

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by the company under section 2 of chapter 4 of the Acts passed in 51st Victoria be remitted, and that said section 2 be repealed.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

to grant that sum. The official residence was furnished by the Government and is a fixed charge on the Dominion revenues, so that, instead of paying the High Commissioner, after Sir Alexander Galt's time, \$4,000 for house rent and incidental contingencies, I understand an arrangement was made by which \$2,000 was retained by the Government in consideration of house rent and the other \$2,000 is a grant to the present High Commissioner, on a par to the grant to the former High Commissioner, for contingencies and expenses incidental to his being there in his official capacity. This he receives monthly, and the vouchers are to be found in the Auditor General's office.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. We tried to obtain the vouchers last year and we could not.

Mr. FOSTER. The one-twelfth part of this \$2,000 is paid every month, just the same as the salary is paid, so that there is no necessity for any more vouchers than for the salary. The items are not given.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Are we to understand then, that the High Commissioner stands on a higher level than a Minister of the Crown in this country, because if any Minister of the Crown incurs contingent expense in the management of his office, if he travels or hires a cab, he has to produce a voucher for it; but here we are voting \$2,000 to our High Commissioner in England, who is at liberty to spend this money in whatever way he pleases, and he is not responsible to the Parliament or the people of this country. I say that this is not a proper method of proceeding. If \$10,000 a year is not sufficient to pay the High Commissioner, let the Government ask for \$12,000 and let them deal honestly in the matter. Take the list of contingencies we paid the High Commissioner last year as found in the Auditor General's Report: "Aid to distressed Canadians, \$25.53." I can imagine that the High Commissioner might have paid that amount out of the \$2,000 instead of charging it to the public service. "Burdett's Official Intelligence, \$6.80." That is another matter which might have come out of this \$2,000 vote, but did not. "Cables and telegrams, \$195.55; cabs and travel, \$86.83; carpentering, \$67.20; commission on postal orders, \$17.60. These might all very well be considered contingencies, but they do not come out of the \$2,000. Then there is a gratuity to Mrs. Wilkinson of \$68.13. I think that might be paid out of contingencies. So might gratuities to postmen and others, \$29.57. Then we have income tax of the High Commissioner, \$260; ground rent of official residence, \$332.15; house duty and tax, \$97.33; newspapers, \$196.04; newspaper cuttings, \$24.33. I think all these might very well come under the head of contingencies, and that, even down to the winding and regulating of the clock, \$10.34, the amount might be paid out of the allowance for that. It may be asking too much of the Government, but I say that the High Commissioner has no right to be placed on a higher level than a Minister of the Crown here, and I believe that if he pays these amounts, he ought to give an account showing what he has paid. Sir Charles Tupper has a salary of \$10,000, and he ought to give a strict account of the expenses he incurs under the head of contingencies. If the contingencies do not amount to \$2,000, he should refund the extra amount, but at all events he

Mr. FOSTER.

should give an explanation of the amount he expends. If this \$2,000 is given to him as a gratuity, we should understand it. Let us know that we are paying him \$12,000 instead of \$10,000, besides all his other perquisites.

Mr. FOSTER. What perquisites?

Mr. McMULLEN. The perquisites he has under these items, and also the perquisites he has in coming here to Canada and travelling through the country free and interfering in elections. The Finance Minister said that the information on this subject was given to us in the Public Accounts of last year.

Mr. FOSTER. I said no such thing.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to give us those details this year.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the income of the High Commissioner is increased by the amount he has invested in the gas company, I should like to know if we will be compelled to pay the increased amount on his income tax.

Mr. FOSTER. That is too gassy a question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I think that is a very proper question, and I think we ought to know if the electors of Canada will have to pay the amount of that increase.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Taking the Minister's explanation as to the reason for the amount of contingencies being reduced from \$4,000 to \$2,000, because of the purchase of the official residence, one would imagine that the ground rent and the income tax would be included and should be paid out of the \$2,000 now allowed to the High Commissioner. If the whole \$4,000 had been taken from him it might be different, but we find, of course, now no item for rent, but \$2,000 is still left to the High Commissioner, and one would think that out of that he would pay the ground rent; and that item is fairly open to criticism.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I think the information which is asked for by this side of the House is perfectly reasonable. We want to know for what purpose the amount voted for contingencies has been spent. We do not charge that it has been spent improperly or corruptly, but we ought to know how it was spent. If it has been spent properly, the Government have no reason to refuse to tell us how it has been spent. If I were asked by my constituents how that money was spent, I ought to be in possession of the facts so as to give them a proper answer, and I do not think it is right for the Finance Minister to ask us to pass this item without a proper explanation. If Sir Charles Tupper has used this money in order to entertain his friends, let us know it, or if he has used it for any other purpose let us know it. I think the question put by the Opposition is a perfectly proper question, and the Government will not perform their duty in refusing to give us the desired information. If the information is given, I am convinced that we can pass the item without further trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought I gave a fair statement of the case in reply to another hon. gentleman. We know that this money has been paid to Sir Charles Tupper as well as his salary of \$10,000. We know that we allowed Sir Alexander Galt \$4,000 for contingencies. Of course he had to pay

the rent of an official residence, while now we have purchased an official residence. Consequently, instead of allowing \$4,000 for contingencies, we only allow \$2,000. We do not ask how that was spent any more than we asked how the \$4,000 was spent. As far as this country is concerned, we know that amount was paid. I do not think it will take hon. gentlemen very long to understand that there is a considerable amount of incidental expenditure in connection with the High Commissioner's office. Sir Alexander Galt did not give the items for his expenditure. He found that it would be impolitic in some cases to give these items. There are various expenditures which the High Commissioner has to make as representing the people of this great country. This \$2,000 is given to him as an allowance, and has been given to him for the last nine years, in lieu of the amount which was previously given to Sir Alexander Galt, less the amount for house rent, because we purchased the official residence.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). If the hon. gentleman will look at the Auditor General's Report, he will see that what he mentions is not exactly adhered to. Sir Alexander Galt paid his own income tax, he paid his own rent, he paid many charges which are included in the contingencies of the present High Commissioner. The present High Commissioner not only has a house furnished him, but he is receiving nearly as large an allowance as Sir Alexander Galt was receiving, and the latter had no house furnished to him at all. The hon. gentleman will see, therefore, that so far as the High Commissioner is concerned the understanding to which he refers, and which was stated to us at the time the house in London was purchased, is not adhered to. Now, I would like also to ask how it is that while the appropriation made last year for the expenses of the High Commissioner's office amounted to \$7,163, the amount actually expended was \$15,970. I do not see from what source the difference between these two amounts is made up.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend, if he looks closely, will see that it is he who has made the mistake. The amount voted was over \$15,000, and the amount expended was also over \$15,000.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. Finance Minister says practically that the \$10,000 is paid as salary, and that the \$2,000 additional is also practically paid as a salary, because we have no more vouchers for the one amount than for the other. It may be, as the hon. gentleman suggests, that it is not politic for us to know in what manner that \$2,000 has been expended. If the hon. Finance Minister will add that \$2,000 to the High Commissioner's salary, making it \$12,000, I do not suppose any more questions will be asked.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the difference between that and what we do at present?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Hear, hear. We do not see the difference.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is much to see.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Will the hon. Finance Minister state what object there is in paying \$10,000 of salary, and then giving \$2,000 in addition? Would it not be better to put the total amount at \$12,000 rather than give the country the impression that the High Commissioner was only receiving \$10,000?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter of taste.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Let us hear what your taste is about it?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is precisely what it is, a matter of taste, and I suppose the Government want a guarantee that the \$2,000 shall be a matter of taste.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. I would suggest to the hon. Finance Minister that it would really be better to include the amount as salary; but while I have a very proper idea of economy, I do think that, instead of putting it at \$10,000 or \$12,000, \$20,000 would be by no means too much to pay—I am not speaking of an individual, but for the position of the representative of Canada in London. There are so many demands made on any gentleman in that position, that I think it would be only showing a proper regard to the dignity and the position of Canada to make a good allowance for the High Commissioner.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think everything must be judged by its relations to other parts of the Government. Something may be said from the point of view of the hon. gentleman: I know that those possessed of great wealth look at \$10,000 as a very small sum; but when we consider that the Prime Minister of this country, whose position is at least as honourable and I fancy ten times as difficult and onerous as that of the High Commissioner, receives but \$8,000, it seems to me absurd to suggest that the High Commissioner should receive \$20,000. You ask that an officer who lives in England, and who, however you may attempt to surround the fact with verbiage, holds a sinecure.—

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)—very largely, should have a salary larger than that of the hard-worked head of a Department. If it is not a sinecure, perhaps the hon. Finance Minister would enlighten this House as to what practical duties the High Commissioner has discharged during the last eight or ten years. We have had this matter discussed here session after session, and with the exception of an effort made by the High Commissioner a few years ago, to stop an edict, the effect of which would have been to hamper the importation of our cattle for the time being, I know nothing practical which that gentleman has done. He may have done a great deal; but from his report, which I have read, year after year, I have failed to find what he does. I remember that, some years ago, a mission was undertaken for the purpose of improving our trade relations with Spain, and predictions of no mean kind were uttered in this House as to what the results of those negotiations should be; but thus far they have been nil. Will the hon. gentleman tell us in what other direction they have not been nil? I know that in election times he comes here and does a great deal of good to his party, and a great deal of harm to his country; but I do not think that anyone, looking at the matter from a non-partisan point of view, will say that for that work he should receive \$20,000 a year of salary, to say nothing of the other expenses of his office. I do think that before the hon. gentleman startles us with such an extraordinary suggestion, he must be prepared to show that our condition in Canada is so essentially prosperous that we should be justified in moving in the direction of

increasing the salaries of our hard-worked officials: before we increase those of persons holding sinecures. Look at the salaries paid to our judges, who are in many cases overworked: look at the salaries paid to our county judges, many of whom are underpaid. If the country is in a financial condition to increase the salaries of any of our officials, I think these are entitled to consideration: but I do not know that the hon. Finance Minister would be prepared to say that the financial condition of the country is such as to enable him even to move in that direction. But before we have these propositions for increasing salaries, which are easily made, but difficult to carry out, we should have satisfactory assurances from those in charge of the finances of the country that our financial condition is better than the official blue-books and the statements in the *Gazette* would lead us to believe.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. The hon. gentleman has compared the emoluments of the High Commissioner with those of the hon. First Minister and the other Ministers of the Crown. The hon. gentleman does not require to be informed that many representatives of European nations, those in Austria, in France, in Russia, in England, get much higher salaries than the Prime Minister in any of those countries: and that is undoubtedly considered necessary to their position, representing as they do their Sovereign, as the High Commissioner of Canada represents the Dominion.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Misrepresents.

Sir DONALD A. SMITH. And I think it would be really in our own interest that the position of High Commissioner of Canada,—I say again, I am not speaking personally, not speaking of the individual—should be made such as to enable him to entertain, to some extent, out of the proceeds of his salary, as is done by almost all other representatives. The hon. gentleman incidentally said that there was a notice on the paper from me in respect of increasing the salaries of the judges. I do trust this will be taken into consideration by the Government, because I think we owe it to ourselves that the salaries of our judges should be increased: and while I hope I am as much actuated by a proper desire for economy as the hon. gentleman or any other member of this House, I should certainly not be opposed to seeing the emoluments of the Ministers of the Crown and of our judges increased, but at the same time we ought to exercise every care in introducing into every portion of the Civil Service those only who are fit to do the work to be assigned to them. If such care be observed, we should be able to pay well all those who are capable of doing, and who do good work for the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we will all agree with the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentleman who has taken his seat. We all want the country to pay properly for all services rendered. The difficulty in this particular case is to discover what services have been rendered for any portion of the salary to the country as a whole. However, I have not risen to discuss that question, but rather to reply to a few remarks that fell from the hon. the Minister of Finance, who, I think, through not having looked into the matter carefully, has fallen into a mistake. The hon. Minister tells us that we are now carrying out, as it were in a par-

Mr. DAVIES (P. E. I.)

tial way, the arrangement made when Sir Alexander Galt was appointed High Commissioner. Now, as I understand the position of the matter, when Sir Alexander Galt was our general agent, he received for about one year \$4,000. For that \$4,000 he was to pay his own rent and taxes, fuel, light and other incidental expenses. That arrangement lasted for about one year. After that an Order in Council was passed giving him \$3,500, out of which he was to supply himself with house rent, etc. That was the state of affairs when the present High Commissioner made the arrangement by which Canada purchased a house in England. We paid for that house and furniture some \$42,000, and it was then stated in this House that the \$4,000 for contingencies was not to be continued because we had furnished the High Commissioner with a house. But to-day we are in this position: that, although we have furnished the residence, we are still voting \$2,000, or half the contingencies. Now, when Sir Alexander Galt got his appropriations, he had to furnish his own house and to pay his own rent and taxes and other incidentals: yet, to-day, we are asked to vote half the expense of the appropriation, and at the same time to supply the High Commissioner with a residence and all the expenses connected therewith. If you look through these items in the Auditor General's Report, you will find that, in addition to getting the \$2,000, Sir Charles Tupper has been paid for those incidentals that were formerly paid out of the appropriation. When the purchase of the house was made, Sir Leonard Tilley, Minister of Finance, pledged himself, on the floor of the House, that the interest upon the whole investment was to be deducted from the allowance. The interest on the purchase of the house and on the cost of the furniture and other expenses was to be deducted from the allowance. But to-day the Government are maintaining one-half of the allowance, thus not carrying out this arrangement of Sir Leonard Tilley's. If you take, say 5 per cent. interest on the investment of \$42,000—I do not know if there is anything additional to that on original capital account—that amounts in itself to \$2,000, half of the original \$4,000 the Finance Minister has spoken of: and, in addition, we are paying other incidentals, such as \$349 rates, \$250 taxes, \$332 gas, and so on. So that you are practically making an increase of salary and not carrying out the arrangement Sir Leonard Tilley had made. I think the item should be struck out and put on its proper footing. If we wish to give an increase of salary, let us say so. If we want to pay necessary expenses, the vouchers should be here. That is the only honest way of keeping the public accounts. If the salary is too low, let us say so, but not cover up an increase of salary in this way.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I hope the hon. the Finance Minister is convinced that not only the Opposition but his own friends agree to the proposition I made, that the \$2,000 should be added to the High Commissioner's salary rather than be paid in the way it is. The hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) must be convinced, from his own argument, that there is something wrong in this way of voting money: and I trust he will see the force of the demand made. If Sir Charles Tupper is to be paid \$12,000, he should honestly and above board be paid the money, and not be

paid \$2,000 under the cover of contingencies. I cannot say I agree in the opinion of the hon. member for Montreal West with regard to the payment of enormous sums to the High Commissioner. However, we are not now considering that matter, and when it comes up for consideration it will be ample time to discuss it, but I fancy there is no chance of it coming up this session. I trust the Finance Minister will see the force of the argument that the \$2,000 should be put on a proper footing.

