, I think, with perfect fairness, that when these charges were made the persons who are to prepare the necessary papers with a view to bring them before the committee, should not be the persons who stand charged. It is a well-settled rule of law that a man is not to be a judge in his own case, and when you

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

place in the hands of the Chief Engineer any part of the collection and arrangement and preparation of the papers which an hon. member of this House said were necessary for the purpose of establishing the case against him, you are departing from that rule, for you are making him to some extent a prosecutor against himself. It does seem to me that the last proposition laid down by the First Minister is indefensible, and entirely at variance with the principles of our law and with the rule that is followed in the United Kingdom.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not observing his usual accuracy, or rather that his memory has failed him when he referred to the case of Lord Melville and his impeachment. That case and the one under discussion are not analogous at all; on the contrary, if the hon. gentleman will look back at the history of that case he will find that when Lord Melville was First Lord of the Admiralty there were charges brought against Sir James Trotter, a subordinate officer of the Admiralty, and an attempt made to connect Lord Melville with them, somewhat, perhaps, under circumstances similar to this case. Lord Melville, upon these charges being brought against him, did not resign, and Mr. Pitt did not ask him to resign, and he remained in office for more than a year, perhaps for two years, while the evidence was taken inculping him, as the majority on the committee believed, as being connected with, or conniving at, or submitting to the impropriety of Sir James Trotter. During all the time of that investigation, which is similar to the investigation by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, Lord Melville remained First Lord of the Admiralty. It was not until the committee reported, censuring Lord Melville and connecting him with the improprieties committed by Sir James Trotter to such an extent that the House of Commons took it as a condemnation and impeached him of high crimes and misdemeanours, that he resigned. In addition to that, Lord Melville was a political officer as the hon. gentleman knows, and ought to command the implicit confidence of Parliament, and he could not with propriety retain his office. I remember another case, that of Lord Henry Lennox, who was Chief Commissioner of Works. When he was charged he rose in his place voluntarily and he said that he desired to resign and to fight his battle alone. He denied the charges and he said he wished to fight his battle independent of Parliament, and not to cloak himself with any supposed influence he might have as being a member of the Government, and he did not wish that anything connected with the charges against him should in any way, directly or indirectly, affect the Government, or that they might be supposed to be conniving with him, or supporting him against the charges. However, the case of Lord Melville is precisely a case in support of my argument and contention.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That may be, but I think that every member of this House who will look at this matter with reasonable partiality, will feel that it is an unfortunate thing that a gentleman who is charged with very great crimes and misdemeanours should be the person whose official duty it is to submit these documents for the investigation of this Committee. I state—and this as

my own individual opinion--that I believe that the hon. Minister of Public Works would have better consulted his own dignity, would have better consulted the dignity of the Parliament of Canada, and the interest of the Government, too, if he had for the time being changed office with some of his colleagues. That, however, I am not disposed to insist on further than to state that I believe he would have done well to have done so. But the hon. First Minister, if I understood him rightly just now, stated that no charges had been preferred against Mr. Perley. Well, I find the hon. gentleman who brought this matter forward, among other things states:

"That the said Thomas McGreevy used his influence as a member of this House with the Department of Public Works, and in particular with Henry F. Perley, Esq., to induce him to report to the Quebec Harbour Commission in favour of the payment of the said sum of 35 cents per cubic yard.

"That the correspondence on this subject between Henry F. Perley and Larkin, Connolly & Co., before the Quebec Harbour Commissioners were consulted, took place at the suggestion of the said Thomas McGreevy, and was conducted with his knowledge and participation in such a manner as to conceal from the eyes of Parliament and of the public the corrupt character of the contract, in connection with which he had received \$27,000."

I think these are very strong charges against Mr. Perley.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Against Mr. McGreevy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They implicate Mr. Perley very grievously.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. An inference may be drawn from these statements affecting Mr. Perley, but they contain no direct charge against him. They charge that Mr. McGreevy used his influence with Mr. Perley, but it is not said that Mr. Perley yielded to the seductions of Mr. McGreevy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to another clause:

"That in the execution of the works of this contract extensive frauds were perpetrated, to the detriment of the public treasury, and sums of money were paid corruptly to officials under the control and direction of Henry F. Perley and appointed by the Quebec Harbour Commission."

Mr. FOSTER. That is, that the officials were under the control of Mr. Perley, not that the payments were made under him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, if you connect together the three statements I have read, you will see that Henry F. Perley—he may be innocent or not, I express no opinion as to that—is deeply implicated as an accomplice in the charges made against Thomas McGreevy and the hon. Minister of Public Works. I will not offer an opinion on the legal merits of the case, but I do not believe that any layman reading these documents would form any other opinion than that Henry F. Perley was to all intents and purposes, I was going to say in the dock, along with the other parties charged.

Mr. McNEILL. I want to say just one word on this matter, and that is, that I do think it would be more generous on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to allow this matter to stand over until Mr. Perley had his trial. Mr. Perley, as we all know, has been for many years one of the most trusted officers in the public service of Canada. I have had some dealings

with Mr. Perley, and though there are some personal reasons why I should not speak very favourably of Mr. Perley's conduct towards myself, for I must say that on more than one occasion I have received rather scant courtesy at his hands, yet I will say this, that from what I have known of him during the seven or eight sessions that I have been in Parliament, it will take very strong evidence indeed to persuade me that Mr. Perley is other than an ornament to the public service of Canada. My belief is that Mr. Perley is one of the most upright and honourable men to be found in the public service to-day; and, believing this, I must say that I think it would be more generous if hon. gentlemen would hold their hands and allow this matter to go before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where there will be an opportunity afforded to Mr. Perley to defend himself, who I believe is being almost killed—as anyone will see who knew him a year or two ago and looks into his face to-day—by the pressure of this charge against him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. My hon. friend misapprehends the point altogether. Nobody on this side wishes to find Mr. Perley guilty; I myself certainly do not. We are simply objecting—and this is a totally different thing—to the man who is accused, no matter who he may be, being called upon to prepare the papers or to decide what particular papers may come before the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I understand that it will be part of Mr. Perley's official duty to say what papers will come down in return to my hon. friend's demand for the production of those documents, and I think the hon. gentleman who spoke last will admit that this important and delicate duty should be put into the hands of anyone rather than those of any of the persons accused.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman makes a mistake in supposing that Mr. Perley has anything to do with the preparation or custody of the documents. All the papers are in the hands of the Deputy head, Mr. Gobeil, and Mr. Perley can only have access to them through the intervention of Mr. Gobeil.

Mr. EDGAR. The charge made before the House by the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte) was levelled against two members of the House, one being a member of the Government, and it brings in Mr. Perley incidentally, and not in a direct manner. But the hon. First Minister has referred to cases in which Ministers of the Crown had construed the bearing of charges made against them. If he had looked at the case of Lord Ellenborough in 1858, he would have found that on the publication of a despatch to Lord Canning, then Governor of India, from Lord Ellenborough, which caused tremendous excitement in the country, Lord Ellenborough at once avowed that he was solely responsible for the publication of that despatch, and he sent his resignation directly to Her Majesty and not to Lord Derby, the Prime Minister, in order to shield his colleagues from responsibility for his act; and in the debate that took place on the subject in the House of Lords, Lord Derby laid down the principle that Ministers were only responsible for the acts of their colleagues if they failed to disavow all responsibility for the act as soon as public attention had been drawn to it. Now, in this case, a gentleman very near to the hon. First Minister, is charged with matters very much

more serious than the publication of a despatch. These are much more serious matters, also, than those with which Lord Henry Le-mox was charged with ; and I admit it is a question of taste, as regards the Minister of Public Works and the First Minister and the others, whether the Minister of Public Works should continue in control of his Department, in which are the papers required for this investigation. The First Minister will remember also the case of Mr. Stansfield, who was accused in 1864, in the press and publicly, of participation in a plot to assassinate the Emperor of the French. An attempt was made in the House of Commons to censure Mr. Stansfield, but the House voted down the motion. As soon, however, as the motion of censure was defeated, the Minister rose and said he would assume the entire responsibility, and retire, thus relieving his colleagues from any imputation or injury. In fact, he said his remaining there would not strengthen his colleagues, and therefore he preferred to leave. It is largely a matter of taste. If the First Minister chooses to allow things to go on as they are going, it is certainly not for us to say anything more. That is his affair and not ours. If it suits him it suits us. I would be sorry to press my opinion on so experienced and able a statesman as the First Minister, as to what would be his duty or the duty of any of his colleagues under the circumstances.

Mr. DEVLIN. I must thank the right hon. the First Minister for his promise to investigate the matter I brought to his notice. I wish to say, however, it was not through any spirit of hostility to any member of the Civil Service that I mentioned this case, but in order that a matter which is of serious importance should be looked into. I would further ask the First Minister to extend the investigation, so that it may include all the various employes of the various Departments who have taken part in the late Ottawa County elections, both Federal and Local.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I hope the hon. gentleman who spoke just now, does not imagine there is on this side any feeling against Mr. Perley, whose name has been mentioned in connection with these charges. That gentleman's public career has been an honourable and distinguished one. So far as his name is known in the Maritime Provinces, I can bear testimony to the fact that there it has always been a synonym for upright conduct. There are peculiar circumstances with Mr. Perley's state of health and his family relations calculated to evoke sympathy ; and I am sure that sympathy is felt in a very great measure by every hon. member on this side. I may add, that I hope it will be shown that Mr. Perley has not been guilty of improper conduct, and in that case no man in this House will be more glad or proud than I will, and I am sure my colleagues around me entertain the same feeling

Department of Railways and Canals... \$55,000

Mr. FOSTER. There is an error in the Estimates. The number of second class clerks in the column 1890-91 is printed as eight, whereas it should be nine, so that the increase is two and not three as appears there. There are nine statutory increases at \$50 ; one at \$37.50, and one at \$12.50. There is an additional second class clerk at \$1,125, and another at \$1,112.50. There is also an assistant

Mr. EDGAR.