Mr McMULLEN. The hon. the Minister of Finance has stated that this item of \$2,000 is in keeping with a like amount paid to Sir Alexander Galt when he was our agent. I have searched the Auditor General's Report for a like sum passed *en bloc* to Sir Charles Tupper and his predecessor. I find that in the first year of Sir Charles' appointment he was allowed \$3,500 for fire, light and taxes. Now, these are all charged in the items recited in the Auditor General's Report, and the \$2,000 is charged in addition. Now, with regard to the remarks that fell from the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith), I am prepared to say, that when Canada is prepared to use a High Commissioner in England to such an extent that his residence in London will pay the country for keeping him there, I have no objection that he should be paid a fair salary for his services, and I am willing also to allow him such an amount as will enable him to discharge his duties with credit to Canada and to himself; but at the time Sir Charles Tupper was appointed High Commissioner, I claimed that the House and the country were misled. The First Minister stated that, by sending a High Commissioner to England and by giving him an official residence, we would save more in the interest we paid in various other ways than his whole salary and expenses would amount to. From the first time he undertook his duties as High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper has not discharged those duties as it was promised he would discharge them when he was appointed, and, consequently, we were misled. When the attention of the Finance Minister was called to this two years ago, he stated that we were under contract with our financial agents in London to allow them to put through our financial transactions, and that, until that contract expired, we would not be able to use our High Commissioner in the way it was intimated to us we could use him five years ago. It is very extraordinary, when the First Minister and the Finance Minister were urging that we should appoint Sir Charles Tupper as High Commissioner because we would save money, that it has been found impossible to take advantage of his residence in London to act as our financial agent. Anyone who reads his report of this year will find that, with the single exception of the delegation of tenant farmers which were sent to Canada, there is not an item of his action which properly belongs to the duty of the High Commissioner. He makes extensive reports in reference to charitable societies and emigration societies, he makes many references which belong to the duty of an emigration agent, but we were led to believe that he would perform much more important duties than those in connection with emigration. He deals also with the matter of educating our people as to how they can ship a number of small commodities which we used to send to the United

States, such as eggs, and butter, and so on. I recommend hon. members to read Sir Charles Tupper's report, and there they will find the class of duties in which he is engaged. The duties he performs could be attended to by a man with a salary of from \$1,000 to \$2,000. Taking the turkey question, he says:

"A considerable number of turkeys have also arrived recently, and have sold readily at good prices; so far as I can ascertain from persons engaged in the trade, there will be an unlimited demand for them in future. They are regarded as being more like game than the British farm-fed turkey, which arises, no doubt, from the touch of wild blood which they contain."

What a grand idea must have struck our High Commissioner in trying to secure an extended market for our turkeys in England, because, as he says, a touch of wild blood makes them more palatable to the English Lords. I never knew that we sent the High Commissioner to England for the purpose of extending the trade in turkeys. However, I say that he has never performed the duties in England attaching to his position for which we pay him \$12,000 a year. I never could get at the secret. I do not suppose that anyone on this side of the House could get at the secret why he was ever sent to England. Perhaps the question of who should be the chief of that party in the future, may have had something to do with his crossing the Atlantic. There were two men on this side who were possible leaders, and we had to send the one to the other side of the Atlantic at an annual cost of \$25,000, and to keep the other here. That appears to have been the reason why Sir Charles Tupper was sent to England, and I do not hesitate to say boldly that it is an outrage to keep a man like him there at such a cost performing merely nominal duties. I do not deny that in point of ability Sir Charles Tupper is a credit to Canada, but, whatever may be the amount of his ability, we do not have the value for the money we pay. The duties which he performs are not in proportion to the amount we have to pay him. There appeared to be no particular objection to paying \$10,000 for such an official. Sir Alexander Galt and others had received a similar amount. But we bought him a residence and furnished his house with everything required from garret to cellar. We pay for that house, and we give him \$2,000 in addition to that. Now the hon. member for Montreal West says it is necessary, in order to enable the High Commissioner to entertain those whom he is called upon to entertain in the high position that he occupies. If that is so, let the people of Canada understand that it is for that purpose the Government are asking for the money. Why should we ask the people of this country to consent blindly to part with \$2,000 for purposes that are not openly acknowledged? The people have a right to know where the money goes. If it is intended to give wine dinners, say so. If it is intended for other purposes, say so. Let the people of this country know what the money is being spent for. I say they have a perfect right to know that. They have a right to know why we are paying Sir Charles Tupper \$12,000 instead of \$10,000. Perhaps that \$2,000 extra is given him in order to equip him thoroughly and prepare him for his periodical visits to the Dominion of Canada when the elections come round, and to discharge the duties of chief advocate of the cause of Toryism in this Dominion. Perhaps that is what it is given

for. If it is given for that purpose, we would like also to know it. Now, I wish to say that I quite concur with the remarks already made, that if we are going to continue Sir Charles Tupper in London, we had better, in the interests of this Dominion, endeavour to make better use of him than we have been doing for the last five years. We have spent from \$100,000 to \$120,000 on the High Commissioner in London for the last five or six years, for which this country has virtually received nothing, unless on one occasion, for which he gets credit, when he prevented our cattle from being scheduled so that they would have to be slaughtered within two weeks of their arrival, the same as the American cattle. Now, that is the only thing, I believe, that he ever accomplished, and that was done three or four years ago. Still we keep him there in the discharge of functions which are of no benefit to this country, and I hold that we should either bring him back or else assign him duties in the performance of which he could be of some advantage to us as High Commissioner. Before sitting down, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, when does the contract terminate with these gentlemen in London that are now discharging the duties of financial agents for us? When may we expect that Sir Charles Tupper, or any other person discharging the duty of High Commissioner in London, will perform those duties himself in the interest of this country, duties which we were promised would be performed by the High Commissioner when we were asked to consent to his appointment?

Mr. FOSTER. I have a great desire to give the hon. gentleman information, and I will answer his questions categorically. That contract expires on the first day of July, 1892, in this way: That on that day, we can either get a year's notice, or we can give a year's notice of the termination; so that either way it may terminate on the first day of July, 1893. With regard to the second question, as to when the time will come that Sir Charles Tupper will do such and such things, I am not prepared to give that information. I want to say, however, as long as I am on my feet, that the hon. gentleman seems not to object to the payment of \$12,000 on the ground of economy. He does not at all find fault that it is necessary that \$12,000 should be paid, but he does not want it to be paid \$10,000 plus \$2,000—it must be \$12,000 in a lump sum; and the reason he does not want it paid in \$10,000 and \$2,000, is because, he thinks he ought to know the items for which the \$2,000 are spent, and he has not been furnished with these items. Now, it seems to me that the arrangement I stated here was a full, open and fair arrangement made in 1882 or 1883, whenever Sir Charles Tupper went there. I did not say that the same arrangement was carried out as we had with Sir Alexander Galt. I stated that Sir Alexander Galt received \$4,000 for certain purposes, so he did; and although the Order in Council mentioned \$3,500, that was only part of the \$4,000 he received, and he was getting besides that, \$500 contingencies pure and simple. I stated that when Sir Charles Tupper became High Commissioner that arrangement was made by which \$2,000 should be retained by the Government and the other \$2,000 should be paid to him for certain incidental expenses. That is exactly the arrangement that was made with
Mr. McMULLEN.

reference to the salary, an open and full arrangement, and I do not see why we should cavil about that. Now there is another point. There seems some strange difference between my hon. friend who spoke last and my hon. friend from Charlottetown. My hon. friend from Charlottetown complains that the High Commissioner has nothing to do, and does not do anything, and my hon. friend who has just spoken complains that the High Commissioner does too much, and that he ought not to do those things that he does do. For instance, the hon. gentleman tries to belittle the work of the High Commissioner because he deals in such small matters as the egg trade, and the poultry trade, and the cattle trade. Not many months ago, Sir, it was not thought in this country, by the party in Opposition, that the egg trade and the poultry trade were small matters. I remember that scarcely a paper of theirs, scarcely an orator of theirs, ever published an editorial or made a speech in which these matters were not prominently brought forward, and the farmers and the farmers' wives, it was said, would be irretrievably ruined because the McKinley Bill would destroy their trade in eggs and poultry. Now it seems that these trades are not so important. I do not think the farmers of this country will look upon it in that way. I do not think that it demeans our High Commissioner, be he Sir Charles Tupper or whoever may succeed him, to look after these interests, which are very large when you come to look at the incidence of them, and the great majority of the people whom they affect. Sir Charles Tupper is not too high a commissioner to look after these matters of trade, which are of vital importance to the various interests of this country. What he has done with reference to the cattle trade is well known, and there is no member on either side of the House, I suppose, who will withhold from him the meed of praise which is his due with reference to that matter. With reference to the egg and poultry trade, my hon. friend, usually so well informed, seems to have fallen into a strange error. I may say to him that Mr. Saunders, Director of the Experimental Farm, never went to Great Britain to look after the egg and poultry trade. The hon. gentleman must have found his information in some strange way; however, it is totally incorrect. The services that Sir Charles Tupper and his assistants there effected were valuable services, and they have resulted in large benefit, and will result in much more benefit, to this country, so far as the trade in eggs and poultry with the mother country is concerned. My hon. friend finds fault, as well, because Sir Charles Tupper is not all the time engaged upon high and lofty matters; he thinks, that instead of fiddling around with eggs and turkeys and the like of that, he should be making loans. Well, Sir, when we made the last loan, the most advantageous loan that ever was placed on the British market, Sir Charles Tupper had an important part to perform, and he did it well, and the result was that, as I said before, we placed a loan on the British market at a rate less than any colony had ever placed a loan there before, and on very advantageous terms, as well. My hon. friend may try to belittle the work that a gentleman representing Canada, in so important a centre as London, has to perform, but he cannot go counter to the general sense of the intelligent people of this country who have only to reflect for a single moment to understand in how

many varied and important ways a gentleman of the ability, such as my hon. friend acknowledges Sir Charles Tupper to be, a gentleman of the unwonted activity which the hon. gentleman also concedes to Sir Charles Tupper, can perform in London in the interests of Canada; and those who have to deal with the English Government know what great services he has rendered to this country in promoting our trade interests. They know how important it is that we should have some person there who understands this country and who is able to work in its interests; and, although the hon. gentleman may cavil as to the \$10,000 and the \$2,000, I apprehend the time will never come when the Government of Canada will cease to have an able and true representative of its interests at the seat of Government in London.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Minister of Finance says that Mr. Saunders was not sent to Great Britain for the purpose of enquiring into the egg and poultry business; he said that Mr. Saunders went there upon other business.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, what did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I am bound to repeat myself so many times, but I will do so out of sheer kindness to the hon. gentleman. I said that Mr. Saunders, the Director of the Experimental Farm, never went to England on any such mission as my hon. friend says he did.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, we will see what Sir Charles Tupper says, and then we will find out whether the hon. gentleman is right, or Sir Charles Tupper. Here is what Sir Charles says in his report:

"The operations of the McKinley Tariff have created a desire in Canada to render the country more independent of the United States markets for poultry and eggs, and inquiries and experience have demonstrated that an unlimited demand exists in Great Britain for such products. Before Mr. Saunders, the Commissioner deputed by the Government to visit this country, and to report upon the subject, arrived, much information was collected respecting the trade, and I trust that its dissemination has been of use to Canadian shippers."

Mr. FOSTER. I will help the hon. gentleman out of the dilemma. There are a great many people by the name of Brown, and there may be several by the name of Saunders.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is possible there may be other Saunders than one. If I made a mistake in saying that he was superintendent of the Model Farm I withdraw that statement. I do not for a moment belittle the duties which Sir Charles may have to perform, but I do not think it necessary that a man receiving a salary of \$12,000 a year should be called upon to discharge such duties. They could be discharged by a great many people who are in our employ in England, and who are sent there for different purposes. It was announced in Parliament that Sir Charles Tupper would be engaged in performing very different duties, and would prove valuable as our commercial agent; and I hope, when this promise is carried out, we will obtain some value for our money, for we have received no value for it in the past.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance has sought to justify the continuance of the office of High Commissioner and the present occupant of it, on the ground that he has performed great

service in respect to the egg and poultry trade. The hon. gentleman has, however, undertaken a larger contract than even he is capable of performing, if he seeks to convince the House that the spasmodic efforts of the High Commissioner with respect to the egg trade would justify the payment of \$18,000 a year for the continuance of the office. The egg trade is a very important one, and its importance was always recognized by the Opposition. We complained that the Government would never recognize its importance; but we hold that the importance of the trade lies not with England, with which it is not carried on, but with the United States, with which it is conducted, and if the hon. gentleman opposite would devote his attention to removing all obstructions to the continuance and extension of the trade between here and the United States, he would be doing service to the country, instead of Canada paying \$18,000 to a High Commissioner to endeavour to build up a trade which we know cannot be successfully carried on with the mother country. The hon. gentleman was on safer ground when he attempted to justify the continuance of the office of the High Commissioner on the ground that Sir Charles Tupper had been engaged in promoting some Canadian loans. But the hon. gentleman made the statement, which I cannot allow to go unchallenged in this House, that the loan floated by the High Commissioner was the best loan ever floated by Canada. I am speaking in the recollection of many hon. members in this House when I say that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) delivered a speech last session, or at least the session before, in which he exposed the hollowness of that pretension so thoroughly that not a member on the Government side has ever replied to his speech since. He showed that the loan to which the Minister refers was, taking into account the money market of that day, one of the worst loans Canada ever floated. The Minister of Finance never attempted to answer his speech, but remained dumb. I will challenge him now to answer it, and he will have an opportunity in the Budget speech to reply to the scathing criticism which that loan met at the hands of the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright). Apart from that matter, what has the High Commissioner done? I suppose the Minister of Finance has taken pains to make the House acquainted with all the services the High Commissioner has performed. We have had reference made to floating the loan, and to the High Commissioner's pottering, to use the hon. Minister's choice language, respecting this egg and poultry business. I think the hon. Minister will find that a very large majority of his own side of the House will fail to support the vote on these grounds. It has been suggested by some that the salary should be voted, and should be even increased, on account of the duties of the High Commissioner connected with entertaining. Who is the High Commissioner going to entertain? If he is going to entertain any of his political friends in this country he would hardly ask the Dominion to pay for it, and if the money is to be voted to the High Commissioner on the special ground that he is going to entertain the parcel of ruined gamblers, I suppose it would hardly receive support in this House. So the question of entertaining had better be left out of the argument. With respect to the proposition of the hon. gentleman for Montreal,

that Parliament should not only pay but largely increase the office, I have examined the authorities to ascertain what the United States pay their ambassadors and ministers abroad. While we pay the High Commissioner \$18,000 a year, the amount of salaries paid to the ambassadors of the United States to France, Great Britain, Germany and Russia is only \$17,500.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend was speaking of the representatives of European countries in Europe.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I do not think the Parliament of Canada should be asked to draw its comparisons from European countries, and to avoid those of a neighbouring republic entirely.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not saying we should draw or should not draw our illustrations from that source, but I am simply stating what my hon. friend used as his comparison.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I will state what I think is the most analogous case afforded by that country which stands in the closest relations to us, and which ought to afford, and may afford some slight grounds, although it should not be the controlling one in fixing our salaries. I repeat that the salaries paid for the four great diplomatic prizes in the United States is \$17,500 a year. When the Minister of Finance interrupted me I was about to say that, speaking subject to correction. I do not think there is a large amount for contingencies voted to those ministers or ambassadors. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mills) says there is not. If that is the case, as a matter of fact we are paying the High Commissioner a larger sum than is paid to the ambassador of the United States to France, Great Britain, Germany, Russia or Mexico. The hon. gentleman is prepared to shake his head at anything.

Mr. FOSTER. At almost anything you say.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I am speaking from the book. The United States only pays \$12,000 a year to their ministers to Austria, Brazil, China, Italy, Japan, Spain; to Turkey, Chili, Argentine Republic, U.S. of Columbia and Peru, \$10,000, and to Persia, Portugal and other smaller countries, \$5,000. It seems to me that if we are going on the basis of comparison, our High Commissioner receives a larger salary than any of the ambassadors of the United States to foreign countries.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I desire to enquire if the hon. gentleman has been convinced and intends to change the method of voting this money?

Mr. FOSTER. I have listened very attentively to the arguments advanced. I will try and give them all the weight which is their due, and will consider the question very carefully.

Mr. MULOCK. A good deal has been said as to what the High Commissioner has been doing. We have not had explained to us why the High Commissioner has not done something to develop our horse trade with England. When election times come on, he and his friends state there is a limitless market in England for horses. They have sung that tune for some time, telling us there is no necessity to take our horses to the American market, as there is an outlet for suitably bred horses in England. Why does not the High Commissioner take practical steps to establish this

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.)

trade in the way which he says is possible? Two months ago, there was held in Toronto, a sale of horses suitable for the English market. The sale was advertized for months. The promoters of the sale, I understand, are good supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and much time and money was expended in scouring Canada in order to gather a very fine collection of horses. I observed in the press, a short time ago, a letter from one of the leading horsemen of Canada—who was also a member of the Conservative party at one time, if not now—in which he stated that these horses were all specially suited for the English market, and yet not one of them found its way there. Why is this? The reason is that when this enterprise was being got up, the High Commissioner, instead of attending to Canadian interests in England, which he is engaged and paid to do, was out here stumping the country in the interests of the Conservative party. Why was he neglecting the opportunity to advance Canadian interests in England; an opportunity which may not come around for years again? Why was he not at that time giving practical effect to what he says is a great possibility for Canada, namely, the development of the English market for our horses? Let us see from the Public Accounts what it costs the country to maintain the present High Commissioner in office. In the Auditor General's Report for 1890, page B—73, I find that we spent last year, \$15,973, or \$16,000 in round numbers.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for office and all.

Mr. MULOCK. Yes; and if you add \$10,000 for salary, you have \$26,000 a year. If we include the interest on the \$42,000 spent for the High Commissioner's residence, without including depreciation of property, we have a total cost of some \$30,000 a year, or a quarter of a million dollars altogether since the present High Commissioner assumed office. We have to pay this \$30,000 a year, while the duties of the office lie so lightly on the shoulders of the present incumbent that he can for a considerable portion of the year be absent either in Canada or other parts of the world other than in England, while, apparently, Canadian interests in England must suffer. There is something wrong in this. Either the duties in that office demand his undivided time and should have it, or they do not, and, judging from the practices of the present High Commissioner, the indication is that these duties do not require his whole time. If we look at the Trade and Navigation Returns, it would appear that Sir Charles Tupper is not giving his whole time to his duties, and that, in consequence, the interests of Canada are suffering. In my opinion, the proper way to deal with this matter is to strike at the root of the evil and to recall the present incumbent of the office, because he is above his masters, the people. He is assuming to be the people and to speak for the people, yet he attacks a considerable portion of the people at home, and he attacks Canadian interests abroad. These are no part of the duties of the High Commissioner, and if the Government properly appreciated their duty to the country they would have recalled Sir Charles Tupper the first moment he dared to degrade the condition of the people of Canada by slandering a considerable portion of them. In my judgment, no man could have been guilty of a greater violation of the duties

of his office than to use his position as a representative of the people, clothed as he is with the apparent authority of his office, to slander a very large proportion of these people. There is no compromise in the matter at all. The High Commissioner has shown himself unfit for his office, in failing to appreciate the judicial position he stands in as representing all classes of the people and as bound in duty to promote the interest of Canada. His position demands from him neutrality as between parties in this country; and as he has failed to observe this, he should be back in Canada, where we can meet him face to face, if he should be returned to this House, and call him to account for the breach of trust he is guilty of. The Administration is responsible for this, because they aid and abet his conduct and keep him in his office. I believe they have good reason to do so, for they are afraid to have him here. They do not care to serve under two kings, and so they keep him away; they, perhaps, would like him here, but they cannot trust him here. Sometimes he is in the Government, and sometimes we cannot tell whether he is in the Government or out of it. On one occasion he was Minister of Finance and High Commissioner about the same time.

Mr. FOSTER. Not at the same time.

Mr. MULOCK. He had the High Commissioner's patent in his pocket, and he sat here as Minister of Finance voting his salary as High Commissioner. He is nothing more than a general boobah for the Government of this country. I see it stated in the papers that he is coming to Canada at once, and that he is to have a seat in the Cabinet. Perhaps the Minister of Finance would tell us what portfolio he would take.

Mr. FOSTER. Ask the *Globe*.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the *Globe* could tell if it desired, but that authority would not satisfy the hon. gentleman, and I will not quote it. I return to the grave proposition which is fairly entitled to consideration, namely: Whether the people of this country are prepared for maintaining in office, in a prominent position in the Empire, a man whose public acts are principally devoted towards slandering a large section of the people of this country?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I do not propose to refer to the item in the Estimates under consideration, but some matters of business have been brought before the House in connection with this matter to which I will briefly allude. It has been stated that an export trade in eggs between Canada and Great Britain is impracticable. I deny that, and I deny it upon the best possible evidence, namely, the practical results obtained from shipments of eggs to the English market. I also deny that the Canadian export poultry trade to Great Britain is impracticable, and I deny that also on information obtained from genuine experiments. Eggs have been exported from the Province of Ontario to England within the last ten months, and the exportation has been successful. Quantities of eggs have been shipped to the English market at a profit within the last six weeks and returns have been already made, which returns I have now on my desk.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read them.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I will read them when the proper time comes. Our eggs are quite equal to, and indeed superior to most eggs placed on the British market from the continent of Europe. The market is not the cause of any loss in shipments to England, the price is not the cause, but it was the lack of experience of our egg men in ocean shipments which resulted in the trade not being so profitable as it otherwise would have been. That difficulty has been overcome by the experience of a few shippers, and to-day Canadian eggs are being laid down on the Liverpool market with as small a percentage of breakages as they are laid down in Boston. There is no difficulty about the shipment, there is no difficulty about the carriage, no difficulty about the quality of the eggs, or no difficulty about the price obtained; but the difficulty lies in Canada, and is accounted for by the opposition shown to this trade by the Opposition here, who seem to be opposed to any trade between Canada and Great Britain. I know as a fact that Mr. Sanders has been successful in his shipments of poultry to England. If my friend Mr. McMullen, instead of reading the names he referred to, spelled them, he would find that one is "Sanders" and the other "Saunders," and that there is quite a difference between them. Mr. Sanders, after his visit to England, made a shipment of seventy-five tons of turkeys purchased in one week. He exported them at a disadvantageous season, shortly after the holidays, and when the choice fowls were all taken out of the country, and yet they competed favourably on the English market and the returns left him a respectable profit. I saw it stated in the papers, that the fowl arrived in a condition unfit for food, that they were condemned by the meat inspectors, and that the exporter was a heavy loser; but, notwithstanding that, I know to the contrary that there was a profit on the shipment, and I know that from the returns which I also have in my desk. Now, as to the horse trade with England. I know as a matter of fact, that, within the last six weeks, a contract has been made by a Canadian gentleman to supply 5,000 horses to one omnibus and carriage company in the city of London: that is about one-third of the annual average of our horse export for the last ten years. When one company in one city in England can make a contract for that supply, I think that we can say that the horse export trade of Canada is on pretty safe grounds.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Have you that in your desk, too?

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). I have it in my desk, and when the proper time comes I will read it.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I wish in a few words to give the testimony of one of the large egg dealers in the Province of Ontario, Mr. D. D. Wilson, who is called the egg king in the west. Last June he shipped a carload of eggs to England, and at the same time shipped a carload to New York, to his agents there. The eggs sent to England were selected or picked eggs, all the small ones being left out and only the best taken; but those sent to New York were sent just as they came from the farmers. Mr. Wilson went to England to push the sale of the eggs there. He found that they arrived perfectly safe. For them he netted four cents a dozen less than he did from the eggs that he sent to New York at the same time. That is his own testimony, and

it shows that the English market for eggs is not so profitable to the Canadian exporter as the United States market. He says that in England you can always find sale for eggs at a price, but not at the best price. In 1878 Mr. Wilson made a test of the English market for eggs. He sent 300 barrels, and he lost \$5 on every barrel.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). By breakage?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). No; but by reason of the low prices obtained for them. According to the usage of the English market, eggs are sold there by the hundred, and 120 are required to make a hundred, in addition to which buyers demand 5 extra eggs, so that you have to give 125 eggs for every 100 you get pay for. It is also known that five weeks elapse from the time eggs are laid in this country until they are sold in the British market, so that they have to be sold as stale eggs, and compared with eggs brought from France they only bring second prices. You can always get a market, for there is a demand for all you can send; but the market is inferior to that found in the United States. So that, although Sir Charles Tupper has been doing all he can to establish a market for eggs in England, the experience of those engaged in the trade is that our egg trade in England will be a failure. With regard to horses, it is admitted by everyone who deals in horses that the United States is the best market for the kind that we raise in Canada. Although we have had to pay 20 per cent. on our horses sent to the United States, we have sent from 17,000 to 19,000 to the American market every year, while we only send about 160 to the free English market. A few years ago some parties were sent to this country to purchase horses for the English army, and even for those which they selected they paid an inferior price to the price obtained for Canadian horses in the American market. The consequence is that the Canadian farmer has ceased to sell horses for that purpose, and he sends his horses to the United States market instead. I would ask the hon. member for Leeds how it is that after the 6th October last, when the McKinley Bill went into force, the price of horses in this country fell \$15 to \$30 a head, if the English market were as valuable a market as he says for Canadian horses, and if we could realize as much for Canadian horses in the English market as in the American? With regard to poultry, it is the experience of men engaged in that trade, that the nearness of the American markets, the great centres of consumption, gives a greater margin of profit to Canadian exporters than they could obtain in England. That is a principle in political economy which I hope my hon. friend will bear in mind. In these three articles I am satisfied our market is on the other side of the line, where we can realize larger profits for producers than we can in England.