to the private secretary at \$300, making in all \$3,450. There is a decrease in the estimated salary of the Deputy of \$1,400, and two third class clerks, making a decrease of \$4,000, and a net decrease in the whole estimate of \$1,650.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. the First Minister propose, in future, to dispense entirely with the Deputy Minister, and confine himself to the services of Mr. Schreiber ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Trudeau has been for many years the Deputy head, Mr. Schreiber the Chief Engineer of Railways, and the lamented Mr. Page, Chief Engineer of Canals. Mr. Trudeau being an engineer, and especially a hydraulic engineer, as well as Mr. Page, he and Mr. Page acted together for years in connection with the construction of canals and the improvement of the St. Lawrence and other waterways, so that when Mr. Page suddenly died it was thought better that Mr. Trudeau, while still retaining office as Deputy head, should be Mr. Page's successor as Chief Engineer of Canals to carry out the plans which had been settled pretty much by them in concert. Mr. Trudeau is now the Deputy head of the Department of Railways and Canals and also the Chief Engineer of Canals, and will continue to be so until it is found that the work is too much for him and some engineer is trained to take the place of Mr. Page. In the meantime the salary of the Deputy head is saved.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is it as deputy or Chief Engineer that Mr. Trudeau is paid ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He is the Deputy head and Chief Engineer, but draws only the salary of Chief Engineer, which is \$6,000. He draws the larger and drops the smaller salary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt Mr. Trudeau is a good officer, but I rather suspect that the hon. gentleman, if he finds it necessary to replace the Chief Engineer, will find that he has landed himself in a dilemma : for, unless Mr. Trudeau is built on entirely different principles from most men, it would be very disagreeable for him, after enjoying a salary of \$6,000, to fall back upon one of \$4,000.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He will not do that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Not if he can help it, I am quite sure ; but the difficulty is this : that if Mr. Trudeau is to continue as Deputy head, and a Chief Engineer be afterwards appointed, you will have the anomaly that you will have one Deputy head drawing \$6,000, and a great many others drawing \$3,200, and you will find a strike for higher wages on their part.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not see any fear of that. Mr. Trudeau is now receiving \$6,000, and as long as he remains in the service he will continue to receive that salary. It is rather an anomaly that the Deputy head, the permanent head of the Department, should receive less salary than the two engineers. Mr. Trudeau is an experienced engineer himself, and the only consequence will be that if it is found he requires assistance, he will still be Deputy head and Chief Engineer, and will get an assistant who will be quite satisfied to take the \$4,000 and wait for an increase, as Mr. Trudeau, like his political head at

this moment, is not a young man, and we may both retire together.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice that in the year before last we only spent \$44,000, and this year we are asked for \$56,000. Now that we have completed a great many of our public works, we ought to be able to make a considerable reduction in the expenditure of the staff required in this Department. Certainly the same amount of work that was going on a few years ago is not now being discharged by the Department of Railways and Canals. A great many railways are now built which formerly necessitated the employment of a large staff, and, though there is some reduction, I think there should be a larger reduction in this expenditure.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In regard to railways, there will be, and there ought to be ere long a reduction in the engineering staff, because there is no new railway work going on except the Extension Railway and the railway running through Cape Breton. As to canals, however, there is an increased amount of work. The Williamsburg Canal and the Cornwall Canal are now worked up to high pressure in order to have our great waterway finished as soon as possible, and we are entering upon the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, so that there will be no reduction for some years to come in that branch.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman did not refer to any increased expenses on the Trent Valley Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That depends upon the support we get from both sides of the House, including my hon. friend.

Mr. BARRON. The First Minister telegraphed that a grant was to be made this year to complete the Trent Valley Canal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman's memory is not quite correct.

Mr. BARRON. I have seen the telegram, and it says that the Trent Valley Commissioners have reported in favour of the completion of that canal, and that Parliament will be asked this session for a vote for that purpose. So I suppose there will be a considerable sum for that work in the Supplementary Estimates. I would call the attention of the Minister to the fact that the railway bridge at Fenelon Falls, to which reference has so often been made, is still there, preventing barges of any size from going down.

Mr. FOSTER. This does not come under this item, which refers only to the officers in the inside service.

Mr. BARRON. I only desire to call the attention of the First Minister to this matter now so that he might see that it is attended to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have been called upon for many years without effect, and I am afraid that, unless the Government takes decided action, matters will remain as they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps, under present circumstances, more decided action may be taken. I may point out that my hon. friend has not been altogether forgotten. The completion of the Trent Valley Canal is provided for by a vote of \$76,000 in the current year, and according to the

Estimates before us, we have spent no less than \$2,000, and a re-vote of \$74,000 will be asked, which I hope will satisfy my hon. friend.

Department of the Geological Survey.. \$48,310

Mr. FOSTER. There is an increase here of \$980. There are 23 statutory increases, amounting to \$1,150, and one at \$30, making a total increase of \$1,180. Four new technical officers have been appointed, and one third class clerk has been promoted to second class, and there has been an increase given to Messrs. Ingall, Curran and Tyrrell. Then, some clerks have been dropped, and one has had his salary reduced by \$50, making the net increase \$980.

Mr. WELDON. The people of Albert County are very desirous that the men of the survey should make their way down to the southern part of that county again. There was a good survey made some years ago, but it was a very hurried one, and there is a feeling now that a survey would do a great deal to direct the attention of the public to the great mineral resources of the county.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of there being twenty technical officers in place of six? What is the effect of making these fourteen gentleman technical officers? Does it place them under a different regime?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Last year we passed an Act by which we made the Department of the Geological Survey a separate Department, and by clause 4 of the Act, at the suggestion of the Director, we authorized the appointment of all these officers as technical officers. They are only really classed as they were previously, but the Act requires that they shall be technical officers and specifies what their qualifications should be. It causes no change in the expenditure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice that technical officers, those having special qualifications, generally receive higher salaries and are removed to a certain extent from the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Their salaries have not been increased, except in the case of the two or three mentioned by the Finance Minister. This was brought about by strong representations made by the gentlemen themselves, who drew my attention to the inequality of the salaries they were receiving with those received by others occupying almost similar positions, not only in Canada, but in the United States; and on the strong representations of the Director, I assented to placing this slight increase in the Estimates. Within the last few years we have lost some of our most valuable men. We have lost Mr. Harrington, who is now receiving \$2,500 at McGill College; we have lost Professor Spencer, who is receiving \$3,000 as State Geologist of Georgia; we have lost Mr. F. D. Adams, who is now receiving \$1,500 at McGill College, and Mr. Kenrick, who is receiving \$1,000 at St. John's College, Winnipeg, and about \$1,400 as Assistant Dominion Analyst for Manitoba. We lost last year Mr. Lawson, a gentleman well known to hon. gentleman here; he is now Professor of Geology in a university in California. I think that we should endeavour, so far as possible, to keep our able men with us, and we are choosing the best and most

talented young men from the different universities, particularly those who show an aptitude for geological pursuits, and we are taking them into service, so far as we can, in order to give them an education which we hope, by-and-bye, will place them in the high position which many of our men now occupy. That is the policy we have pursued in the Department, and I hope there will be no objection taken to these slight increases.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not disposed to take exception to paying this class of officers well, but I want to understand exactly what we are doing. I believe there are twenty gentlemen altogether under the head of technical officers. Am I to understand from the Minister of the Interior that these are all in one class, and that they may, by process of time, ascend to a point equivalent of that of chief clerk?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes: if they serve long enough they are all entitled to the statutory increase, which would bring their salaries up to \$2,400.

Office of the High Commissioner for
Canada in London, salaries..... \$7,384

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). These items pertain to the inside of the Department of Finance, the Minister tells us. I just wish to enquire whether the High Commissioner is engaged in the inside or the outside service at present, and when would be the proper time to discuss him.

Mr. FOSTER. He is not present just now. He certainly does not come in this category, anyway.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who looks after these officials during the miscellaneous absences of the High Commissioner on special services? Are they so well trained that they are able to run alone?

Mr. FOSTER. They are able to go by themselves.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, does not the hon. gentleman think that if we are so fortunate as to have officers of this class who are able to go by themselves, who do not require to be looked after, who can run the office quite as well, and perhaps a good deal better, when my lord the High Commissioner is away on special service, as when he is there—does not the hon. gentleman, who gives these gentlemen so high a character, think that he could leave them there without a High Commissioner at all, and that he would be justified in letting them run the office alone all the time?

Mr. FOSTER. They can do their own work, but not the High Commissioner's.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is certainly a part of the High Commissioner's work, particularly that part which goes towards making things pleasant in Nova Scotia—this work, probably, these gentlemen cannot do; but all the practical work that he does, what he is paid to do, what he is sent there to perform—all that, I rather think, these gentlemen could do just as well without him as with him. I am glad to have the testimony of the Minister of Finance to the fact, and I hope the House will make a note of it.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice that the High Commissioner serves in another office. I do not know whether the Government constituted the office for him or not, but it appears to me to be a

Mr. DEWDNEY.

type of the eternal fitness of things. I see from the *Empire* that Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed director of water works and gas works to a corporation which has just been organized with a capital of two million. Now, if he is going to manage the gas works there, how is he going to manage the gas works here? Does he get an extra salary for this? Is this \$2,000 for his extra salary? I think that if we want a High Commissioner at all, if there are duties for him to discharge, it would be quite as well for him to attend to them instead of going into trade outside the High Commissioner's business. He is paid a handsome salary, and still he is going into trade and taking the management of these corporations. How much are we granting now in order to keep up this enterprise in which he is engaged? Is he going to employ servants paid by the country in order to manage these companies and these works? That is something the House ought to know. I do not know whether the Government are in this concern or not. I do not think they will manage it as successfully as Sir Charles would if he were here. But they should let the House know about it, and if he is under their instructions, if he is guided by them, if he is moved by them, and if they still control him, we ought to know whether they are with him partners in this gas enterprise.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think my hon. friend has brought up a matter which may require a little consideration at the hands of the Government. Now, I doubt exceedingly the wisdom or the propriety of the High Commissioner of Canada, an officer who receives a handsome salary from us, and a house which we have furnished for him regardless of expense—I greatly doubt the propriety of his officiating as a guinea pig in London. I do not think it is consonant with our dignity and—

An hon. MEMBER. What is a guinea pig?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must refer my hon. friend to the *habitués* of the Stock Exchange. Practically speaking, it means this: that gentlemen who occupy certain official positions are very often in the habit of—what shall I call it?—hiring themselves out to financial institutions in London, for which they receive various sums, some larger and some smaller. In the case of high commissioner guinea pigs, a guinea a week—from which practice they take their name—may be allowed. A plate of guineas, I have understood, is handed round to the various directors at the ordinary meetings, and each of them is allowed to extract one: perhaps, in the case of a high commissioner he may be allowed to extract a little more. Anyhow, I doubt exceedingly whether it is desirable, or prudent, or in the interests of the people of Canada, to retain our High Commissioner.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Steam-Boiler and Plate-Glass Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Hyman.)

Bill (No. 51) to incorporate the Vancouver Dock and Ship Building Company.—(Mr. Mara.)

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

Bill (No. 55) to incorporate the Atikokan Iron Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

Bill (No. 56) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Davis.)

Bill (No. 57) to incorporate the Buffalo Lake and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald.)