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid that we are forgetting that the item before us is that of contingencies, and we are drifting into a discussion of the best market for eggs, horses and poultry. This discussion came up incidentally in connection with the work the High Commissioner has been engaged in, and to a certain extent it might be considered legitimate; but we have now had a speech on each side on the pure trade question, and I think I must

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron).

appeal to the Committee to come back to the item of contingencies.

Mr. FLINT. Although perhaps somewhat out of the line of the item before the Committee, I wish to make a few remarks on the question of the High Commissioner's office. The discussion with regard to the salary attached to that office has drawn from the hon. member for Montreal West (Sir Donald Smith) the declaration of his opinion that the salary ought to be much higher than it is at present. While I do not rise to attack his opinion on that point, I might even go so far as to agree with him, provided that the occupant of that office were under the control of the Government, that he would so act as to elevate it rather than degrade it, and that he would represent before the people of Great Britain all the people of Canada in all their varied interests, rather than act as the representative of one political party in Canada, using his immense talent and great energies, not only in attacking the political party on this side of the House, but in misrepresenting on the subject of loyalty the opinions and sentiments of a large minority at any rate of the people of this Dominion. I am not attacking the occupant of the office, because we all know that he is an earnest politician, that he has led parties in this country, that he has been to a great degree an ornament of this House, and that he is a strong supporter of the present Prime Minister; but I think that we have reason to feel disappointed in the Government in permitting the highest civil servant under their control to assume the position he does without rebuke. It is not Sir Charles Tupper who is to blame, because he is only acting according to his temperament and under the responsibility of the Government, for which we have the word of the right hon. Prime Minister; they have endorsed all he has done during the election and since in bolstering up and furthering the interest of one political party. Now let us look at the position from an English standpoint. We must consider, not only our own feelings in this matter, as Liberals and Conservatives, but the position of honest independent Englishmen, viewing the Dominion of Canada through the spectacles provided for them by the official representative in London of the Canadian people; and I ask you if the time has not arrived when this House should show its disapproval of such conduct by refusing to vote the large appropriations asked for? The High Commissioner—not Sir Charles Tupper the individual politician, but the High Commissioner of Canada—left his office and came to this country to take a leading part in the recent elections. Had he confined himself during that campaign to the consideration of the trade question or any other great question agitating the country, much that has been said need not have been said on this occasion, but we all know that he took a peculiar ground, never before taken by any of the political leaders of this country. He took the ground that the leaders of one of the great political parties in this Dominion were at heart traitors, and engaged in a treasonable conspiracy to wrest this country from the British Crown and annex it to a foreign State. This position, completely unsupported and untrue in itself, should, taken by the High Commissioner representing Canada in England, be repudiated in the strongest possible terms by gentlemen on both sides of the House.

I will not detain the House by entering at length into what that gentleman said in his able and vigorous manner throughout the campaign, and which impelled into the politics of this country a bitter feeling it will take a long time to get rid of, but will briefly refer to the manner in which he has been contradicted by the people of England to whom he uniformly appealed in order to prejudice them against the party to which I have the honour to belong. How have his charges, made directly or indirectly, that we were traitors to the British Crown and engaged in a plot with certain persons in American political life to take this country from British control and annex it to the United States, been met in England? These charges, which were telegraphed to all the prominent English papers, called forth in the columns of the *London Times* a protest from so distinguished a statesman and Conservative as Sir George Baden-Powell. That gentleman was in Canada during the elections, and there heard the charges hurled by Sir Charles Tupper, and his supporters, and the Conservative press, against the Liberal party; and so strongly did he feel the injustice done to the Liberals of the Dominion, that he wrote a long and able letter to the *Times*, a few passages from which I shall quote. On the 29th February, 1891, Sir George Baden-Powell wrote as follows:—

“It so happens that when I was in Canada last autumn, I had the privilege of seeing a great deal of the leading men of both parties, and especially of the Liberals, staying, for instance, with Mr. Goldwin Smith in Toronto, enjoying the hospitality of Mr. Longley in Halifax, and talking over the situation with many another Liberal in Victoria, Vancouver, Montreal, Winnipeg, Ottawa and other places.”

He then goes on to say:

“It becomes absolutely clear that both parties in Canada are not only distinctly loyal to the British connection, but also loyal to Canada, and that any ministers or leaders who swerve for one moment from either type of loyalty will at once lose the votes and support of their followers.”

This is the opinion of Sir George Baden-Powell:

“Such are, in brief, the conclusions arrived at after much discussion with men of all parties in Canada. And above all, we know that the leaders and voters of both political parties will give short shrift to any who are wanting in loyalty to the Canadian nationality or to the great Empire, of which the Dominion is rapidly becoming one of the most important and principal constituent elements.”

Well, Sir, that is the opinion of Sir George Baden-Powell, to which he gave circulation in order to check the false impression which was being created in England by our High Commissioner against the leaders and rank and file of the Liberal party. But let me quote the *London Times* itself in an article dealing with the colonies. On the 30th March, after the English and Colonial papers had been filled with the diatribes of Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, that great exponent of English public opinion thus sums up its views on the matter, after a careful review of the whole situation, and, I presume, a careful examination of the leading speeches on both sides:

“In listening to the echoes of the election which are carried over the Atlantic, it is hardly possible to doubt the strong political dislike to the constitution of the United States which continues with other causes to stimulate the sentiment of loyalty to British connection. Not one party alone, but all parties cherish the Canadian constitution which they regard as the nearest approach to

liberty which has yet been realized. They look upon it in every way as more admirable than that of the United States.”

I do not blame our official representative for being a politician; but I blame the Government which, after placing him in the position he occupies, compelled him to give expression to his views. The Government are responsible for every utterance he made during the elections in this country and in Great Britain since the elections with regard to our political affairs. But after the excitement of the campaign was over, and when the echoes of the struggle had died out, the feelings of our High Commissioner became to a certain extent abated; and the London press received a telegram recording an interview held in New York with the High Commissioner, just as he was about to leave for England. We find that the High Commissioner felt compelled to take back many of the utterances he had made during the campaign. On 8th April, 1891, the following telegram appeared in the *London Times* from New York:—

“Sir Charles Tupper in an interview with a representative of the *Tribune*, on being asked whether he regarded complete reciprocity between Canada and the United States as unfair to Great Britain's material interests, is represented to have replied that the only terms upon which complete free trade could receive the sanction or support of anyone in the United States would, in his judgment, inevitably sever Canada from Great Britain and could not fail to be regarded in England as indicating Canada's desire to adopt that course. He declared that the number of annexationists in Canada was utterly insignificant, and that any man who had shown any tendency in that direction had been defeated at the polls.”

How much more moderate is this very proper expression of his views, if they were honest, than the fiery statements he made from the platform throughout the country during the elections. It is merely an expression of opinion—an opinion which that gentleman has a right to maintain if he sees fit. He declared that the number of annexationists in Canada was insignificant. This admission is a direct contradiction of his wild statement during the campaign that the result, if the Liberals obtained office, would be inevitably annexation, that they were the head and forefront of a conspiracy entered into with prominent men of the United States to bring about annexation. Since the election, this very High Commissioner, feeling bound to eat his own words, took back, in the presence of the people of England, all the assertions he made during the campaign. He said that the number of annexationists is utterly insignificant, and that every man who showed any tendency to annexation had been defeated at the polls. He withdrew the charge of treason against our party, for we find that a number of the most eminent and prominent gentlemen on this side of the House have not been defeated, and, consequently, could not have shown any tendency towards annexation. Unrestricted reciprocity, he added, was dead. Well, this is the position that our High Commissioner has been compelled, in the face of the people of England, to occupy; and I ask this House if it is such a position as should be rewarded with increased salaries and emoluments. When the High Commissioner of Canada descended from the lofty position in which he was placed with the almost unanimous approval of the Canadian Legislature, and degraded himself by resorting to the lowest tactics of party warfare, either the position should be abolished or the salary reduced so as to administer to him and the Government which sustains

him an effectual rebuke. But not only has he, during this election and since, been occupying an inconsistent position before the people of England in regard to his statements as to the loyalty of the great political parties in this country, but he has entered into a controversy in England where both their feelings and their capital are involved in the welfare of one of the greatest corporations of this country. Whether the charges he has made are true or false, what position does the High Commissioner occupy in England when he enters into a controversy with these people, who are interested in this great corporation? This is a controversy which has become very bitter, which must be prolonged, and must destroy any usefulness which the High Commissioner may have had in the mother country. I am not going to quote at any length the extracts I have in regard to this gentleman, but it is clear that, owing to this controversy, and the bitterness engendered by it, owing to the charges which have been flung backward and forward, the High Commissioner's usefulness is gone in the mother country, and the Government ought to withdraw him from the position he occupies. The *Railway News*, referring to this matter, says towards the close of an article :

"But what about Sir Charles Tupper's position? He is the highly paid ambassador from the young Dominion to the old mother country, paid out of the taxation of the Dominion, contributed by the citizens of all shades of opinions, and probably the largest contributor is the corporation of the Grand Trunk Railway; and yet he considers it within his privileges to forsake his duties as a servant of the State and to engage in a fierce and undignified advocacy of one set of politicians against another."

Importing into the mother country the charges which are made by one party against another in this country, which should be threshed out in the courts of this country and not made a laughing-stock in the press of the mother country. Further, this article says :

"The conclusion is inevitable that the interests of himself, his relatives and his friends outweigh all considerations of the discharge of a great public duty. What would be said of any other public servant in the world (outside of the South American Republics) acting in such way."

The *London Truth*, referring to the same subject, charges him correctly with misrepresentation, which, if the office is to be upheld in the way it should be, must involve the High Commissioner in another controversy with that journal. *Truth* says :

"Does he expect the shareholders to yield to his desire to discredit the present management of the line and to place in their stead a docile set of officers, who will repeat the 'jobbery, corruption and mismanagement' which was the result under the control of his predecessors? Heaven save the Grand Trunk shareholders if the property once passes under the influence of Canadian politicians, whose methods are now very well understood in this country."

Why are Canadian politicians so vilified in the mother country? Must it not be to a large extent due to the charges which have been flung broadcast by the representative of the people of Canada? Should it not rather be the duty of the High Commissioner to soothe the feelings of the people of the mother country, to defend the people of this country whom he represents from charges of disloyalty against the Crown and against the Empire? I contend that the office of High Commissioner has not been sustained in the way it should be by the present incumbent of that office. It is true that he does not lack ability or experience, but the Government, by inviting him to take part in the late

Mr. FLIST.

campaign, have involved themselves in agreement with all the statements which he has made; and I believe that we ought either to wipe out of existence altogether the office which he holds, or to place in that position a man of integrity, a representative of the veracity and ability of the people of Canada, irrespective of party politics.

Mr. DICKEY. I do not rise to discuss the question which has been before the House, but simply to refer to some remarks which were made by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). I do not know that the comparison between the cost of the consular service of the United States and the cost of our service in England can be of any practical value, but it is well that the facts should be stated. The hon. member for Queen's asserted that the cost of the consular service of the United States in England was \$17,500, and he affirmed that there were no contingencies. I have in my hand the Appropriation Bill presented to the United States Houses for the next year, and in this I find that the salary of the Minister to Great Britain is \$17,500—the amount which the hon. member for Queen's stated was the whole expense of the consular agencies in Great Britain. I find also, that the secretary in that office receives a salary of \$2,625, and the second secretary receives \$2,000. Further I find this :

"For the purpose of enabling the President to provide at the public expense all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several legations in the transaction of their business, and also, for rent, postage, telegrams, furniture, messenger service, clerk-hire, compensation of cavaliers, guards, dragomans, janitors, and porters, and so on, \$105,000."

Then there is a further vote :

"To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular service and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States, to be expended pursuant to the requirements of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, \$80,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary."

In addition to that, we find that there is an allowance made for several consuls. There is one in London who receives \$6,000. There are also consuls at Birmingham and Manchester, who have clerks receiving from \$2,000 down to \$960 each. Then you also find this item :

"Expenses of providing all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, signs, rent, postage, furniture, statistics, newspapers, and so on, \$150,000 in connection with consular agencies."

So, whether the comparison be useful or not, it is certainly only fair that the House should be made aware that, so far from \$17,500 covering the expenses connected with these services on the part of the United States, which Sir Charles Tupper performs on the part of Canada, it does not represent more than one-fifth of the amount they expend.