Bill (No. 58) to incorporate the Whirlpool Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. LANDERKIN. Before resuming the discussion on this item for the office of the High Commissioner in London, it may not be out of place for me to make a reference to the Chairman (Mr. Bergeron). The hon. gentleman has occupied a seat in my neighbourhood during one Parliament, and I am glad to see the elevation to which he has attained. If his services and his abilities are not in due time properly rewarded, I hope he will bolt from the party again. During the time I have had a seat here I have had three or four members sitting beside me, all of whom have attained eminence. I do not know whether the Government have the idea that those who sit beside me are specially fitted on that account to occupy high positions, or not. Mr. Royal was made Lieutenant Governor of the North-West Territories; Mr. Mercier sat beside me one session and subsequently became Premier of Quebec. I do not know whether this Government made him so or not. Now the hon. member for Beauharnois has been elevated to the position of Deputy Speaker; from the fact that he sat near me three or four sessions, his qualifications cannot be doubted. In coming to the item to which I called the attention of the Committee before Recess, I will refer to the notices which appeared in the newspapers in regard to this subject. I shall also refer to the dual offices that are held by persons appointed to offices by the Government, and consider the advisability of permitting those who are paid by this House, and paid fairly well, to enter into the management of other concerns and business in the old country, thus taking their time and attention from the duties and responsibilities of the offices conferred upon them by the Government and this House. From the newspaper report I notice that Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed Director of the Water Works and Gas Works Securities Corporation, which has just been organized with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling. It is gratifying to know that our High Commissioner is not financially in distress; that he is able to incorporate probably by himself—it does not say he is the manager—a company with a capital of ten million dollars. The object of the new corporation is to buy up water works, gas works, and other concerns of the kind in Canada and the United States. I draw the attention of my ultra-loyal friends opposite to the words "United States," not that I consider it a very treasonable thing myself, but I do not know how hon. gentlemen on the other side may find this compatible with their recent utterances on this subject. You would imagine at least that an officer appointed by the Government of Canada, drawing salary and pickings to the amount of \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year, would invest his money in enter-

prises in Canada. I think that is the position which hon. members opposite would have supported during the last election; but they would probably subscribe to a different doctrine now. It is gratifying to know that legislation of an Imperial character will be passed in order to allow this company to go into operation. It is further indicated by the telegram that legislation in the colonies will be required in order to allow our High Commissioner to spread himself through Canada and the United States. If the office of the High Commissioner does not require to be kept open during the whole year, then it is a question for the House and the Government to determine during what period of the year the office shall be kept open. If the High Commissioner can undertake to manage the duties of his office and also this gas concern with a capital of \$10,000,000, it is clear to the members of this House and to the people that the time has arrived when this question can no longer be shirked but that it must be dealt with freely by the people. It is not for me to discuss the ways and means whereby the money was secured to the extent of \$10,000,000; but the High Commissioner may have provided all the funds himself. That is the question. I do not know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that considering this is the first night you have occupied your position, it would be fair to call upon you to decide whether we should discuss in this House, how and by what means he who has been kept on a salary of almost starvation price can establish a gas company with a capital of \$10,000,000. Remember, Mr. Chairman, that I do not doubt his qualifications to manage this company. I do not deny but that he may possess qualifications for this office, but the question for the people of this country to consider is, whether it is longer necessary for us to keep a High Commissioner to discharge the duties of a company involving so much capital as this. It is known to everyone in Canada that the High Commissioner was absent from London quite a portion of this year. He was engaged in the elections here, and it is well known that since the elections he has been keeping himself prominently before the people through the press of the United Kingdom, and he has maintained that prominence at the expense of the Ministers of the Crown here. He would indicate from his utterances that they are his servants instead of his masters; that is the position he has kept prominently before the people of England and the people of Canada. Now, whether he has been always wise or politic in his utterances it is for the House and the Government to decide. He draws his salary from the people of this country independent of party; he has made statements in reference to the Liberal party of this country of such a character that it becomes the duty of the Government to take cognizance of his utterances and to put a stop to them. The Liberal party in this country pay him three-fourths of his salary, because they represent three-fourths of the best interest of the country, and if the High Commissioner continues to use language so offensive to them it becomes the duty of the Government and the duty of this Parliament to say that no gentleman shall occupy a position in which he attempts to degrade and insult those who pay him the larger portion of his salary. During his election campaign the High Commissioner used utterances which were not of a character to be approved of by fair-minded people,

no matter to what party they belonged. I believe he spoke at Windsor, in the County of Essex, and it is gratifying to those who sit on this side of the House to know that the Government lost a supporter in that constituency and that we gained a supporter by a majority of some 700 votes. That is one good thing at least for which we should feel a little grateful to Sir Charles Tupper and cause us to be a little lenient towards him. He also spoke at London in favour of the Minister of Agriculture, and my distinguished young friend (Mr. Hyman) was returned by a large majority from that constituency. Now, if the High Commissioner had gone on in that way I might be inclined to excuse some of his vagaries and some of his language, but no matter how eminent his services may be, I cannot forget what is due to the people whom I represent, and to the people of this country generally. After the election was over, Sir Charles Tupper assailed the Grand Trunk Railway, a great enterprise in this country. He made an onslaught on the Grand Trunk Railway Company, because, as he states, they did not consent to convey the voters to the polls and to use their influence to support the Government. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to a speech which he made at Amherst against the Grand Trunk Railway, and I want to ascertain what is the intention of the Government in reference to this speech. I will read the speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it as read.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I know the gentlemen on the other side of the House do not like this kind of literature. I know they feel a little ashamed of it, for well they may feel ashamed, and if they do feel ashamed I must congratulate them, because where there is shame there is some hope of reform. However that may be, Sir Charles Tupper said :

" Among the great odds that the Government had to contend with in Ontario was the enormous power of the Grand Trunk Railway, and Sir Charles proceeded to handle that corporation without gloves. He said he never could have believed that they would have been base enough to be guilty of the disgraceful conduct that had characterized them during the recent campaign. The Grand Trunk railway was deeply indebted to the Canadian Government."

That is something I never knew before—

" That corporation had received enormous assistance from Canada "—

That is more sensible than to say they received it from the Government—

" That corporation had received enormous assistance from Canada—far more in proportion to the benefit received than had been given the Canadian Pacific. When he was Minister of Railways the Grand Trunk had come to him, explained the danger and peril they were in at their inability to reach Chicago, and by purchasing from them for \$1,500,000 the River du Loup section of the road, in which they were sinking money, he had enabled them to reach Chicago and saved them from paralysis."

He would have allowed the company to take paralysis if he knew they would not support him all the days of their lives.

" But had he known as much then as he knows now he doubted very much if he would have done it. But the Grand Trunk had never forgiven the Government for the construction of the Canadian Pacific.

" Sir Charles said he would let the world into a state secret."

I believe he would, or any other secret if it was going to injure those who opposed him. I believe he is sincere in this matter :

" In 1880, authorized by Sir John Macdonald, he had offered the Grand Trunk Railway Company, through Sir Henry Tyler, all the privileges and franchises now enjoyed
Mr. LANDERKIN.

by the Canadian Pacific if they would build that road. Sir Henry Tyler was willing to undertake the contract if the thousand mile section between Nipissing and Port Arthur was omitted. Sir Charles Tupper pointed out that that section was an essential part of the line. Canada could never become a nation without it: so the privilege of constructing the Canadian Pacific was refused by the Grand Trunk. Sir Charles pointed out the essential character of the Lake Superior section. Had it not been for it, Canada would be completely at the mercy of the Americans in case of non-intercourse. Sir Charles Tupper's last act as Finance Minister was to induce the Government to give the Grand Trunk a large subsidy to aid the construction of the Sarnia tunnel; yet, when Sir Henry Tyler was denouncing the Government recently and threatening what he would do when the elections came on, at the same time congratulating his shareholders on the completion of the tunnel, he never referred to the Canadian subsidy. Sir Henry had been true to his threats and the Grand Trunk management had commanded their employes to vote against the Government. This corporation exercised great influence, but even if they thought they had ground for complaint against the Government, he never believed the Grand Trunk would be base enough to go back upon England, to go back upon its English shareholders, to go back upon Canada and to support a party and a policy whose avowed mission it was to strike down British institutions in North America and bring about the political union of Canada with the United States."

I would like to call the attention of the hon. First Minister, who, I am glad to see, is now in his place, to this extraordinary utterance of his High Commissioner, and I would like to ask him if he thinks it is compatible with the duty of the Government to allow one of their officers to insult a party which is as loyal to every tradition of this country as any other party, and if he does not think the Government should take some action to prevent any officer in the pay of the people insulting those who have shown their loyalty on every possible occasion. Now, the president of the Grand Trunk Railway makes a reply to this speech, and shows the reason why the High Commissioner made this assault :

" Sir Henry Tyler publishes to-day a long, effective and temperate reply to Tupper's charges. He shows how on February 25 Tupper had a long interview with General Manager Seargeant and warmly appealed for the support of the company in the present emergency, promising in return that if the Government were sustained the company should have the fullest and most friendly support from the Government if and when required."

Now, did Sir Charles Tupper go to Mr. Seargeant at the instance of the Government to promise that, in the event of the Grand Trunk supporting the Government, they would receive every consideration they might require? Then Sir Charles comes back to the charge. This is his last shot :

" Sir Charles asserts that it is now proved that the Grand Trunk Railway went to a shameful extreme to aid the ruined gamblers in attempting to subvert British institutions in Canada."

Ruined gamblers ! This is the term that the High Commissioner, who receives from the people of Canada about \$30,000 every year, applies to the great Liberal party, which represents half the people of this country ; and the Government, regardless of its duty, apparently is willing to allow that insult to go unanswered on the floors of Parliament. I say it is an insult to every man, woman and child in this country to allow a paid officer to make statements so offensive to any portion of the people of Canada. If that officer were in the employ of friends of mine, I would say that it would be unworthy of them to retain him in office any longer. I think it is time this sort of thing were stopped, for it appears that he not only threatens the party on this side of the House, but he threatens the Government. He is going to do

wonderful things with his majority if the Government do not do what he wants done; he is going to bring his power and influence to induce his following to go in and ask the Government what they like, promising that they shall receive it. Now, it does appear to me that something should be done by the Government to stop such utterances as these being made by the High Commissioner against the people who sustain and support him. It is bad enough to have to pay such an outrageous salary to him, but it is worse to allow such utterances to be made by him without a word of protest from the Government. It seems singular that a gentleman who is as loyal as Sir Charles Tupper says he is should now be managing this gas company, which intends to do business in the United States. That would seem to be an ultra-loyal piece of business. And in this connection it does seem strange that the Grand Trunk, which goes to Chicago, is a disloyal road, leading to annexation, while the Canadian Pacific, that goes to New York, is ultra-loyal. That is one of the things I cannot understand. It will require a little light from the hon. First Minister or some of the other Ministers. Now, I hope this item will be fully considered before it is passed. If the High Commissioner is going to run this gas company, perhaps we could relieve him of his duties for the rest of this year. We are not going to have another election this year, and I do not think the Government will require his services, so that perhaps we could let this item drop. Let him attend to the gas; let him monopolize all the gas in this country and in the United States, and perhaps his sustaining power will be such with the aid of that imponderable, elastic agent that he will be able to keep the Government under his heel for all time to come.

Mr. McMULLEN. There are one or two questions which I want to ask with regard to this item before it is passed. In the first place, I notice that the estimates for the incidental expenses of the office of High Commissioner when it was first established in 1881 amounted to \$3,000, in 1882 they amounted to \$5,294, in 1883 to \$5,250 and in 1884 to \$5,453. Now, while Sir Alexander Galt performed the duties of High Commissioner, these items included the rent of his house and all other expenses; but since Sir Charles has been appointed, we have bought for him a residence at a cost of \$48,000, and we have to pay taxes on that residence which are no doubt included in the vote we are asked to pass, namely, \$8,790. I cannot well understand how the amount could have run up from about \$4,500 at which it stood when Mr. Galt performed the duties, to nearly \$9,000, and the disparity is greater when we consider that in Sir Alexander Galt's time we had to pay the rent of a house which was included in the amount of contingencies, whereas the sum now granted to cover contingencies does not include any item for rent, because we have none to pay, having bought a residence for Sir Charles Tupper. I have carefully read over, and I recommend hon. gentlemen opposite to read over the report of our High Commissioner in London, and I fail to see in any part of it any ground whatever for continuing the office of High Commissioner in London, unless I except one good act which Sir Charles Tupper has done, namely, the sending out to this country a delegation of tenant farmers for the purpose of inspecting

the lands of our Dominion and the improved lands in the several Provinces. That I consider was a very good move, and I hope it will have the result of inducing a number of these people to buy up lands in our older Provinces and settle on them, which lands can be procured cheaply, and thus allow those holding them to go out to our North-West and open up that country. With that exception, for which I give our High Commissioner every credit, I do not see a single item in the whole report to justify the continuance of this institution. Our High Commissioner gives us a list of a number of charitable institutions formed in the British Isle for the purpose of sending out emigrants to this country and providing for those who are in a destitute condition, so as to enable them to settle on our lands. But all that information could have been easily gathered by our emigration agents in England. The High Commissioner also refers to the fact that there is an unlimited market in England for dried meats and hams and other articles of that kind, which information could also have been obtained equally well from the Trade Returns of England without any expense. He has also drawn attention to the export of eggs to England, and has apparently made some little effort to secure a market there for our eggs and poultry; but it is very singular that notwithstanding the fact that he is in London with a large staff of officials, we had, in order to work up if possible an export trade in eggs and poultry, to send over Mr. Saunders, the chief in charge of the Experimental Farm here. Sir Charles admits that Mr. Saunders has given this matter considerable attention, and that, owing to his efforts, some exports of eggs have been made with, as he says, very profitable results. I do not know about that. Our High Commissioner then proceeds to instruct us as to the way in which fowls should be dressed and put up, as to the portions upon which the feathers should be left and those from which the feathers should be plucked. I never imagined, when we were asked to appoint Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner, that he would be called on to devote his valuable time, at an expense of ten thousand dollars a year with perquisites of fifteen thousand, to the task of instructing our people how they should put up their poultry and eggs for shipment to the other side. That appears to be rather a peculiar business for a man of his qualifications and position to be called on to discharge. When he was appointed High Commissioner, I well remember the right hon. the First Minister, in asking us to provide for his salary and contingencies and for the purchase of his house, thus making the High Commissionership a permanent institution, promised that such appointment would save us more money annually in the way of commissions on loans and payments of interest than the entire salary and expenses would amount to. I have carefully followed Sir Charles Tupper's reports from that time to the present, and have never been able to discover that he has saved us one farthing financially in any manner whatever. Last year the attention of the hon. the Minister of Finance was drawn to this matter, and he then put Parliament for the first time in possession of the fact that the Government had made arrangements with some financial company in London for a term of years to act as our financial agents, so that while the right hon. the First Minister was hold-

ing out as an inducement to this House the prospect of Sir Charles Tupper discharging that duty, and thus saving us the commissions, we were under contract with a financial company in London to act as our agents, not only during that year, but for four or five years afterwards. While, therefore, we have had our High Commissioner and a full staff of officers in London, and were induced to vote the expense necessary to keep up that department, under the promise that we would be thereby saved all this commission, we were then paying and have been since paying some \$35,000 or \$36,000 in commissions annually to a financial company for the purpose of meeting the interest on our bonds and redeeming our debentures. I challenge any member of this House to take up the High Commissioner's report and point out where he has rendered any service which will warrant our continuing him in office at a cost of \$35,000 a year. Take, for instance, his recommendation concerning emigration. He says:

"I have gone into the question of immigration at greater length than usual in the case of reports of this kind; but, in view of all that has been said from time to time on the subject, it is desirable that the fullest possible information should be placed before the public, especially as I hope large sums will be voted henceforth annually to immigration, in view of its importance to the Dominion."

He recommends that we should devote larger sums to the purposes of immigration in the future. Now, to show how much the Government appreciates his recommendations, in the very Estimates they have brought down this year they have reduced the sum devoted to immigration by \$51,000. Yet Sir Charles Tupper recommends in his report that it should be increased. I do not know whether the Government are of opinion that our High Commissioner does not understand what he is talking about, or that he is not capable of discharging the peculiar functions of the position he occupies, but I do say this, that while we have a High Commissioner in England we should make the best use of him we can. That Sir Charles Tupper is eminently qualified to fill that distinguished position I do not deny for a moment, and I should like to see him remain there as long as hon. gentlemen opposite are on the Treasury benches. I have no objection to that, but I do object, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin) has said, that he should leave the duties of his department for two or three months at a time, and run up and down the country in a special train addressing the electors with a view to show that the Grigs should not get into power and that the present system should be perpetuated. I think it is not only unfair, but it is a very imprudent and a very barefaced action on the part of the Government to take a high place functionary, who is receiving \$25,000 a year from the people of this country, away from his duties and bring him out here to speak in a manner which is insulting to one-half of the people of this country. I think his assault upon the Grand Trunk Railway was exceedingly imprudent. I do not think this country can afford for a moment to ridicule or to override by legislation the privileges and rights of the Grand Trunk Railway. It was the pioneer railway company of this country, and the people of England spent their money lavishly to open up the country through which that railway passed. I think it is unbecoming of Sir Charles Tupper to assail that company so wantonly and so unwarrantably as he has done in the London

Mr. McMULLEN.

Times. However, we may have some more to say upon this subject before this session closes. At present, I say that, if we have no more duties for the High Commissioner to perform than are shown in this report which he has published, there is not sufficient justification for continuing his office. If the people of this country say that there is an evident necessity for the existence of the office of the High Commissioner in London, I am content, but I say that there is not one tittle of evidence as to the value of that office with the exception of the delegation of tenant farmers that he sent to Canada in order to endeavour to secure an influx of that class of people into this country. Apart from that, there is not anything in his report to justify us in keeping him in the position he occupies; and, if he is to remain there, we ought at all events to keep down the cost of the office instead of increasing it from year to year. In the last five years this increase has amounted to nearly \$10,000, and I hope the Government will not propose to continue this increase in the future.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken in regard to this question, have shown more animus than wisdom against the High Commissioner. They seem to have forgotten the very important duties which he has performed. There is scarcely a month in which his name is not seen in the public press, not only of Canada, but of England and the European nations, bringing before them the importance of Canada. In that way, he is assisting the interests of this country, and the enterprises in which the people of Canada are engaged. Take his action in regard to the scheduling of cattle from this country. The export of cattle is one of the most remunerative lines which we have, and but for the action of the High Commissioner, no doubt we would be standing in the same position as the United States, and our cattle would be scheduled, and our farmers would have suffered in consequence. This is only one instance, but the effort has been made again and again to interfere with the carrying on of our present prosperous trade on the same lines as heretofore, and every time the High Commissioner has taken a stand for the interest of Canada, and by his great ability, and integrity, and intelligence, and energy, he has frustrated every effort which has been made against the interests of Canada. Should we then refuse to vote him the paltry salary which he is getting? Is it because of this small expense that these attacks are being made upon him to-day? I think it is rather because of the part which he took in the interests of Canada and the preservation of this Dominion during the late election. There is no man who has earned his money so well, and has done so much for the people of Canada in England as the High Commissioner, and he is the last man with whom we should be disposed to part. We should be glad to pay him not only this salary, but a much higher salary, because no man has done so much as he has to bring Canada before the English people. He has the interests of Canada at heart, and we should not only willingly support him to the extent we have up to the present time, but to a larger extent than we have done. In regard to immigration there are many members here who would agree with me that, although the Government has been induced to cut down the expenditure on that account, we should

not carry out that species of economy, especially as we have those vast fields in the North-West for incoming immigrants. I think we should have taken the High Commissioner's advice, and increased, rather than diminished, the vote for immigration. The High Commissioner has shown the same ability and statesmanship in that question as he has in other questions in which he has interested himself in regard to Canada. I would be very sorry to see any reduction made in his salary, or to see him brought home and taken away from the great work he is discharging in the interests of Canada.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. gentleman refers to the services Sir Charles Tupper has rendered in preventing our cattle from being scheduled in the old country. Surely, he must have read of the visit of Mr. Plimsoll to this country, and that, at the meeting held in Montreal, Mr. Plimsoll said that if the people were under the impression that the reason for our cattle not being scheduled was any action of Sir Charles Tupper, or was because Canada was a dependency of the British Crown, they made a great mistake. He said that there was no person known to him in England as the High Commissioner of Canada or as Sir Charles Tupper. He said this was the first time he had heard of it, and he said, further, that the moment the people of the United States showed that the disease of pleuro-pneumonia was eliminated, they would have their cattle admitted to the British markets just the same as Canadian cattle.

Mr. SPROULE. I am sure the hon. gentleman from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) knows, that, when an embargo was placed on our cattle, Sir Charles Tupper went down to the cattle yards and combatted that attempt to exclude them. Are they aware of that? Certainly we see that the public press knows it, and whether hon. gentlemen opposite know it or not is a matter of small concern. The Canadian people do know it, the Canadian farmers know it; they know that an embargo was placed upon these cattle, and, had it not been for Sir Charles Tupper, it would not have been raised. At different times since the same effort has been made to bring us under that schedule, and in every instance he has ably prevented it and defended the interests of the country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If we give the High Commissioner credit for all that is claimed for him, it could only be said that he was doing what was part of his duty. What we want to enquire about to-night, what we want some information upon—and I think this Committee will not be satisfied unless that information is given—is what Sir Charles Tupper was doing when he neglected duties of that kind and came to this country and took an active part in the elections. We want to know who instructed him, who invited him. We want to know if it was done with the sanction of the Ministry; we want to know if it was done at the request of the Ministry; we want to know if the example of a gentleman in the Civil Service, occupying the highest position in that service, is to be accepted as a guide for all other officers that are in the Civil Service? We find the First Minister to-night, replying to my hon. friend from Ottawa County (Mr. Devlin), professing some surprise that a gentleman occupying not a very high position in the Civil Service should have been found en-

gaged in electioneering in the late elections in one or two counties; and if I understood him aright, he promised to enquire into that. If we may interpret his words aright, it seems to me that we would be justified in inferring, from what he said, that it was contrary to the wishes and to the policy of the Government that those who were in the employ of the Government, the servants of the public, should be found taking an active part in election contests. If that be so, I say we want to know by what authority, at whose request Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, came to Canada, leaving his duties, spending weeks and months here—not now to enlarge upon some of his utterances, which I may find occasion to do later on. We want to ascertain why it was that he was here. Who invited him? Was he requested to come? Was it with the sanction of the Government that he did so? Is it the intention of the Government to declare that it is one of the right and proper duties of the High Commissioner, for which the people of this country pay him? I do not know whether the Finance Minister is asleep or not, but he is supposed to be leading the House on this occasion; and although I do not suppose that I would be justified in demanding that consideration at his hands for myself, yet I think I may say that this Committee will require that either he or some other member of the Administration shall answer some questions that are pertinent in reference to this matter. It is necessary that we know on what basis we are proceeding, what line of conduct is to be followed, what the duties of those engaged in the Civil Service are, and then we can rightly comprehend as to whether there is any necessity of enquiring into the action of those in the Civil Service who have been found engaged in political work. If that is the policy of the Administration, if that is the British practice that is followed, or professed to be followed, by hon. gentlemen opposite, we wish them to say so, and the answer we want is a definite one, as to whether Sir Charles Tupper violated that which was due to his office, defying British precedent, to say nothing of decency in the matter; whether he did it on his own motion, or whether he came at the request of the Government. We want to know the position Sir Charles Tupper occupies in this country, virtually; we want to know if he claims to be the virtual head and the leader of the Government of this country; we want to know whether he is the virtual power, while the nominal power alone is in the hands of the Ministers? These are points that we want to have answered. I think that sitting still and not answering them, will not, perhaps, conduce to the Committee getting on, for I think I am not alone in the desire that I have for this information. Having got that, we will be better able to understand and to discuss this question, as to whether it is desirable to have a High Commissioner's duty wholly confined to what was supposed to be the duties of his position, or whether it is better that periodically, every year, he should take an annual tour through this country at the expense of the people, in order to abuse and vilify more than one-half the people of this country. We want to know whether it is part of the High Commissioner's duty, while he professes to be engaged in his duties on the other side of the Atlantic, to write down the credit of this country, to engage in enterprises that have for their object, as we have