Mr. CHARLTON. I do not suppose that the members upon this side of the House, or the party in this country which is represented by the members on this side of the House, have any objection to the office of a High Commissioner in London. On the contrary, it is generally agreed that the office is a very useful one. The objection is not to the office itself, or to the fact that the High Commissioner is paid liberally, and we believe it would be better that the \$2,000, which has been referred to, should be incorporated in his salary, and that the country should understand that he receives \$12,000, instead of \$10,000, with a sort of smug-

gling arrangement by which he gets \$2,000, the country being led to believe that he spends that for other purposes than the expenses legitimately chargeable to his salary. But I repeat, that we do not object to the existence of this office; all we demand is that this office should be properly filled, that it should be filled by a gentleman who will honestly discharge the duties of that office, who will confine himself to the discharge of those duties, who will not act, when he is High Commissioner for the Dominion of Canada, representing all the people of Canada, as a mere partisan, coming to this country to defame and decry one-half the population of the country, to vilify and malign certain public men of this country, thereby prostituting and debasing the functions of his office to the purposes of a mere partisan, and a partisan of the most violent and reprehensible character. These are the reasons why we criticize the salary and matters connected with the position of High Commissioner in London. If the office is to continue in existence, we want that position to be filled properly, we want that position to be filled honourably. We do not want a gentleman in the position of High Commissioner in London who can be called upon, when his services are required, as a mere canvassing or electioneering agent, who will leave his duties for which he is paid in London, to come here and bolster up and further the purposes of a political party. These are not the functions of such an officer, and, by discharging his duties in this way, he casts odium upon his office and he leads the people to believe that the office had better be abolished; for the people readily see that Sir Charles Tupper, in coming, as he has upon two different occasions, to this country to engage in the active business of a political campaign, himself a High Commissioner, representing the whole people of Canada, himself occupying a position where, if he is needed at all, ought to be in London to attend to his duties there, leaving those duties, abdicating for the time being his position, coming to Canada and travelling up and down in special trains through this country, and accompanying Ministers of the Crown in making partisan addresses in various parts of the country, stigmatizing the character of public men, denouncing them as traitors, adopting all the disreputable tactics of mere party politicians—the people, I say, readily see that these are not the duties of a High Commissioner, and by allowing the High Commissioner to discharge his duties in this way, you will make his office odious to the people of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Mr. CHARLTON. This gentleman evidently has a good deal of spare time. He can come to Canada in the way I have represented he has come, and travel about with my friend the Minister of Customs, with my friend the Minister of Finance, with my friend the Premier of the country, with my friend the Minister of Justice, he can travel with these gentlemen either in groups, or alone, in a special car up and down this country. In addition to the amount of leisure which he seems to have been able to devote to this business, he evidently had sufficient time to engage in speculation. He is a director in gas companies, he is a director in water companies, he has an interest in the dead meat business. I believe he had something to do with floating a loan upon the English

market for the Caraquet Railway, and the English stockholders will naturally not remember that hon. gentleman with feelings of kindness and gratitude for the part he has played in the placing of these various loans and financial schemes which have resulted, not in advantage to the English public, but in advantage to manipulators and speculators only. I say that we do not ask to have this office abolished, but we ask to have it properly and honestly filled. We say that it is a scandal to have this office filled in the way it has been. We say that it is not a mere partisan office, that it is not an office the holder of which is entitled to act as a mere partisan, and that if he has duties to perform which require that he should remain in England, then he ought to remain there and perform them, but, on the contrary, if he has not duties that require him to remain in England to perform, then that fact is sufficient reason for abolishing the office. The whole question resolves itself simply to this: Has the office of the High Commissioner in London, and the functions pertaining thereto, been filled in a decent, creditable and proper manner? Has the office been filled in such a way as to justify the expectations and satisfy the desires of the people of this country?

Has Sir Charles Tupper acted in deed and truth as High Commissioner of this Dominion? Has he acted in the interest of all parties in this Dominion? Has he acted for the people of Canada as a whole? I say that he has come to this country and defamed and vilified our public men, and hundreds of thousands of the people of this country. I say that is not a part of his functions, and that in doing these things he deserves the rebuke of the people of this country. I say that if this office is to be filled in this way in the future, we had better abolish it. If you are going to use it as a mere annex and appendage to the party in power, for the purpose of increasing the influence they may wield, we had better abolish the office. Why, Sir, the conduct of this hon. gentleman in seeking to obtain the influence of a great corporation in this country, and, failing to obtain that influence, then going to England and seeking to injure the reputation of the public officials of that corporation, seeking to injure the interests of that corporation in making himself an offensive partisan in a quarrel of this kind, in bringing himself into collision with the stockholders and officers of a great corporation in Canada, the motive actuating him being perfectly palpable—because he could not control those people, could not use their influence in the interest of the party that he came here to assist—I say it is a scandal, and we have reason to complain, and we do complain, of the manner in which the High Commissioner of Canada has discharged his functions, and we say the mode in which those functions have been discharged by Sir Charles Tupper deserves the rebuke of this House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. Minister of Finance, in his remarks with regard to the duties of the High Commissioner in England, stated that it was one of his duties to attend to the egg and poultry business, and that he did not consider that a matter that was at all out of the sphere of his duties. We admit that; but I would like to know from the Minister of Finance, if it is a part of Sir Charles' duties to attend to the matter of securing extended markets

for such things as poultry and eggs, why did he and his colleagues consider it necessary to appoint a commissioner in the person of Mr. Sanders, to go to England at an additional expense to this country, and attend to that very particular thing? Now, if Sir Charles is supposed to perform those duties in England, certainly he should be able to do them without putting the country to the expense of sending Mr. Sanders there for the specific purpose of investigating and reporting upon the probabilities of our being able to secure a market in England for eggs and poultry. Now, with regard to the remarks that have fallen from several hon. members who have recently addressed the House, on the whole question of Sir Charles Tupper's tour to Canada during the recent election, and the manner in which he has so evidently shown himself a political partisan, not only in Canada but in England, I say that it is unfair and it is more than the Government should expect, that we should consent to the passage of this item, meekly and quietly, in face of the abuse, and criticism, and the undeserved epithets that he has applied to the Reform party in this country in his recent visit to Canada. Why, Sir, supposing any member of the Opposition went home to England while Sir Charles was privileged to hold the office of High Commissioner in London, I would like to know if we ought not to be in such relationship with the High Commissioner that at least, although differing from him politically, we might feel at liberty to call upon him, to take advantage of his being there as a representative of Canada, and use him for any purpose that might be proper and right and in the line of his functions? Now, I would ask, in presence of the existing strained relations between Sir Charles and the Reform party of this country, how can we expect that any member of that party can call upon Sir Charles in London, or ask him for the slightest assistance? Why, Sir, after his coming across the Atlantic and pouring out the abuse, the criticisms, and the epithets in which he has indulged, on stump after stump, in regard to the Reform party in this country, how can we forget and forgive such language on his part, and how could we call upon him, or take advantage of his being in London, to ask him to perform any service pertaining to his functions as High Commissioner, in the interest of any person that might call upon him, or in the interest of Canadians generally? We could not do that, we are shut out from doing that. If he is in the habit of entertaining his friends to wine dinners and that kind of a thing, of course we would be shut out from participating in any of them. If you were to alter his designation and call him High Tory Commissioner for Canada in London, that would be a proper name. We should then understand the position he fills. He is really the High Tory Commissioner there, and he shows he is High Tory Commissioner when he comes here; for in making statements that cannot possibly be sustained by facts he is unsurpassed, of which we had a sample last year. He outdid all the members of the Tory party. It is not desirable that the High Commissioner should occupy such a position in the eyes of the people of this country, and it is unfair to expect that we, the Opposition in this House, should quietly submit. I should like to see hon. gentlemen opposite submitting to the insults and abuse to which we have been subjected. I hope the last visit of the High Commissioner to

Mr. McMULLEN.

Canada, when he was asked by the First Minister to come here and facilitate the election of his party and the continuance in office of the Tory party, will be the last exhibition of this kind we shall have in this country, whether the Commissioner be a Conservative or a Reformer. I hope the next High Commissioner who is appointed will so carefully keep within the limits and bounds of the duties of his office, that he will not make himself subject to the well deserved criticisms which have been visited on the High Commissioner on this occasion. Well does the High Commissioner deserve from the Opposition the most severe criticism, within the limits of parliamentary procedure, for the manner in which he acted towards the Opposition during his visit, and for the manner in which he acted on all occasions since his appointment to the office. The best course hon. gentlemen can adopt, is to remove the present High Commissioner. We have no objection to fighting that gentleman fairly face to face. We have done so, and are prepared to do so again; but when another High Commissioner is appointed it is to be earnestly hoped he will not disgrace his position, as has been done by the present occupant, by discharging the two-fold duties of High Commissioner in England and high Tory advocate and stumper for the party in Canada. One position is sufficient. I hope that after 1st July, 1893, we will be able to increase the duties so largely that the High Commissioner will no longer be able to visit Canada during two or three months of the year, and the contention be subsequently made in Parliament that the duties of the office did not suffer. Sir Charles Tupper would not dare repeat the unwarranted attack he made on the Reform party during the late election, and we are going to let him know this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen need not begin to indulge in any cat-calls. We are here to stay, and the more hon. gentlemen engage in those amusements the longer will be the session, and there is an hon. gentleman now presiding over the House who will not allow them to be indulged in. We have criticized the actions of Sir Charles Tupper as he has merited, although he has not yet received as much as he should receive. It may be he has been led into a trap by the First Minister, who is a wonderful man for leading people into traps. I have watched the right hon. gentleman's course for 25 or 30 years, and I have found that when a man attains a strong position, he leads him to commit an act which makes him thoroughly unpopular. Whether he has led the High Commissioner into a trap by inviting him on two occasions in Canada to perform the duty he did perform, it is perfectly certain that if the High Commissioner expects to raise himself in the estimation of our people or of the people of England, or to cultivate that cordial feeling that statesmen should cultivate, he cannot do so by adopting the scurrilous course the Commissioner adopted during the late campaign. The High Commissioner should have more respect for the dignified position he holds, than to make himself subject to such criticisms as have been passed upon him. I have made a challenge to hon. members opposite, and I repeat my challenge. I challenge any one to take up the report of the High Commissioner, and

to peruse it from beginning to end, and then say that the duties are such as should attach to the office of High Commissioner, to whom is paid a salary of \$25,000 a year. The report refers to two or three little matters that have been attended to by the High Commissioner, from which this country has derived a little benefit; but taking the whole volume, it is a compilation of information gathered from different sources, from the Trade Returns of England and other sources, that could be easily compiled by the humblest man in his office. That report is nothing in return for a salary of \$25,000. If the United States pays a large amount for salary, and also a large amount for contingencies in connection with their office in London, the country gets something better than we obtain. If we compare the duties of the chief agent of the United States in England and the duties of the High Commissioner for Canada, we find the duties are more onerous, more important and more valuable which the United States have performed for the money they vote for their commissioner than we obtain from the payment of salary and expenses from the High Commissioner. Let us get some duties for the High Commissioner to perform, and in the meantime the Government should withdraw not only the items for the High Commissioner, but the incumbent of the office, and place there someone whose record is unstained by any action, public or personal, one to whom we could look up to with respect, and one to whom the people of England could look up to with respect, and one in regard to whom we can feel we have in England a true and loyal advocate, not in the interests of the Tory party, but in the best interests of the country as a whole, and one who will entertain kindly feelings towards Conservatives and Reformers alike, as anyone occupying the office of High Commissioner should do.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Hon. gentlemen opposite will, perhaps, not feel any great concern respecting the abuse poured out on their political opponents, but this feeling is not shared by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I think they might fairly reprobate it, and they would do so if they were just to their opponents, but we do not expect that. We are not afraid of what may be said about us or of meeting any one in debate on this question: the gentleman himself to whom allusion has been made is a very powerful debater; but I am not aware that the Opposition are afraid to meet him in debate either on the public platform or in the House. This is something which the Ministers ought to consider in reference to the discharge of the duties of that office, and which ought to have some weight with them, if they care anything about utterances made against political opponents. The Minister of Finance has told us that the High Commissioner was very useful during the negotiation of the last loan and that he was able to render that assistance which permitted the Minister to place the loan on terms so favourable as described by him. I have to take exception to his favourable description of the loan, because I think he forgot some terms and conditions peculiar to that loan which made it very acceptable in the minds of the loan-taking public. We are told that one of the principal reasons assigned for the appointment of the High Commissioner was that he would

be in England, ready to lend assistance when visits had to be made to that country with reference to any financial undertaking. The First Minister admitted the other night that it was at the request of the Ministry, Sir Charles Tupper came to this country to take part in the elections, and in making that confession he removed part of the charge as it might be urged against Sir Charles Tupper and took it upon the Government. That was very well, but I pressed another question on the right hon. gentleman, to which I received no answer, and to which I think it would behoove the Minister of Finance to give a little thought and attention. That question was: Whether the present conduct of the High Commissioner in England while there professing to discharge his duties as such, has met with the approval of the Government? I ask the Minister of Finance this question: he can answer it in a word. I would ask him, if he thinks that the credit of Canada and the securities of Canada, if he should now desire to negotiate another loan, were such that he could hope to place the loan upon the London money market on as favourable terms as he did when the last loan was effected? I would like the hon. gentleman to answer that question.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer you when you get through.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would like to get the answer now.

Mr. FOSTER. But it is not right for two members to stand up at one time.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Then I will sit and wait for the answer.