heard investments in the neighbouring States, and at the same time to act as scribe for one of the papers over there, attacking one of the largest interests we have in this country, and using the power and influence that his position gives him, in order to damage that corporation? Let us know what the position and the duties of the High Commissioner are, and in what relation he stands to the Government and to the people of this country.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall the resolution be adopted?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; Mr. Chairman, we certainly have a right to know under what circumstances the High Commissioner, who is a paid official of the people of this country, spends many months of his time on this side of the Atlantic? Was it in the discharge of his duties as High Commissioner, or did he come here at the special request and instance of the Government of this country? That is what we want to know, that is what we have a right to know. It is a very doubtful matter whether it is desirable for us to pay money for the maintenance of a High Commissioner at all, if a part of that High Commissioner's duties are, as has been stated, to come over here and abuse his paymasters. I say that he had no right to do it. I say that he set a most disgraceful and indecent example to all the members of the Civil Service. He is one of the chief officials of the Civil Service. He knows that; he, himself, standing in his place here, has repeatedly declared that he believed it was contrary to the rule, to order, and to propriety, for members of the Civil Service to interfere with elections. Now he, one of the leading officials, has set the example to every civil servant throughout this Dominion, of leaving his post, so far as we know, without the authority of the Government, and coming over here to interfere in the elections. The Government should, in justice to themselves, say whether or not Sir Charles Tupper came here by their request, or of his own proper motion. I understand that he was paid his salary as High Commissioner during the whole time of his sojourn here. Had he chosen to resign, as I think he did on a previous occasion, his high commissionership, that would have been another matter. But he did not; he came here while he was our paid servant, and in so doing I say he violated all propriety, and all the rules which we have heretofore understood governed the action of civil servants.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the Government decline to answer that question, would they give us a little light into the journey that Sir Charles Tupper took to Washington when he took two of our Ministers along with him? It is said they did not stay very long in Washington, but they went down there, and I understand they had quite a retinue with them. It seems when they went down there they expected to stay all summer; I was told they had enough trunks with them for a circus troop. But when they went down there the interview that took place with the Government of the United States, I am told, did not last all summer, but lasted only three minutes. The Government might tell us a little about that, if they will not tell us about the other. Did they take Sir Charles, or did Sir Charles take them? That is a very proper question to ask. Did they take Sir Charles to Washington, or did he take them? Did they take the trunks, or

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

did Sir Charles take the trunks? As is very properly suggested by an hon. friend of mine, that is a "grand trunk" question. We ought to know about this, because arrangements had been made before the election to have this meeting after the 4th March, but, after they got there, they were told that no arrangement was made; the Grand Trunk had run off the track, and the connections failed to be met. The arrangements were made before the election, but they did not materialize. I do not think it would take more than three minutes for the Minister of Justice to tell us all about that.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If Mr. Chairman did not lean over his papers so much, he would see that this vote is not carried, and you, Sir, as an old parliamentarian, will, I am sure, give every opportunity to Ministers to give information, and we want to have some information in regard to this matter as in regard to others. We want to know whether Sir Charles Tupper left his position in London and spent weeks here, away from his office, at the request of the Government, or, whether he did that of his own accord and in violation of his duty?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it is simply disgraceful that the Government will sit silently upon their seats and that the members supporting the Government sit with a muzzle upon their mouths and dare not open their mouths upon this subject. I think the charges which have been made against the High Commissioner are so important that they require an answer from the members of the Government. I believe, with the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), that this office should be abolished altogether. I do not think the country is getting any benefit from it, and all the benefit which may be supposed to be derived from it could be obtained from our thousand-and-one immigration agents in England and other countries. We have an army of immigration agents appointed and paid high salaries to send immigrants to this country, and the result is that very few remain here and we are not able to keep our own natural increase of population, even with the immigrants added. My opinion is that the services of the High Commissioner are of so little worth that the office should be abolished. Besides that, I think his course in leaving his position in London and taking part in the elections here is such as to demand his dismissal. It does not add to the dignity or responsibility of any Government that they have an officer so high in position as the High Commissioner leaving the duties which the people of Canada pay him a large salary to perform, coming out here and abusing a large portion of the people of this country. I say that the course of Sir Charles Tupper, in tramping this country from Halifax to Toronto in a special train at the expense of the people of Canada, and the language he has used in regard to the political opponents of the Government ought to lead at once to his dismissal; not to speak of the abuse which he has heaped upon one of the greatest corporations in this country, the Grand Trunk Railway Company. I think that corporation has done more for the Dominion of Canada than any other corporation in this country, and the only reason for the abuse which Sir Charles Tupper heaped upon it was that that corporation would not turn its influence in favour of the Government

of the day. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company were more pliant. They lent their whole influence to the Government. They provided special trains all along their line from Vancouver to Halifax to bring voters to vote for the Government, but because the Grand Trunk Railway Company would not do that, because the employes of that company were told to vote as their conscience directed, they are abused by a gentleman who receives \$25,000 a year from the people of this country. I know that the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not try to influence their employes. In my county, in which the Grand Trunk Railway runs from end to end, the employes were told to vote as they saw fit. I am sorry to say that the majority of them did not see fit to vote for me. But the Canadian Pacific Railway sent out a mandamus to their employes that they must vote for the Conservative candidate. This is the position taken by these two great corporations, and I think that this great functionary in London, who is supposed to be doing such great things for the people of this country, when he comes here and abuses this great corporation which I believe has done more for the people of Canada than any other corporation, simply because they did not see fit to turn their influence in his favour, should be dismissed. If for no other reason, he should be dismissed as a warning to all, for all future time, that gentlemen appointed to that position should mind their own business. I think it is the bounden duty of the Government to give us some information on this point. It is very pertinent to ask whether this gentleman came here of his own accord or at the request of the Government, and whether the Government approved of the course he has taken in the election, and of his course in abusing and vilifying this great corporation all over the world. I think it is outrageous that the Government should sit quietly and silently in their seats without giving any explanation on this subject.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the question is too broad to ask whether Sir Charles Tupper was brought out at the request of the Government. But we will narrow the question down. I see that Sir Charles Tupper held a meeting in Kingston, at the close of which he said, according to the supplement of the *Empire*:

"I must not conclude without expressing to you Sir John Macdonald's deep regret at not being able to be present here to-night. Nobody here regrets it more deeply than the humble servant of Sir John Macdonald's Government, who has been endeavouring to-night briefly to outline the position of our country. But in not coming here Sir John only showed that he thinks of the country before himself. He would have given anything to stand here to-night, to enjoy the pleasure of witnessing your beaming countenances and listening to the rallying shouts of warm support of the Liberal Conservative party."

Some hon. MEMBERS, Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I quite agree with that. I know that Sir John would receive the warmest reception from a great many of the electors of Kingston. But here is the point I am at:

"He directed me to say to you that he was so busily engaged at Ottawa, sending telegraphic messages all over the country, making arrangements for the undoubted security and success of the great party to which he belongs, that he found it impossible, except at an enormous sacrifice, to be here. He felt that if he was able to come, he might be returned by acclamation; but he would subject himself at this inclement season of the year, to the

hardships of a contest, rather than fail in a single duty to the country. (Applause.) That is why I have the pleasure of standing here to-night before this magnificent meeting of the electors of this noble constituency, which for so many years has returned to Parliament a statesman who was looked up to throughout the Empire. (Loud applause.) I envy the electors of this noble constituency the privilege which they possess, of holding the services of so distinguished a gentleman as Sir John Macdonald."

Might I ask the First Minister, did the High Commissioner tell the truth to the people of Kingston: did he say truly when he said that Sir John Macdonald had sent him to that meeting and had sent a message with this gentleman who is a leading civil servant of this country? That is a question that can be very easily answered, and if the First Minister will favour us with a reply then, perhaps, we might be able to follow it up with enquiries in other directions.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, Mr. Chairman, I cannot resist the seductive tones of my hon. friend and I may answer him: Sir Charles Tupper did go there at my request and he made the speech at my instance, and I fancy that his speech must have had a considerable influence, because in the previous election I was elected by a majority of seventeen, and after Sir Charles Tupper made this speech I was elected by a majority that only wanted seventeen of 500. You see I was pretty wise in my generation in asking Sir Charles to go there and make a speech for me.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). You would be wise if you stopped him at that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will go a little further, and I will say that Sir Charles Tupper came out from England to give us the advantage of his skill, and influence, and eloquence, at my special request.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). We have succeeded at last. I knew the First Minister would answer, but he was in the back benches when the question was brought up, and his colleagues did not evidently care to assume that responsibility; but he has given the reply. The First Minister is, therefore, guilty of violating all that he has taught this House to believe is a great British principle. He has set an example that has opened wide the gates to permit and warrant any of the civil servants of this country taking part in elections. I would ask the First Minister how he forgot that he had set this illustrious example when my friend brought up the case of these minor officials in the city of Ottawa? How is it that the great Commissioner who kept our cattle from being scheduled in England, who is engaged in promoting a turkey and egg trade there, and whose presence in England is said to be of such vital interest to the country, could come over here and remain for such a length of time? Why is it that the country should have to go to the extra expense of sending to England another—not a High Commissioner, but an egg commissioner—to take charge of this matter which we are led to think Sir Charles ought to have done? The First Minister congratulates himself upon his choice, and I dare say Sir Charles is a powerful speaker. Sir Charles spoke at Kingston, and the First Minister's majority was largely increased, but I think it is only his generous nature that gives the credit of that to Sir Charles Tupper. I think, perhaps, that the majority was due in a great measure to the popularity of the Prime Minister in his own constituency, and that the Franchise Bill

and the making-up of the voters' lists helped the majority somewhat, although I do not in the least want to detract from the popularity of the right hon. gentleman. If the High Commissioner had been so eloquent and so powerful it is a pity he should have expended all his eloquence and all his constituency-gaining power in the city of Kingston. The First Minister, while showing great shrewdness in sending Sir Charles to Kingston, has not yet told us whether it was at his instance the High Commissioner went to London and to Windsor, and to other places, because the High Commissioner did not gain votes there. Either the First Minister lost his shrewdness or Sir Charles lost his power of gaining votes by his eloquence. I believe, however, that the High Commissioner would have done better in London if the First Minister had not been there himself. I am told by a friend of the hon. gentleman that at that meeting Sir Charles was speaking only a short time when there were cries from the audience that they wanted to hear the old chieftain, and the eloquence of the High Commissioner was evidently not what they went there to hear. I rather liked that, because I thought that a great many actions of the High Commissioner were an assumption that he was lord and master of this whole Dominion, that he was the leader of the Cabinet, that he was the Prime Minister of the Prime Minister himself, and that he was running the Prime Minister as well as running the country. I was glad to see that the faithful followers of the First Minister rather repudiated that idea which was conveyed by Sir Charles, and that the electors of London gave him his answer by defeating the Minister of Agriculture and returning my hon. friend (Mr. Hyman). Neither was it a shrewd move of the First Minister to send Sir Charles to Windsor. It is true the right hon. gentleman was not there to divide the attraction, and Sir Charles had it all to himself and hesitated to let anyone else speak.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Oh! Solomon Whitespoke.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). But is not Mr. White an annexationist?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Of course he is.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, that is extraordinary. At all events, Sir Charles objected to have anyone speak against him and he had the whole meeting to himself, with the privilege of charming it by his eloquence, but the result was that the gentleman he supported, and who was, I think, the chairman of the Central Committee of the great Liberal-Conservative organization of the whole Province of Ontario, was defeated and my hon. friend from Essex (Mr. McGregor) was returned with 600 or 700 majority. Now the First Minister might tell us whether he lost his shrewdness in taking Sir Charles beyond Kingston, or whether Sir Charles lost his eloquence.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will tell you what he did: he lost his voice.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Well, if he lost his voice I do not know whether he has recovered it yet or not, but I do know that he is using his pen, or gets someone else to use it for him, and his writings with the pen are not any more creditable to him than his public utterances in Canada. The paid servant of the Canadian people using his voice in his own country to denounce one-half of his

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

fellow citizens as guilty of disloyalty, in attempting to put a brand upon them that no man has a right to attempt to put upon others, has passed the bounds of decency. He is a man whose words could be treated lightly if it were not for the harm they were doing the country. The man who is now using his pen—if we may accept the reports we get—to write what he is putting his name to in the London press, whether written by himself or others: the man who is saying to the people of the mother land that in this important Parliament the Liberals are a party disloyal to the country, a party that are seeking annexation and political union with the United States: the man who being in the pay of the Canadian people, dares in a London newspaper to apply to the Liberal party of this country the name of "ruined gamblers" and insinuates that they were engaged in an attempt to sell their country.—the man who does that passes the bounds of decency, and the Ministry ought to say whether or not they endorse the sentiments that their High Commissioner is giving utterance to. The Government ought to say what is the position they take in reference to this matter: they ought to be bold enough to rise in their places, if they endorse these utterances, and in the presence of the representatives of the Liberal party in this country, make that charge if they believe it to be true. If, however, they believe it is, as they must know it to be, a foul libel upon the Liberal party, then I call upon them to repudiate the utterances of the High Commissioner; I demand that they should recall him from a position he has not dignified by his utterances and writings. I call upon them in the interests of Canada to recall him, because he is doing harm in the mother land to this young nationality, to this Dominion of Canada, when he uses his position as a servant of the Canadian people, and the mouth-piece of the Canadian Government, to declare to the people of the old land that one-half of the people of this country—for I hold that the Liberal party comprises one-half of our people, and I will not say the least important half—are not true to their country, that they are not loyal, that they do not seek the best interests of their country, that they are engaged in an attempt to hand over their country to another nation, to bring about a political union between them. I say, Sir, that utterances like these by him who is considered the mouth-piece of the Canadian Government are calculated to injure this country, of which the hon. gentlemen opposite are the guardians, and they ought to have an answer in regard to this matter. We want to know whether they assume the responsibility of Sir Charles Tupper's utterances and writings: we want to know whether or not they endorse his attacks upon one of the largest institutions we have in this country; we want to know whether or not they sanction his endeavour to destroy the credit of that country; we want to know whether or not he is giving expression to these utterances in accordance with the feelings and wishes of the Canadian Government. Sir, we have a right to know this, and we have now before us the information given by the hon. First Minister himself that he, proud as he claims to be in always following British precedent, sent to London and requested the High Commissioner of Canada, a public servant of the people of Canada and paid by them, to leave his duty there to come to Canada and

engage in electioneering, in stumping this country from end to end—endorsing his utterances, as far as Kingston is concerned, and, I suppose, appearing in company with him in vilifying a large portion of the people of this country, in endeavouring to excite hostility against them, and in giving utterance to sentiments calculated to damage this country in the eyes of the mother land and other nations. The hon. First Minister has told us that it was at his request that Sir Charles Tupper came and engaged in this work; and I suppose, unless he repudiates it, that we have to assume that it is with his consent, concurrence and approval that Sir Charles Tupper is engaged at present in England in attacking one of the most important institutions of this country, and in libelling one-half of its people as not being true to it and its institutions. That is the position in which our High Commissioner has placed himself, and do you think it wise that we should continue him in that office? Do you not think, if we are to have a High Commissioner in England and part of his duty is to take part in an election contest and stump this country in order to provide eloquence for a party who you would have thought would be able to provide it for themselves, that he should be appointed High Commissioner for the Conservative party in Canada, and that we should have another High Commissioner to go to England who will understand his duty to be to look after the interests of Canada there, and strive to do it good instead of harm? It seems to me that that question is involved when we are asked to pass the vote now before us; and we are entitled to a further explanation from the Ministry as to whether or not they look with approval upon the conduct of Sir Charles Tupper since his return to England. Perhaps the hon. First Minister will vouchsafe to us his views on this point as candidly as he did on the other. He is the most trusted member of the Cabinet; when he speaks he speaks with the approval of his colleagues, and I have noticed sometimes that when he refrains from speaking, his colleagues do not show a disposition to take the responsibility upon themselves. Therefore I may be pardoned if I single him out and ask him to be kind enough to answer this further question: Having approved of Sir Charles Tupper's conduct here, and having brought him here, does he approve of his conduct at the present time in the mother country?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think the Government will find it to be to their interest to give a little more attention to the discussion of this question than has yet been given by the limited answer of the hon. First Minister. His answer has gone this far, that the Government have assumed the responsibility for the appearance of the High Commissioner in this country as a partisan of the Conservative party and a paid orator for the promotion of their party interests. We know that if a citizen of one country goes abroad and commits an offence against the law of another country, and his Sovereign chooses to assume the responsibility of his act, that relieves him of any liability to criminal prosecution for the wrong he has done; and looking at the relation in which the High Commissioner stands to the Government, the hon. First Minister's answer has to some extent relieved Sir Charles Tupper of what would otherwise be a very grave political offence. But, Sir, there is

something more to be considered than the mere fact that the High Commissioner has taken part in the elections of this country. It is true, when the Government proposed to create the office of High Commissioner they told us that the appointment of a representative of the Government of Canada in England would relieve the Government here of a great deal of their responsibility in the negotiation of loans and in other public purposes which made it sometimes necessary for Ministers to cross to the other side of the Atlantic. Well, experience has not proved that statement to be well-founded; and if the High Commissioner can leave his office, as he frequently does, without detriment to the public service, it is perfectly clear that the public service does not require a High Commissioner. But, Sir, the offence with which the High Commissioner is charged from this side of the House is not that he has obeyed the Government and neglected his duty as the paid official of the people of this country, but that he has devoted himself largely to misrepresenting and vilifying those who are politically opposed to the Government. In fact, he is the official vilifier and unvarnished calumniator of those who represent the Liberal party on this side of the House. The High Commissioner is the last man who should have brought the charges which he has against the leaders of the Liberal party. This gentleman has been singularly fortunate in his efforts to provide at the public expense for those who stand near to him. It has been stated that he and those immediately connected with him draw not less than \$30,000 a year from the public treasury of this country. He has, no doubt, a very great interest, therefore, in upholding the party with which he and his friends are, for the time being, identified, and he does not appear before the people of this country to give evidence against the Liberal party as a disinterested witness. His interests are far too great personally for him to be looked upon as a witness whose evidence can be taken with the utmost confidence. Where did he learn that the Liberal party or its representatives in this House were "ruined gamblers"? He should be the last public man in this country to employ such a phrase. He is the last man connected with this country who should speak in that way of those who sat opposite him for nearly a quarter of a century in this House. There ought to be, Sir, at all events, something like *esprit de corps* among those who are here, even though politically opposed to each other in Parliament. But there is nothing of that spirit exhibited in the attacks made by Sir Charles Tupper on the leaders and representatives of the Liberal party in this House. The hon. gentleman employed his position in England, not merely to attack the Grand Trunk Railway Company and damage it as far as he possibly can, but he employs his official position and the standing it gives him before the public of England for the purpose of calumniating and traducing those who are now sitting on this side. It may be a very short time or it may be a considerable length of time, but some time or other he must know that, in the fortunes of political warfare, parties will change seats in this country. What sort of impression is the statement of this calumniator, made before the people of England, calculated to leave in their minds of the leaders of the Liberal party in this country? Have we no pride of country, no interest in the character

of those who sit opposite to us? If we are to be regarded as representatives having an interest in our country, is it to our advantage to go abroad and to have presented to us the statements said to be made by men belonging to our country, holding high official positions, that we are ruined gamesters, that we are men not to be trusted, that we are men who sought to sell our country and are ready to sacrifice the interests, and future hopes, and prospects of it for the purpose of removing those who sit opposite to us from office? I, as a representative of a section of the Liberal party in Ontario, feel very little interest in the question whether I sit on this side of the House or that, but I feel a very great interest in the promotion of what I believe to be a wise policy in the public interest. I have no interest whatever in traducing the character of those who are politically opposed to me. That is what the High Commissioner has done before the English-speaking public, not only on this continent, but over the whole British Empire, in order that, wherever the name of Canada is spoken, the leaders of the Liberal party may be spoken of as ruined gamesters; as men who undertook to ruin this country for the purpose of securing their temporary success as a party. I denounce such statement as a foul calumny; I denounce it as a malicious falsehood, and I call on hon. gentlemen opposite to unite with me in denouncing such language, and with the view of bringing this matter fairly before the country, I move that this whole item be struck out—that it be not concurred in.

Amendment negatived: yeas, 20; nays, 37.

Contingencies, including amount \$2,000, required to pay for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner, taxes and insurance on official residence, income tax, rent, fuel, light, stationery, &c. \$8,550

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). With reference to these contingencies, I wish to ask for information to which I think we are entitled. When the High Commissioner was taking his tour through Canada, it was stated in the press that he travelled by special train. I would like to know whether that was the case, and if so, what was the cost of that train and out of what fund it was defrayed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not aware that any of the High Commissioner's expenses were paid out of the public service, but I will enquire.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose his trips from England to this country and back again find a place in the expenses?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That may be, but I cannot say.

Mr. McMULLEN. We have a right to know whether he came out on the special invitation of the First Minister and for what particular purpose. Did he come out for the purpose of attending to elections or other matters of an official character?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have already stated what I asked him to come out for.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The right hon. gentleman stated candidly that he came out to attend the elections. The First Minister has been, however, altogether too modest. I, as a citizen of Kingston, beg to state that it was to the First Minister's own special and earnest care of his constituents, he was indebted for his increased

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

majority. The First Minister had been a good nursing father or mother, whichever he prefers to be called, to the citizens of Kingston for the last three or four years. Such has been his care that a short time ago, when I had to go down to that constituency on private business of my own, the first thing I heard was that the hon. gentleman, in his anxiety to prevent the people from suffering from distress and destitution, caused no less, I think, than one hundred and twenty cars to be built, about the 5th or 10th of February last, in certain car works in that city. About the same time likewise, the hon. gentleman, in his disinterested regard for the welfare of my fellow citizens, was solicitous in procuring some important railway subsidies for projected railways in the neighbourhood of that city. Well, they have as good a right to it—no more and no less—than a good many other roads the hon. gentleman has subsidized.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You did not do much for them.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes; we did, in a fair and square way.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman would not thank you for it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know that, but the hon. gentleman was too modest in attributing to the words of Sir Charles Tupper what is due to his own good deeds. The hon. gentleman has ordered measures to be taken for the construction of a graving dock in that port of Kingston, and that graving dock, I believe, is under the charge of a certain Mr. Connolly, a member of a firm of which many members of this House are likely to know more before many days than they have before; and I am told that, somewhere about the 15th February, a little after the date of the speech referred to, this worthy man, Mr. Connolly, caused it to be proclaimed in the city of Kingston that anyone who wanted work had only to come to him and he would get it, if the work only consisted in wheeling the rubbish from one side of the dry dock to the other. It is evident, therefore, that not only is this due to the words of Sir Charles Tupper, but also to the good deeds of the First Minister, and the zeal which was shown in bringing in so many expatriated Canadians from Watertown and other parts of the United States to swell the hon. gentleman's majority. I might ask if this includes the hon. gentleman's club fees? I understand the hon. gentleman's club fees were paid amongst his contingencies.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Was his board paid when he was here?