Mr. FOSTER. The question, as I understand it, is whether I think it probable that Canada could float as favourable a loan to-day as she did in 1888? My answer to that question is this: If the condition of the London money market and the money markets of the world were just as favourable now as they were then, I believe the loan could be put upon the British market even more favourably than then. If my hon. friend has read the financial papers he must know that at the present time the state of the market is not nearly so favourable as it was in 1888.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I have read the financial papers and I can say that the Minister has given a very fair answer, but my question was not directed towards ascertaining such an answer as the one given. I recognize that the condition of the money market has much to do with effecting a loan, and the answer I have received from the Minister of Finance is that he believes, all things being equal in the money markets, we could effect a loan to-day on as good terms as in 1888. Very well; the High Commissioner for Canada has been in England, the High Commissioner has been telling the people in England that one-half the people in this country are virtually rebels and annexationists, and I take it that if Canadian security is as good to-day as it was in 1888 the people of England believe the High Commissioner does not tell the truth of the people of Canada. There must be one of the two alternatives: your credit cannot be as good in London to-day as it was then, and Sir Charles Tupper cannot be believed at the same time. I say, if you take the latter alternative, that you have a man as the mouth-piece of the Canadian Government in London, a man representing that Govern-

ment, whose word is contemned, despised and disbelieved by the people of England, and in maintaining him in office you are lowering the dignity of the Dominion of Canada. Canadian credit is injured in England, or else you have a High Commissioner representing this country whose word, not being believed, brings upon this country dishonour.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The High Commissioner has, no doubt, a pretty difficult task in England. He is sent to that country, where free trade is the policy, and he is trying to popularize Canada, that has copied the protective trade policy of our American neighbours. He, no doubt, finds it very difficult to make the people of England believe that the present Administration in Canada, which introduced the American tariff, have any love for British instincts or British customs. Hence, Sir Charles Tupper's duty is a difficult one, and sometimes he has to slap his own Government very severely, as well as he slaps the Opposition. Consequently, he appears to be slapping all round. While speaking about the result of the election, after his return to England, he gave the present Government a direct slap in the face. In trying to popularize the great High Commissioner in England, he indicated that it was not the policy of the Government, but the blunders of the Opposition, which won the election. He held that the policy of the present Government was obnoxious, and that, if the Liberals had gone in for a revenue tariff, the Government would have been beaten, because the policy of the Government was a bad one. After giving this slap in the face to the Government, he tried to make things even by using highly improper language and unfortunate epithets against those politically opposed to him. The fact is, that Sir Charles Tupper tries to defy the Government and the Opposition as well. He appears to be an Ishmaelite: his hand is apparently outstretched against every man's hand except the hand of the High Commissioner. There is one man he appears to love, and there is one man he likes to speak of, and to praise, and to admire, and to adore, and that is Sir Charles Tupper. This is the gentleman who has done grand things for the chicken trade, the poultry trade, the egg trade and the other interests of the Dominion. Why, we could have all that done better by a market gardener, with but a fraction of the expense; everything in connection with that would properly come within the department of a market gardener, and not within the department of the High Commissioner for Canada. The High Commissioner for Canada is above the law, and above the Ministers of the Crown, and above the Governor General even: for they give detailed statements of their expenditure in every department, and he does not. High and exalted as our Governor General is, and representing as he does Her Gracious Majesty the Queen in this country, he gives details of his expenditure in his office: but the High Commissioner does not! The latter gentleman gets \$2,000 in one lump, and the Government are afraid to ask him for vouchers or details lest they should offend this high and mighty Commissioner. Not a single word of explanation will they ask him; and when you ask them how he spends the money they grin and they fawn upon the High Commissioner, but they dare not ask him for a voucher. When it is moved for in the Public Accounts Committee, as it was

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

moved last year, not a single voucher were they able to bring down. He defies the Government: he says virtually: I am your master and you are my servants: I will give you no return. Give me the money that I want, or I will call out my forces and I will condemn all of you: you are obliged to give me what I want or otherwise out you go. That is about the reason why this Government allows the High Commissioner of Canada to disgrace Canadian interests and the Canadian people as he has done during the past year, circulating statements that are false. Canadians who love their country were glad to find, after he had been hurling tirades against the Grand Trunk Railway Company, that when the shareholders met the old board were re-elected by an overwhelming majority, showing that, however great the influence of the High Commissioner may be over the Government of Canada, he has very little influence or power in England, and very few people there believed the statements he made for the purpose of damaging a railway which has done so much to develop this country. I, as a Canadian born, feel keenly on this subject. I feel that the Government, by their fear of the High Commissioner, are laying down a precedent which should never be set under a limited monarchy, in allowing any officer to take the reins in his hands and defy the Government and Parliament. All he wants is the means to enable him to indulge in unlimited extravagance in the old country, to entertain his friends and to abuse those with whom he differs. It is well enough for us to have our different views about the policy that should prevail in the country; but every man, be he a Conservative or a Reformer, should stand up for British ideas and customs, and fair-play is one of them; and any officer who is a servant of the people and who endeavours to traduce the Opposition, is no longer fit to hold any high position or to receive public money from the people of this country.

Mr. MULOCK. I think there are some matters on which we ought to have information from the Government. It is known to all hon. gentlemen that during the visit of the High Commissioner to Canada before the last election, he was reported to have endeavoured to negotiate a treaty or an alliance with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for political purposes. It is said, with what truth I do not know, but on the authority of persons high in office, that he approached the manager of the railway in Canada, and in one way or another endeavoured to secure from him the support of the railway company for his party, no doubt making offers in return. He was here at that time, I understand, at the request of the right hon. First Minister. Therefore, in engaging in the political campaign, he was the duly accredited agent of the party opposite. First, then, I would like to know from the Government whether it was with their authority that he approached the Grand Trunk Railway Company? I do not know what his method was, whether he used persuasion or something stronger, whether there was a system of intimidation or some attempt at corruption; but whatever his method was, I should like to know whether the proposals he made to the Grand Trunk manager on that occasion were made with or without the knowledge of the Administration. Further, I think it is due to the country

that we should know whether or not the attitude of the High Commissioner towards Canada and towards various interests in Canada, since the election, meets with the approbation or the ratification of the Administration. It is one thing, of course, to hold the officer responsible; but since the Administration retain him in office, they are adopting all his doing, and assuming the responsibility for conduct on his part which should properly secure his dismissal. Is it, then, with the sanction of the Administration that he is attacking a great financial corporation to which Canada is deeply indebted for its early development, even if it is not dependent upon it now as it was in years gone by?

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

After Recess.

SUPPLY.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. Since Recess I have no doubt the Government have been able to obtain the information they could not give us a few hours ago. I was pointing out, before the House rose, the responsibility which the Government is bound to take in connection with the action of the High Commissioner. I think there is a principle involved in this matter, which it will not do for the Administration to pass by in silence, for when we come to consider the practical effect of the action of the High Commissioner in regard to the Grand Trunk Railway, we find, according to the published statements, that his utterances have been destructive of the property of a vast number of the capitalists of England. We find that the effects of his onslaught upon that great corporation has been to depreciate the value of the securities of that company in the English market, and to the extent of that depreciation to injure the value of those securities to the holders. Does the Government endorse such action? The High Commissioner is reported to have said that the Grand Trunk Railway management has been characterized by reckless extravagance and by recklessness of management. In making the grave charges he did, he spoke, I presume, in his official capacity as High Commissioner of Canada. It is impossible for any one not thoroughly versed in the details of railway management, not having accurate knowledge of themselves, to make any such statement. If we give credit to the High Commissioner of having spoken only what he knew to be the case, then he has stated a fact which, of course, it is wise the public should know, but if he has merely stated suppositions as facts, he has abused the position he fills. If you admit for a moment that the agent of any country—and we boast of Canada being a great country, and the greater the country the greater the influence of its representative—if we admit for a moment that the agent of a country like Canada can in another country become a stock jobber, can become an instrument to depress or raise securities to his interest and advantage, Canada may as well enter the stock exchange at once and become an ordinary gambler in securities. If you propose, Sir, to allow the influence of the Government to be

used to destroy capital, let it be known to the capitalists of England that if they choose to invest in Canadian securities, they run the risk, unless they place their political influence at the bidding of the Administration, of having their property depreciated. Why, if the people of England do their duty in this regard, they will call upon the Administration of England to insist on the Government of Canada withdrawing this Commissioner from a position which he abuses to the injury of the English people. The Administration of England, to-day, I have no doubt, will, if they have not already done so, discharge their duty towards the people of England, who have invested their millions in Canadian securities, by causing such representations to be made to this Government, that English investors will no longer be exposed to such dangers. The Administration cannot too early make its position known upon this question, for its silence will be taken as an acquiescence in the acts of their agent. Their maintenance of him in office is a ratification of all that he has done; and if the Administration is dumb, there ought still to be voices among their followers, which will make themselves heard in the interests of the country. Or have things come to this pass, that a Cabinet can muzzle a whole party, which boasts of being so independent, patriotic and loyal? Has it come to this, that the great loyal party of Canada is engaged in destroying the wealth of the people of England for the sake of continuing themselves in office? I can understand men, under some circumstances, holding to party loyalty, but I am unable to understand how, on an occasion like this, the whole party can be muzzled under the leadership of the Minister of Public Works, who, I presume, is leading the House to-night. It is due to the people of Canada that the action of our High Commissioner should be repudiated, or if it is not, that fact should be made known. So long as this cowardly conduct on the part of the Government continues, we can assume but one conclusion, and that is, that the Government, whilst too cowardly to assume the responsibility for what has taken place, desire to profit by it, and must be held responsible. I am not in favour of great corporations, which come to Parliament for powers, using those powers for political purposes. In my judgment, it is equally wrong and equally unfortunate whether it be the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway that plunges itself into the vortex of party politics in Canada. In either case, they are going out of their true course; but I do congratulate Canada that it does not happen at this moment that the two great corporations are united in raids on the public treasury. The High Commissioner gave a parting shot, I suppose, a parting indication of the reign of debauchery he would inaugurate, were he placed in control of the Treasury benches, when he said to the Maritime Provinces, just after the 5th of March last: "The people of Ontario and Quebec are evenly divided, the Maritime Provinces hold the balance of power, and now is your opportunity to knock at the Treasury benches." That was the doctrine enunciated by the agent general of the Administration; and having uttered these words, he goes off to England, to attack English interests in the way I have indicated.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton.) Where did he make that statement?

Mr. MULOCK. I will read it for you before the evening is closed, but I have not got it by me just now.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). Better send for it.

Mr. MULOCK. I am glad these hon. gentlemen have at last found their tongues, and I will repeat later on the exact words the High Commissioner uttered. This is the first time we have heard from them, and even now I am glad to see that an hon. gentleman so retiring as the hon. member for Cape Breton has sufficient courage to admit that the utterances in question are unworthy of the gentleman to whom he owes his seat in this House.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Cape Breton). He never said it.

Mr. MULOCK. We will see whether he said it or not. I was not present, but I cut the extract out of a good Tory paper, if I recollect aright, and I shall endeavour to place it within the reach of the House at the earliest possible opportunity.

An hon. MEMBER. You cannot do it.

Mr. MULOCK. Who says I cannot do it? The man who says that shall have an opportunity of making that statement good when I present my proof. I do not think there is any man except my hon. friend from Cape Breton, who would have the hardihood to assert that the High Commissioner did not practically make that statement. At all events, it was so stated in the press; and whether or not, let me ask, was the action of the High Commissioner, in his negotiation with Mr. Seargeant, of the Grand Trunk, such as to indicate that he was incapable of making such a proposition? Did he not propose to the Grand Trunk that they should throw in their allegiance with the Administration and that they would be duly rewarded? When did he ever show delicacy in disposing of public money for political gain? We cannot forget what happened in 1872; we cannot forget what the High Commissioner's role has been since he has been in public life, either in the old Province of Nova Scotia, or in the Council of the Dominion Parliament. It would be against his whole record if he did not indulge in the doctrine I have referred to. But, Mr. Speaker, we can take care of his utterances in Canada; we know the High Commissioner in Canada; he is known here, and, therefore, to the extent he is known he is comparatively powerless. It is not so in England. His office clothes him with an authority which gives a weight to his words which perhaps they would otherwise not enjoy, and, therefore, the Administration is the responsible party on this occasion, and it is due to the people of the country that the true position of the Administration on this question shall be made known. There is only one way in which the Government can properly do its duty; there is only one way in which the Government can repudiate their responsibility and again restore Canada to her proper position, and that way is at the earliest possible moment to recall from this position of power and responsibility an agent who so far mistakes his true position as has the High Commissioner. That is the only compensation which can be made to Canada, and unless that compensation is made the Government is responsible for what has taken place. I venture to say that the Government has taken upon itself a responsibility which,

Mr. MULOCK.

in the near future, they will wish they never had assumed. Under these circumstances, I feel, whatever others may feel, that whilst it may be said we are voting money for an office, I cannot ignore the fact that this is money for an individual as well, and although the item itself is one of comparative insignificance the occasion is one which should not be passed by in silence by those who do their duty to their country. I rejoice, therefore, to see that the question is receiving some attention from those who look after the interests of the country, even though the Government appear desirous to remain silent upon it.