Post Office and Finance Departments—
To pay the officers engaged in balancing and computing interest on depositors' accounts to 30th June, 1891. \$3,600

Mr. McMULLEN. Is this paid by the job or by the hour?

Mr. HAGGART. I think it is by the hour, after their usual time, but I am not certain.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is very important, because, if they are paid by the hour, the officials have the opportunity of lengthening out the work to suit themselves. If they were paid by piece-work, they would rally to the work, and a certain amount of work would be done for a certain amount of money.

Mr. HAGGART. They are all trusted officials, and I think they are paid by the hour.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is a very unwise course to pay them by the hour. You are offering a premium to them to leave over an amount of work, so that they may charge extra pay for that service. No doubt, some of it is work that cannot be done within the hours. I believe that, in connection with the Savings Bank branch, the books used by the officials during the day cannot be used for the purpose of balancing up for the end of the year until after hours, but it should be let by piece-work, or a certain amount of work should be done for a certain amount of money.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would suggest to the Department some plan by which the balancing of accounts could be done by piece-work.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is quite clear that the Postmaster General is not posted with regard to the work done in his own Department, because I asked one of the chief clerks in the Savings Bank Branch, and he told me that part of the work is done by piece-work. I know that part of the work is done by piece-work, and the hon. gentleman says it is done by the hour. I advise the Postmaster General to post himself before he gets so saucy about it.

Contingencies—Governor General's Secretary's Office..... \$13,500

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How would the contingencies of one of the Departments compare with the others as to the number of hands employed? Would they be about equal?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. In the printing, it is much larger. In the Post Office Department, for instance, a large quantity of the contingencies is due to printing. In the Governor General's Office or the Privy Council, there is a very large item for telegrams, and especially for cablegrams, which are costly and numerous, particularly during the last two years. You will see how that runs by the Auditor General's Report, page B-63 and afterwards.

Privy Council Office—Contingencies... \$11,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see that last year the hon. gentleman did not confine himself to the vote spent, about \$14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. This year we are trying to keep it down to the amount.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice one or two curious items in this. What on earth are the leather boxes for, fifty-two in number, for supplying the Privy Council?

Mr. FOSTER. They must be for covering the documents in the office.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I hope those refreshments were not wholly of a spirituous character.

Mr. FOSTER. Apollinaris, mainly.

Contingencies—Department of Justice. \$5,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to know how it comes that this varies so enormously from the actual expenditure? In the Minister's department for the year 1890, I see that \$10,141 were required, while he only asks for \$5,000 this year. I would be very glad if he confined the ex-

penditure to it, but the disproportion is enormous between what was actually expended and what is asked for. There is no particular advantage in cutting this down nominally, and then spending a great deal more than we are asked to grant.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Perhaps the penitentiary branch is included in the Department of Justice.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is. In the Auditor General's Report, both are included.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) How are the travelling expenses of inspectors of penitentiaries fixed?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Fixed by Order in Council, the same Order in Council that fixes the travelling expenses of other civil servants. An inspector is allowed \$3.50 a day for travelling, besides actual boarding expenses; and in British Columbia, \$5.

Contingencies—Department of Interior..... \$18,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In looking over the report of the Minister of Interior, I notice that there was a sale of some property by auction in Montreal, that the auctioneer did not pay over the proceeds of the sale; that after election time had expired, something over \$2,000 were got out of the auctioneer, and that subsequently, I think, endorsed notes were taken for the remaining \$8,500; that the parties all went into insolvency, and that nothing has been received. How does that account stand now?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the account stands exactly as the hon. gentleman has stated, and he has correctly related the circumstances. The auctioneer who was engaged to make the sale of that property, was represented to me at the time, by gentlemen who knew Montreal well, as one of the most responsible auctioneers in the city of Montreal. He had been previously doing work of that character for the Government, and I had no hesitation, from what I had heard of him, in engaging him to make a sale of that property. The Deputy Minister attended the sale, the terms of which I do not exactly remember, but I think a percentage was paid at the time of the sale. A certain time had been given to the auctioneer to make up his accounts, but when it was found that he was not making the remittances that were due, application was made for them. He continued to be slow in making his remittances, and after some pressure, he paid the proportion which the hon. gentleman mentioned, some two or three thousand dollars, into the bank as part payment of the sale, leaving a large balance. I came to the conclusion there was something wrong, and I put the matter into the hands of the Department of Justice, who proceeded against him. In the meantime he had gone to England, and was away from Montreal for eight or nine months. When he came back, the matter being still in the hands of the Department of Justice, a proposition was made on his behalf, offering these notes which, it was represented to me, were the best security we could get for the money. I accepted the arrangement, but eventually the parties who owed us the money went into liquidation, and I fear the account will be a dead loss.

Contingencies—Department of Indian Affairs..... \$8,000

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). If the Minister of the Interior would look at B—66 of the Auditor General's Report, under the head of travelling expenses, he would see "Mr. Dingman, \$1,606.86." Is he the inspector of Indian agencies?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; he is the inspector.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not understand that amount. I thought he had been in Brantford all the year.

Mr. DEWDNEY. He was a great deal of the time; but the travelling expenses had been incurred, except those for travelling between the head office and Brantford, in visiting the various reserves, going as far as Quebec in the east. Last year the same question arose, and I brought down a return showing exactly what travelling expenses had been paid by the inspector, and I shall be glad to bring down a similar return this session.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Who was in charge of the Brantford office when he was not there?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The agent, Mr. Gilkinson.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). He is the agent.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes, he was the agent until very lately—until he was superannuated.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What position did Mr. Dingman occupy then?

Mr. DEWDNEY. When it was found that the affairs of the office were in rather a bad shape, he was sent there to put matters on a more satisfactory footing. It required all the time he could give in order to put the office in a satisfactory state. I believe it is now in a pretty good position, but not as good as it should be.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is another item which reads very curiously. I do not know what explanation the Minister may choose to make in regard to it. It reads as follows:—"Advertising Notice, re-addressing communications to the Hon. E. Dewdney as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, and not as Minister of the Interior, or L. Vankoughnet." Are we to understand that for the purpose of advertising the fact the hon. Minister was not to be addressed as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or was to be so addressed, and not as Minister of the Interior, it was necessary to spend \$2,805 not to speak of the odd cents? That is the way the entry reads. Perhaps there may be some mistake, and I should like to know whether the money was spent for that purpose.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I must say that when this paragraph in the Auditor General's Report was brought to my notice, it was the first time I had heard of this matter, and I can assure the hon. gentleman it surprised me as much as it does himself. Immediately on the matter being brought to my attention, I made enquiry as to the circumstances connected with it. I was reminded by the Deputy that a month or two after I had been in office my attention was drawn to the fact that there was great difficulty in getting letters belonging to the different branches sent directly to those branches. The head branch of the Interior Department is in the Eastern block, and the other is in the new building. In view of this inconvenience,

Mr. DEWDNEY.

I authorized the Deputy to take measures to correct it. I found that, on the strength of those instructions, he communicated with the Queen's Printer, and requested him to advertize in various papers in the Dominion for a certain length of time, so many insertions daily and so many weekly, and to his astonishment he found that the accounts paid by the Queen's Printer amounted to this most extraordinary sum. This is a plain statement of the fact, which astonished me as much as it has astonished the hon. gentleman, when brought to my knowledge.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It appears to me that in the administration of the Department of the Interior there does not appear to be any desire for economy. I observe that \$18,000 are asked for contingencies, which is about double the amount for an ordinary Department. On reading the report of the Department the other day I found that in all the branches the receipts and the work are both decreasing; that the number of letters sent out and received is very much materially less than formerly; that the receipts are very much lower, in fact, ridiculously low; and if one may judge from reading the report, the general work of the Department cannot be much more than 50 per cent. of what it was formerly. I do not know whether the Minister or the Deputy is responsible for the extravagance. Six or eight years ago, when there was a great boom in the North-West, and when very large receipts were expected from the sale of Dominion lands, and when the Department was apparently energetic in endeavouring to sell the lands, there might be some excuse for an increase in the departmental contingencies; but that excuse ceased now that the receipts have declined, and the work of the Department has decreased so materially, as appears from the report. I cannot understand why there should be such an enormous amount for travelling expenses. Besides the Minister's expenses, which I presume are necessary, there are the expenses of Mr. Burgess, the Deputy, Mr. Pereira, Mr. Deville, Mr. King, Mr. Rothwell, Mr. Hume and others, ranging from \$100 to \$500 or \$600. I should like to know what is the necessity of incurring such large travelling expenses, and whether the hon. gentleman can give any assurance to the Committee that, in view of the decreased receipts, the Department will be conducted on more economical principles?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think the hon. gentleman will allow, from what occurred several days ago, that we propose a very large decrease this year, a decrease larger in proportion than the falling off in the receipts.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Not in contingencies.

Mr. DEWDNEY. No; I find that the contingencies have ranged from \$22,000 to \$17,000 odd last year. In regard to the travelling expenses of the gentlemen mentioned, I may say that, first, there are my own travelling expenses. I went as far as the Pacific that year, and I do not think my travelling expenses were exorbitant, but economical. Mr. Burgess had instructions that same year to go to British Columbia to enquire into certain important matters pending there. He was taken ill when on his trip and detained there some weeks, which accounts for the apparently large amount of his expenses. With respect to \$94 for

Mr. Pereira's expenses, I do not exactly recollect whether they were incurred when he was travelling with me or not. Mr. Deville, as Surveyor General, must necessarily do considerable travelling, and I do not consider the amount charged by him is excessive. Mr. King was one of our inspectors at that time, and had to do a certain amount of travelling. Hon. gentlemen must remember that our work is in the far west, and is an expensive journey, and if any one is detained in that country, he must necessarily run up a pretty large account for travelling expenses. Mr. Rothwell was sent by me to Banff Park, when the Park regulations came into force, to consult with the superintendent with regard to the issue of leases and so forth. Mr. Hume is secretary to the Deputy Minister, and he went with him to British Columbia.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I suppose the hon. gentleman will be able to effect a saving next year. I presume when he went to attend to his election this year, at his own expense, he would look over the affairs of the Department at the same time, and there will be no travelling expenses for that.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Mr. Johnson is our lithographer, and I presume this amount is for travelling expenses in visiting the establishments, chiefly in Montreal, where our lithographing is done.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The Minister expressed his surprise at the amount paid for these advertising notices, and, I suppose, being in that state of mind, he cannot tell us much about it. Has he noticed, since this money was expended for advertising purposes, if the communications coming into him were more properly addressed than formerly?