Mr. McMULLEN. This being the last item under the head of contingencies, it is no use calling "carried," because it will take a considerable time to speak on other items connected with this vote before they pass. I am glad to see the Minister of Customs in his seat, because it will be my duty to put a few questions to him before I am finished. Now, with regard to the attitude which the High Commissioner has assumed with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. I must say that, in my humble opinion, it is exceedingly unfortunate that any such differences should have arisen. It is quite clear from what has been published in the press that after the High Commissioner came to Canada he sought an interview with the general manager of the Grand Trunk, and in order to hold that interview he went to the general offices of the Grand Trunk Railway in Montreal. After the interview, possibly because the Grand Trunk would not come down to the terms stipulated by him, all these differences have come before the public in the press, and have been published by Sir Henry Tyler, as head of the Grand Trunk Railway, on one side, and by Sir Charles Tupper, our High Commissioner, on the other. It is exceedingly unfortunate that this state of things should have arisen, because it is not in the interests of the country that large corporations of that kind should be approached by a man who occupies the position either of a High Commissioner or of a Minister of the Crown in the way in which Sir Charles approached the Grand Trunk. If the Government are enabled by the High Commissioner, or by any other person who chooses to cast in his lot with them as political agent or political aid, to terrorize into obedience the public corporations of this country to support the Government, or else to understand they will be visited by that Government with punishment if they do not, it is, in my opinion, an exceedingly improper and imprudent example to inaugurate in this country. I maintain that it was against the interest of the country for the High Commissioner to make that attempt on the Grand Trunk. Suppose the High Commissioner, on the occasion of his next visit to this country in the interest of the Tory party, should decide to approach the banks of this Dominion and ask them to cast in their lot with the Conservative party or else to be visited with punishment in some direction or other, how disastrous would be the result. This is an unwise and imprudent policy, and it would not be right if an attempt of this kind should be passed over without thorough and searching criticism. I am glad to be able to say that the Grand Trunk stockholders in England do not appear to have been very seriously swayed by the action of Sir Charles Tupper, for in spite of his denunciations they gener-

ously supported and re-elected the old board of directors of the Grand Trunk Railway. It is our right and our duty to condemn in the strongest language we can use such conduct on the part of a High Commissioner, no matter to what party he belongs. We should endeavour to show the great public corporations of this country, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway and others, that they are free to discharge their duties and that they cannot be terrorized into obedience by any Government, be it Grit or Tory. The attempt of the High Commissioner to inaugurate a system of this kind was decidedly wrong, and he deserves all the chastisement he has received from this side of the House for his conduct on that occasion. I hold that we are deeply indebted to the Grand Trunk Company, being the pioneer railway of this country, for what they have done to build up the country; we are deeply indebted to those people in England who invested something like 170 millions of money in that institution to give it a standing, and make it capable of rendering the efficient service that we have enjoyed under its operations; and I say that we have no right to permit any effort to be made to trample upon its rights and privileges. Why, Mr. Chairman, had the previous Government who occupied the Treasury benches of this country been permitted to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway, that railway would have been owned largely by this Dominion, it would have been, to some extent at least, the property of this Dominion. But the hon. gentlemen opposite placed the Canadian Pacific Railway in such a position that it was completed by a corporation, and that corporation now virtually owns the country. It is quite clear from their actions during the last election that the Canadian Pacific Railway and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches are very closely connected, and very deeply interested in one thing, and that is, that the present party should occupy power in this country, and hold their present position in the interest of that particular company. Now, I have nothing to say against the Canadian Pacific Railway. They deserve all credit for the enormous improvements they have made, and the manner in which they have completed their line. I wish them every success, and I am glad to see them occupy the very distinguished position they hold on this continent as one of the leading railway systems. At the same time we want them distinctly to understand that no railway company is to be placed in such a position that they can dictate to the people's representatives, or dictate to this House; and no railway company ought to be placed in such a position that they are subject to be dictated to by the Government that are in power for the time being, no matter of what political complexion they may be. I say that the course Sir Charles Tupper took with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway was not at all the course he should have taken as a representative of this country in England. It was derogatory to himself, it was not creditable to him as the representative of the people, and it is a slur upon the people and upon himself that he should have descended to the means that he used towards that company to try to force them to support the Tory party in this country during the last general election. I hope that it will not be repeated. I earnestly hope that he, at least, will not be permitted to repeat it; and

I am quite sure that should it ever fall to the lot of the party on this side of the House to have to send a gentleman to England as Canada's representative, he never will be allowed to indulge in the threats and the insinuations with regard to any railway company, in which Sir Charles Tupper has indulged with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway. I did not wish to allow this opportunity to pass without making these few remarks with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway; and after other members have made the remarks that they desire to make in addition to what has already been said, I may have a few questions to put to the Minister of Finance and some others to the Minister of Customs, because I find there are a great many items that can well be cut down, and should be cut down. I congratulate the Minister of Finance on making an effort to put in the pruning knife, and I am glad to see that he has effected some reform, though I am sorry to see he has not used the pruning knife more frequently. We are glad to see him going in the right direction. At the same time I think it is our duty, when passing these items in connection with contingencies, to point out where we consider the pruning knife might be used more than it has been in the past. I quite understand how hard it is, particularly in the case of those who have been drawing Dominion pay for so many years, to withdraw from them the advantages they have been deriving for years past; but once the knife is put in and the pruning commences, I contend that it ought to be continued. I believe that is the only means by which we can bring the expenditure of this country within the limit of the means of the people of this Dominion—by persistently cutting down the expenses in all directions. We can well afford to do it. We have been on the highway of extravagance for the last 12 years. Year after year increased expenditures appear in the contingencies; item after item has been added to the annual expenditure. Why, Sir, we have had hundreds of officials added to the list of those who have been drawing extra allowances, year after year. Last year some 480 or 500 civil servants drew extra allowances for extra work. This system was only initiated a few years ago. The system of drawing extra allowances has only had four or five years of a start, and if we keep it up for a few years more we will have every civil servant in Ottawa drawing extra allowance. There are several items that should be subjected to the operations of the pruning knife, and before they are finally passed I wish to point out those items which, in my opinion, should be curtailed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There are some other points with regard to the expenditure which I wish to refer to briefly. I am glad to see the Secretary of State in his place, because there is a matter to which I wish to call his attention; it was referred to in the Committee of Supply during the last session. He will remember that his attention was called to the fact that a large sum of money was paid for advertising the sale of the Statutes, and I think he promised on that occasion that he would look into this matter and put a stop to it. Until then the sale of the Statutes had been advertised almost wholly in the city of Hull and in the city of Ottawa, and in one or two places in Quebec. That would indicate that the Secretary of State believes

that it is not necessary that the people resident in other portions of the Dominion should be aware that the Statutes are for sale, as he confined his advertising to those particular localities. This year I see that he has expended the sum of \$660.20 in advertising the sale of the Statutes, and he has confined his advertising to about the same papers that he confined it to in the previous year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is an old habit.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. An old habit ought to be eradicated when it is a bad habit. Now, the advertising is confined on this occasion to the city of Hull, and one or two papers in Montreal that I never heard of—at least, they are not leading papers at all—and some papers in Ottawa that I have not heard of. Of course we have heard of the *Citizen*, and there is the *Journal*. Then I see the *Naturalist*—I never heard of the *Naturalist* published in the city of Ottawa. It must be a new paper altogether. Then there is the *Quebec Canadian*, the *St. Jérôme Nord*, the *Three Rivers Journal*. I think the Secretary of State made a promise with regard to this matter last session, and I would like to have some explanation from him.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been advertized in the *Empire* for six or eight months.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Don't you pay the *Empire* anything?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; they advertize free.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Now, cannot the hon. gentleman get the same terms from these other papers? If he can, I will say that he is discharging his duty well. But I really think some explanation ought to be given regarding this expenditure.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is a matter of advertising. There are very few papers in which the advertisement does not appear; it is not a very large amount, and it goes to the ordinary accounts for advertising, the amount of which is distributed among the several departments. The notice has been advertized in all of the papers, some advertisements being free and some paid for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then there must be something wrong in the Auditor General's Report. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 65-D he will find this expenditure is given in detail. The advertisement only appeared in certain newspapers. I never saw it in any newspaper, and I very much doubt if the *Empire* would insert it for nothing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman does not read the newspapers in which our advertisements are published.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it necessary that the work should be done at all? I do not think it is.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It has been done.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This is no justification. The hon. gentleman promised last session to remedy the matter. If the Secretary of State refuses to give any information, I will proceed to speak on another point.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have given the explanation. The accounts were paid because the advertisements were given out and were published. I cannot give any other explanation. The advertisements were sent out, were published, and were paid for.

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Then the hon. gentleman exercises no judgment in giving out advertisements, according to his statement. The hon. gentleman says they were paid for because they were given out, not because they were necessary. There is another matter to which I desire to call attention, namely, the large amount paid annually for newspaper subscriptions for the several departments. I do not know why those papers are taken. There must be a large reading room in every department, and the clerks in the offices cannot be doing anything except reading newspapers, and this may possibly account for the extra clerks required each year. No less than \$10,533.50 were paid for newspaper subscriptions for the departments last year, as follows:—Governor General's Office, \$474.94; Privy Council, \$529.15; Justice Department, \$595.46; Militia Department, \$816.03; Secretary of State's Department, \$745.11; Interior, \$724.07; Indian Affairs, \$269.15; Audit Office, \$8; Finance Department, \$580.37; Inland Revenue, \$562.76; Customs, \$483.15; Post Office, \$735.96; Agriculture Department, \$1,486.72; Marine Department, \$376.70; Fisheries Department, \$175.17; Public Works, \$1,073.75; Railways and Canals, \$897.90. We have in connection with the Senate and House of Commons a reading room to which all the newspapers are sent and kept on file. It would serve the public interest very much better if, instead of there being a reading room for each Department, the clerks in the Departments were compelled to take a little exercise after performing their work and come to the reading rooms here. I do not think this country should pay them large salaries and at the same time furnish them with material which would induce them to neglect the work they are paid to perform. This suggestion was made last year, and, as it is a good one, it should be carried out. No doubt a large number of these newspapers would follow the course stated to have been followed by the *Empire* in reference to advertisements, for the Tory newspapers obtain not only \$10,000 a year for newspaper subscriptions but also bonuses from other sources. Last year they received \$133,775 for printing. The Secretary of State told us the other day that all the printing was being done by the Printing Bureau. If so, how does it come about that the Auditor General states in his report, and I refer the Secretary of State to page 131—A, that up to the end of the last fiscal year \$135,775 was paid for printing outside the Bureau. Yet the Secretary of State declared only last week in this House that all the printing was done at the Printing Bureau. Surely he must have known that such was not the case. When a Minister makes a statement for the information of the House and the country, he should be in possession of all the information that the public documents give.

Mr. FOSTER. Those are items for a year ago.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That was what I was talking about at the time. No doubt when we look at the next report of the Auditor General we will find a similar statement, because I called the Minister of Finance's attention to the fact that every year, during the last eight or nine years to my knowledge, the amount expended under this head reached from \$150,000 to \$200,000 every year. Then there is the advertising given to newspapers supporting the

Government, because I want to be understood by the House, it is already understood by the country, that an advertisement is rarely found in any newspaper that does not support the Government. The supporters of the Government are supported by the Government. The clerks in the Departments do not read the Grit papers. If they did so, they would be disgusted with the management of the country's affairs and even civil servants would help to turn out the men who now occupy the Treasury benches. But they do not get the requisite information, for the Government take care to provide only good Tory reading in the Departments, and it is because they are educated to support the Government that so many of them do so. The expenditure for advertising appears to have been \$46,701. Newspapers which have received these vast sums for subscriptions, printing and advertisements, might well afford to send to each Department of the Civil Service copies of their papers free. It is the common thing for newspaper proprietors to send copies of their papers to advertisers, and to be liberal with such, in order to see that advertisements were inserted in proper places and the number of times ordered. The Secretary of State should take this into consideration and close the reading rooms in the different Departments, and benefit the health of the clerks by asking them to devote their whole attention to the public service during the hours from nine till four, which are not very long hours, and they do not require the eight and nine hour movement here, and after the closing of the Departments come to the House of Commons reading room and peruse the newspapers. If they did so, they would obtain an intelligent view of public affairs, because the papers are not confined to Conservative but include Reform papers, and the Minister would thereby not only improve the physical health of the clerks but their intelligence also, and the public service generally would be benefited.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to ask the Secretary of State—

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I would like to know if the Government intend to take action in this matter in reference to what I have just spoken. It was before the House last session and they promised to make some improvement.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have taken a note of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and I will answer him after my friend from Wellington (Mr. McMullen) has spoken.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there is an item of \$4,000 here for the Civil Service Examining Board, and I would like to know if there is any necessity for continuing the services of that board. How many civil servants have we now in the Dominion who are without office, but who have passed the examination and are eligible for an engagement?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I must answer my hon. friend as I answered him last year. There are I believe over 3,000 in the position he has indicated, but when we remember that the expense of these examinations is in a large proportion covered by the fees imposed on the applicants I do not think it is a bad expenditure of \$2,000 to have an examination made on subjects which are worthy of study by not only those who intend to enter the Civil Service, but by those who may enter into banks and other positions in life. I

maintain that the small sum which comes from the public treasury for this purpose is insignificant in comparison with the good which is done the young men of the country by a system of examination which causes these young men to devote themselves to the higher classes of education, as they are required to do for the examination.

Mr. McMULLEN. I may state in reply to the hon. Minister that we have institutions of all kinds in the country which subject the young men to a more searching examination than is required by the Civil Service Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Question.

Mr. McMULLEN. When we have 3,000 or 4,000 young men eligible for admission to the Civil Service I think we might rest for a year or two without continuing this expenditure of \$4,000 for Civil Service examinations. I believe that this system spoils the young men rather than improves them, for the reason that when they pass this examination they devote all their time to exercising influence in all directions to try and secure a Government position.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They do not need an examination for the purpose of using such influence.

Mr. McMULLEN. Suppose they do not; yet, when they pass the examination, it is a step further in the direction of trying to secure a position. They bring influence of all kinds to bear upon members who are supposed to be able to get them into the service, and, as a result, we have to-day more clerks in the Departments in Ottawa than are absolutely necessary to carry on the business. This is because the claims of the young men who have passed the examination are pressed upon the heads of the Departments and are backed up by such influences that they cannot be refused. As a consequence, we have men engaged in the Departments and drawing salaries from the country, who are utterly worthless. I maintain that these examinations should be discontinued for a year or two. In this connection, I might point out that Mr. LeSueur, who was superannuated some fourteen years ago, and who draws superannuation allowance of about \$1,100, is paid \$400 a year as a Civil Service examiner, and \$700 as secretary to the examining board, making about \$2,200 in all, including his superannuation. This, in my opinion, proves that this civil servant was superannuated before his services should have been dispensed with, and that he was superannuated for some cause other than ill-health, because he seems to be able to discharge these other duties fourteen years after he retired from the service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I find from the Auditor General's Report that a little over \$2,000 only is paid out of the public treasury for the Civil Service Board of Examiners. It is intended, in future, to increase in a certain measure the fees to be paid by candidates, so as to meet the whole expense of the board. I understand that it is not well to leave even such a small amount to the charge of the public treasury as is now asked for when such a large number of eligible candidates are on the list, and I shall, therefore, propose to increase the revenue from this source. The fees collected from the applicants amount to over \$1,800 now; this year they will amount to \$2,000, and I hope that next year the fees will

meet the entire expenditure of the board of examiners. In reference to the statements made by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville), I may say that nobody more than himself should have known that the charges he has made against the department are not altogether warranted. The expenditure for printing which has been quoted by my hon. friend as being a contradiction of the statement I made the other day is not justified by the figures. Almost the entire expenditure is not for ordinary printing, but for printing done under contract for the Intercolonial Railway, by the Burland Lithographic Company for the Finance Department, and a class of work which cannot be done at Ottawa. It is put under the head of "printing" although it is not actually printing. Three-fourths, if not four-fifths, of that amount is for printing which could not have been done in the Government Bureau, and for lithographing which must be done outside. Nobody knows that better than my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Somerville).