Mr. DEWDNEY. There is a great change for the better in that respect, but it has not yet been altogether corrected.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I would ask the Minister if he thinks it really necessary to have this army of extra clerks who appear to be in the Indian Department? There appears, from the Auditor General's Report, to be a regiment of clerks in that Department. It would almost seem to be a refuge for the incapable. Can the Minister give us any assurance that nine-tenths of these will be released from their attendance and their salaries saved to the people?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I propose to do away with almost the entire number of our temporary clerks and to increase the permanent list. We can make a reduction of expenses in that way.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) That principle would not seem to make any reduction, but, on the contrary, it would increase the permanent expense. I notice that the work of the Interior Department appears to have greatly decreased. Now, why cannot the Minister run the Department on the old permanent staff and save \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year to the country.

Mr. DEWDNEY. It is not possible to do that. The temporary clerks are now drawing larger salaries than if they were on the permanent list, because in the latter case they would only receive the minimum of their class on first appointment. I am endeavouring to carry out the suggestion of the hon. gentleman as far as I can.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I took occasion in a general way to make an investigation into the departmental expenses by comparing one Department with the other, and it appeared to me that the only Department which decreased the expenditure for clerks for a number of years past was the Finance Department. I presume that in this Department the work would be increasing rather than diminishing.

Mr. FOSTER. It has increased.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) In other Departments, and I specially refer to the Interior, where the work is largely decreased, the expenses for clerks has been increasing every year. Judging from the statements made by the different officers, the work of that Department cannot be more than half what it was seven years ago.

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the work of the Department of the Interior is not decreasing, but increasing, yet he will find that we are decreasing the expenditure. Owing to improved communication we are able now by amalgamating offices to do a good deal of the work in the Territories. If the hon. gentleman had looked into the work of the Indian Department he would find that it has been steadily increasing. Since 1882 the increase has been a hundred per cent.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It was not that Department that I spoke of, but the Department of the Interior, and I formed my judgment from the hon. gentleman's own report.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to ask a question with regard to subscriptions to newspapers. It seems to me, as a new member of the House, that this item is very large, considering that it applies to every Department of the Government. I would like to ask if there is a reading-room in connection with each of these Departments, and whether all these papers are taken in the city of Ottawa or scattered through the different offices throughout the country? It seems to me, from a superficial glance, that there might be a reasonable saving in this item, for in the nature of things there must be an enormous number of papers taken which are scarcely of any value. I can easily understand that in some of the Departments newspapers of a valuable character require to be taken, and the country should pay generously for them; but there appears to be included a vast number of small country papers which can be of no value at all, and they must be taken merely for the purpose of gratifying their publishers. I would like to ask also whether, as a rule, these papers belong to one political party. I have not added up all the items, but there must be something like \$10,000 spent in newspaper subscriptions, although we have two or three large reading-rooms in the city. However, I am asking for information, and I would like to know what is the custom or rule, or the necessity for such an extensive subscription for country papers throughout the Dominion?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason for it is that information must be had. If my hon. friend had been here for a number of years, he would have heard this discussion of newspaper subscriptions at every recurring consideration of the Estimates. Two years ago I stated that an effort was being made to reduce them, and that effort has been at-

tended with considerable success. It is being repeated this year, and I have every reason for believing that the accounts for the current year, and certainly those for next year will show a great improvement in this respect. A large number of these papers have to be taken, in some Departments for one reason and in some for another; and it is not always the big papers that are the most necessary. For instance, in the Marine and Fisheries Department, the local papers about the coast are specially needed. In the Finance Department we require to take some financial papers both from our own country and from Great Britain, some of which are expensive. I am free to confess that this item has been larger than was necessary, not only under this Government but under preceding Governments. I suppose if we came down to a fair and honest expression of opinion, we would say that we could do with a very much less number; and the question now is how we can fairly reduce the number, not by a too heroic and sudden a process, but this happens to be a very opportune time for economy in this respect.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The chief sinner, I think, is the Department of Agriculture, which pays \$1,368 a year for newspapers. Those overworked officials must have a great deal of trouble in reading those papers. The Department of Interior is almost as bad with \$686; but, considering that there is an army of 87 officials there, you must give them something to do. But when we pay these sums for newspapers for a single Department, the thing is becoming ridiculously absurd. Promises of reductions have continually been made, but I have been long enough here to know the value of these promises. However, it is very little trouble to give them. If that were all the complaints we had to make, it would not be much.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance whether Liberal newspapers as well as Conservative, are received in the Departments?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they are at times—the valuable ones.

Mr. DEVLIN. I am not at all surprised at the item being large; we find it amounts altogether to something over \$10,000. I think all the newspapers are not received for information. I have heard that for a number of years something was practised on one of the Departments that shows that the papers are not always read. An enterprising editor, by changing the heading of his paper, got a Department to take the same paper under two names for a number of years.

Mr. FOSTER. We found that man out and stopped it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There is a story that one official wanted to receive some real information and got the *Globe* newspaper, but as soon as it was found out the paper was summarily stopped. I think the hon. Minister of Marine knows something about that.

Mr. FOSTER. The *Globe* and *Grip* are taken.

Contingencies—Department of Public Works..... \$7,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is a charge here for framing an address to the Queen.

Mr. FOSTER.

What has the Department of Public Works to do with that?

Mr. FOSTER. It ordered the frame for Mr. Mulock's address.

Contingencies—Post Office Department. \$35,000

Mr. DEVLIN. I find that the Postmaster General invited sealed tenders for the contract to carry the mails between Chenneville and Papineauville railway stations from the 1st July next. I have every reason to believe that various tenders were received. I know, as a fact, that some parties came all the way from Chenneville, got the blanks, and made out the tenders. They were reliable men and had excellent names upon their tenders, but they were informed that the old contract would be renewed after they had been put to the inconvenience and expense of coming up here.

Mr. HAGGART. Whenever tenders are opened the contract is given to the lowest tenderer. In no case since I have been at the head of the Post Office Department, when tenders have been opened, has the contract with the former party been renewed.

Mr. DEVLIN. Can the hon. gentleman inform me now what is the amount paid to the contractor for carrying the mails between Papineauville and Chenneville?

Mr. HAGGART. I have not the names of the post offices even off by heart.

Mr. DEVLIN. I will read a copy of a letter which I received from Mr. Lindsay, the superintendent of the Department, in reply to one I wrote asking for an explanation. I received this reply:

"The Deputy Postmaster General desires me to say, in reply to your note asking for blank tenders, that the Postmaster General has decided to renew the contract from Chenneville to Papineauville for the mail service, and, therefore, the forms you ask for would not be required."

Yet I find that a notice was posted up in the lower end of the county asking for such tenders.

Mr. HAGGART. That was done through error, as the hon. gentleman can see. The contract was renewed before the notice was put up.

Mr. DEVLIN. I got the reply I read, the day before yesterday, and the notice is dated the 3rd March, 1891.

Mr. HAGGART. The contract is often renewed before the tenders are opened. Sometimes tenders are advertised for, and before the tenders are opened and received the old contract is renewed. It is always renewed on the report of the Inspector, and the recommendation of the Deputy in my Department.

Mr. DEVLIN. Then there is no necessity for inviting tenders, and great inconvenience is caused to the parties who tender. No doubt in this case the contract was renewed because the contractor was a very devoted friend, I will not say of the Department, but of the party controlling the Department.

Contingencies—Department of Marine, \$4,000

Mr. TUPPER. The estimate has always been too small. The expenditure last year was \$3,667, and I think, it has never been kept within the \$3,000. In making up the estimate, there was no

use in keeping it within the \$3,000 when \$4,000 was expended.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I remember that, at the time when this Department was divided, I predicted that the officials would devote themselves to showing that they could spend as much money as other Departments, and they do not think they are as important unless they do spend as much money. I should like to ask if the Minister does not see his way clear to putting the Department back on the basis on which it was some years ago, instead of having two Deputy heads? I think the business was conducted more satisfactorily then than it is now, and I believe the hon. gentleman will agree with me.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the Committee rise and report the resolutions.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether there is any foundation for the statement that his Department has recently sustained a loss in connection with the revenues from Crown timber at Calgary?

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; I am sorry to say we have.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Does the hon. gentleman know the amount?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I think it is a little over \$3,000.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 26th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Ontario and Rainy River Railway Company.—(Mr. LaRivière.)

Bill (No. 78) to confirm an agreement between the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to confer further powers on the Shuswap and Okanagon Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

CHIGNECTO MARINE TRANSPORT RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide that the time for the completion of the works of the Chignecto Marine Transport Railway Company, Limited, shall, as respects their title to receive the subsidy heretofore authorized, be the 1st day of July, 1893, instead of the 1st July, 1890; also that all penalties, forfeitures and deductions incurred by the company under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Acts passed in 51st Victoria be remitted, and that said section 2 be repealed.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Printing Bureau—Cleaning, &c.....\$2,000

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). An understanding was arrived at when the Committee rose that one item should be reserved to afford an opportunity of discussing the various contingencies of the different Departments, and in order that any hon. member who desired to offer observations on the subject of contingencies should have an opportunity of doing so in Committee to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. That was true, and I suppose the observations will be forthcoming when we take the item up.

Mr. CHARLTON. This is the last item, and the House is very thin to-day. The expectation was that this would be allowed to stand, so as to give an opportunity for discussing it.

Mr. FOSTER. It was allowed to stand for the last night only.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I was not here during the discussion with regard to the High Commissioner, and I would like to get some information with regard to this matter. Item 24, page 9, reads:

"Contingencies, including amount of \$2,000 required to pay for the contingent expenses of the High Commissioner, tax and insurance on official residence, income tax, rent, fuel, light, stationery, etc."

Now, in the Public Accounts Committee last session a question was asked with regard to this expenditure, and an effort made to ascertain what this money was paid for, but we were unable to get that information. I see, however, that in the Auditor General's Report we have some explanation of this expenditure. At page 72—B, it says:

"Gas rent, \$14.94; ground rent of official residence, \$32.15; house duty and tax, \$97.00; income tax, \$250.00; parochial rates, \$349.47; stationery, \$559.60."

These items are mentioned in the Estimates, and it would therefore appear that the High Commissioner gets this \$2,000 in addition to all these other contingencies. I think, therefore, that there ought to be some way of obtaining information, either in the Public Accounts Committee or in the House, which would enable hon. members to ascertain how these \$2,000 were spent. The High Commissioner receives a salary of \$10,000 per year, and if that is not enough let the Government make the salary \$12,000 a year, and we will at least understand what the money is voted for. We should have some information to enable us to say whether this vote for \$2,000 ought to be voted or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I find in the Estimates for contingencies, High Commissioner's office, London, for the year 1890-91, the following:—"Rent of office and fuel, \$2,812; cleaning, gas, repairs, \$175; printing and stationery, \$650; postal expenses, \$800; miscellaneous petty cash, \$960; travelling expenses, \$150; income tax, \$122; newspapers and periodicals, \$255; messengers' wages, \$603, making a total of about \$7,000. These are the contingencies in the High Commissioner's office itself. This vote of \$2,000 is for contingencies of the High Commissioner for expenses pertaining especially to his office. I find that in Sir Alexander Galt's time we paid \$4,000 to him, out of which he provided a residence for himself, but after the purchase of the official residence it, of course, became unnecessary