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am glad to get any information from the Secretary of State, but the information he gives me is not in accord with my information in regard to this matter. I am perfectly confident that when we established this Printing Bureau at an enormous expense to the country, the Opposition, at all events, supposed that it was established for the purpose of doing all the printing required by the Government. The Intercolonial Railway is part of the machinery of the Government of this country, and there is no reason why the printing required by it should not be done at Ottawa. That railway uses blank forms of all kinds and these blank forms can be stereotyped and printed here at a cheaper rate than is now paid for this work which is given out to the favourites of the Government in Halifax, St. John, Quebec and other cities, where the newspapers have enormous accounts against the Government, in some cases amounting to \$8,000 and \$10,000 for one single establishment. There was no use in establishing the Printing Bureau at all if the work on which such large profits are to be made was to be given out to these private contractors, the patronage of which enables the Government, to the detriment of the public interest, to help those who support them. Now, the hon. Secretary of State says a large proportion of this work is lithographic work. It was stated to me as a fact, and I believe it to be a fact, that the Post Office Department at the present time are using forms for post office orders which were got from the Burland Lithograph Company as photo-lithographs, when they are really letter-press printing done in the city of Montreal, but paid for as lithographic work; and this same work could be done at the Bureau at a much lower cost. If this is the way the hon. Secretary of State and his officers are humbugged by this company, it is time he and the country knew it. The blue-book itself shows that a very small portion of the total amount expended for printing was for lithographic work at all. In fact, there is not a word about lithographic work. Not a solitary item in the amount I gave was paid for lithographing—not one dollar, not fifty cents; let the hon. Minister look at the book and see for himself; and yet he gets up and tells the House and the country that a large portion of this amount is for lithographic work. I think he ought to be more particular when he makes these statements.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not right to use big words, and words that might be offensive, in a discussion of this kind. But I must say that my hon. friend appears to be very well informed about the internal management of the Printing Bureau. He must have very good friends there. He is nearly as well informed as myself.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Better.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No, because I mentioned, and probably the hon. gentleman has heard of it, that the work of which he spoke and which used to be given to the Burland Company has been taken away from it, because I ascertained that the Printing Bureau could do the work by a new process and I ordered it to be done there. My hon. friend has probably heard that these post office forms and some of the Inland Revenue forms can be printed at the Printing Bureau; this was done two or three months ago; and my hon. friend has only taken advantage of what I had ordered, and what is being done now. Now, my hon. friend has said that there is not a dollar of lithography charged in this printing account. If my hon. friend will look at page A—29, he will find that there is one item of \$43,000 charged for lithographing for the Finance Department done by the British American Bank Note Company. At page A—28 there is \$10,000 paid to the Halifax *Herald* for railway printing which the manager of the railway considered could be done more conveniently and more cheaply there than at the Printing Bureau here. The same thing applies to the payment of \$10,000 to the Moncton *Times*. Then, there is another item of \$19,000 paid to the Burland Lithographic Company, and there is an item of \$5,000 paid to the Montreal *Gazette* for work on account of the Geological Survey. So that as I said, more than three-fourths, if not four-fifths, is for work which could not be done by the Printing Bureau here. I may say to my hon. friend that I have every year taken notice of his warnings, and I will thank him for every item he sees on which he can give me his friendly advice, which I shall be glad to follow.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend made a statement a little while ago which certainly surprised me, coming as it did from an hon. gentleman so well informed, especially in printing matters. He stated that in this sum of \$135,775 not one dollar had been paid for lithographic work. Now, if my hon. friend will turn to B—23, he will find the items which make up the sum of \$43,101 charged to charges of management, under the head of printing notes. Of this amount not one dollar is for printing, but all is for lithographing. This shows the House, and those who read these criticisms, the methods adopted by hon. gentlemen opposite in the House, and if such methods are adopted here, what must be the methods used outside on the platform, where no such rein is held over their criticisms.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am willing to acknowledge that I made an error; but we had the hon. Secretary of State the other night declaring that all the work was done at the Printing Bureau. When I make an error I am willing to make correction of it; but hon. gentlemen opposite do not get up and admit that they made an error. The hon. Secretary of State does not admit that he made an error the other night.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I stated that the printing was done outside for some good reason. I never stated that railway tickets, and railway advertisements, and railway time tables were printed at the Printing Bureau; because the superintendent of railways informed me that this could not be done here with equal economy or equal advantage to the good management of the railways. I hope, however, we will be able in the future to do it as we have succeeded to do with the stationery for railways. The printing item for railways alone is \$47,000; agriculture comes in for \$16,000, a great part of which is for pamphlets published for the benefit of immigration in England. We have \$43,000, \$47,000, \$16,000, \$10,000, out of \$133,000, which are certainly warranted by the declaration I made the other day, that all the ordinary printing was done at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I am not at all satisfied that the hon. Minister has apologized as handsomely for his mistake as I did for the mistake I made. Furthermore, he said I obtained my information from the Printing Bureau, and know as much as he does about the management through some one employed in that department. I wish to disabuse his mind of that impression. I obtained no information from anyone in the Bureau, so that he need not mete out condign punishment to any one he may happen to suspect.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not object.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Nobody in the Bureau gave me information. I furthermore tell the hon. gentleman I am glad to know he has discovered that this Lithographic Company has been imposing on him, and is prepared to have his letter press done in the Bureau, where it ought to have been done long ago. I represented to him that he was paying, as lithographic matter, for what was not lithographed at all. With regard to the statement that a very large amount of money is squandered on outside work which ought to have been done in the Bureau, I still stick to my text. Anyone who examines the pages A—28, 29, 30 and 31 of the Auditor General's Report, where a detailed statement is given of the papers to which money has been paid, will see at once that the accusation I made of money being squandered for the purpose of supporting the party press is well founded. That system should not be allowed to continue. But to come back to the original question, I would like to know when the Secretary of State is going to do away with these reading rooms in the Departments?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The Minister of Finance may give some information on that subject, but my hon. friend knows that if this is a sin, it is not a sin of recent date. I think these reading rooms existed before this Administration came into power.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. That is no excuse for you.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. And they may have existed on a larger scale than they do now. My hon. friend must not flatter himself that the improvement was made in the Printing Department at his suggestion; the reform was made before I was given notice of it by him. My hon. friend says he does not take any information from the Printing Bureau. I must say I do not object to his getting information there as much as he likes. I invite

every hon. member to visit the Bureau, and I am only sorry that more hon. members do not visit it to see the manner in which it is conducted, for I am sure that after their examination they would make no complaint on this score. My hon. friend, who is a practical printer, may find fault with my political management, but I have confidence he cannot find fault with the way the Bureau is conducted. The hon. gentleman or one of his colleagues stated that Mr. LeSueur should not have been superannuated, but I did not superannuate him. He was superannuated long ago, I think in 1877, by the friends of the hon. gentleman. If he was superannuated too young, it is not the fault of this Administration; and the duties he has performed as one of the Civil Service Board of Examiners are certainly duties for which credit should be given him.

Mr. MULOCK. A few moments ago when I intimated that the High Commissioner had told the people of the Maritime Provinces, after the general elections, that their opportunity had arrived, that statement seemed to be doubted.

Mr. McDUGALL (Cape Breton). Read the words.

Mr. MULOCK. I spoke from recollection, having in my mind simply what I read in the *Empire* at the time. I have since endeavoured to find in the file of the *Empire* what the exact words were, but some friend of the Government has so fallen in love with them that the paragraph has been cut out. I have referred, however, to an authority which ought to be undoubted since it has received over \$8,000, for Government printing during the past year, the *Halifax Herald*. In its issue of March 11 appears a report of Sir Charles Tupper's speech at Halifax, which no doubt will be accepted as authentic. In large black letter type at the head, are the points intended to strike the attention of the people; and after exposing the dastardly conduct of the Grand Trunk Railway people in springing at the throats of the Government and joining with the enemies of Canada, the head note proceeds to say: "Thanks to the votes of the people of the Maritime Provinces Sir John can now send commissioners to Washington." I believe, that was done—"and Mr. Blaine will gladly negotiate a fair and just treaty of reciprocity and a settlement of all irritating questions." And then the newspaper proceeds to give prominence to the point in the address, which concerns the subject under discussion: "The great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces." I have not gone through this four column speech to find out what the great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces is; I have, at all events, struck upon that portion which formed the foundation of the *Empire's* report. My recollection of the *Empire's* version was: "Now is the opportunity of the Maritime Provinces to obtain justice."

Mr. McDUGALL (Cape Breton). Those are the words you used.

Mr. MULOCK. Surely you are not going to repudiate the authority of the *Halifax Herald*. The report continues:

"You see to-day, as the result of this great and vital contest, Ontario and Quebec pretty nearly balanced, the one party with the other, and you find the Maritime Provinces, Eastern and Western, the smaller outlying Provinces, the North-West and Manitoba, smaller than ours, holding the balance of power. These small Provinces are in a position to claim the very highest and first con-

sideration at the hands of the Government for the noble manner in which they have sustained the institutions of our country."

Will the hon. gentleman say what is meant by these significant words? We have not yet got the supplementary estimates; we have not yet the estimates for railways; we have not yet seen what appropriations are made for public works, this Parliament has not yet run its course. But we see what has been done in preceding Parliaments, and we know as well as if the demands had come down what is going to happen. We know perfectly well it means a raid on the treasury. We know that is what Sir Charles Tupper's words mean if they mean anything.

Mr. FOSTER. A free translation.

Mr. MULOCK. If there is any other translation, I should like to hear the Minister of Finance tell us what it is.

Mr. McDUGALL (Cape Breton). These are the words: "The Maritime Provinces hold the balance of power, and now is the time to knock at the door of the Dominion Treasurer."

Mr. MULOCK. Yes, and I repeat the words. Those are significant of the views of the High Commissioner. If those words are not correct, will the hon. gentleman tell us what he did mean?

Mr. FOSTER. Put your own interpretation on them.

Mr. MULOCK. What is the meaning of the "great opportunity of the Maritime Provinces?"

Mr. FOSTER. Sir Charles Tupper did not say that.

Mr. MULOCK. The newspapers said that. Tell us what it means?

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Will the Minister of Finance make an explanation?

Mr. FOSTER. Will this explanation suit the hon. gentleman? We went over the whole question Friday night, and it was up for discussion quite a time. I made my statement then. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will take that as it is in *Hansard*, so that I need not take up the time of the House on it.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) There was no discussion, and the discussion was reserved especially for today.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), with his usual courtesy, states that there was no discussion on the question of newspaper patronage. If my hon. friend asks the member for Yarmouth, or the member for Ottawa, he will find to the contrary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Minister of Finance can easily say whether he intends to remove the evil or not.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, as I stated on Friday. If the hon. gentleman will take the trouble to look at the amount expended under this head for the last financial year, and this year, he will find we have effected a large saving in most of the departments. In the Governor General's department, where the expenditure was \$800 or \$900 a few years ago, it was brought down last year to about \$500. A similar saving was effected in some other departments, resulting from an attempt to cut down the large amounts that had been previously paid. However,

Mr. MULOCK.

the Government is giving attention to the matter at the present time, and an arrangement has been made by which it will be seen, when the accounts for next year are brought down, that a very large saving will be effected in this item. It is the intention of the Government to bring the expenditure down to a fairly reasonable basis, and to an amount with which I do not suppose hon. gentlemen opposite can find fault.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I do not like the Minister of Finance to repeat his answer twice, and I think he can properly claim to be relieved in that particular; but neither on Friday nor to-night has he answered the plain question asked, whether he endorses the action and proceedings of Sir Charles Tupper, High Commissioner in London, in the newspaper controversy he is carrying on?

Mr. FOSTER. What proceedings?

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Writing to the newspapers, attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, and denouncing half of our people as ruined gamblers, proceedings which tend to destroy credit—that is if his word is believed in that line.

Mr. FOSTER. I have an indistinct recollection that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) raised this question, but the very eloquent and impressive speech of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) drove it entirely from my mind, especially as I am unaccustomed to receiving compliments at his hand. I remember indistinctly one question, as to whether or not the Government stood by Sir Charles Tupper in his attempt to bring the Grand Trunk into line during the last election, his attempt, in other words, to bulldoze the Grand Trunk. The hon. gentleman answered his own question, or rather put his own question out of court, because he referred to it as a matter of report, and the time of the House need not be taken up with such reports as that. If the hon. gentleman had continued his search he would have found another report, quite as well founded, the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper, in which he distinctly affirmed that he made no such advances or proposals to the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) The Minister of Finance, with that courtesy which has distinguished him on more than one occasion, ventured to impute to-night that I had not stated the truth—that is what his insulting remark amounted to—when I stated there had not been any discussion on the newspaper question on Friday evening. I knew what I was talking about. I observe that the discussion does not take one column of *Hansard*. A few remarks were made by the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint), stating that he was a new member of the House and asking for some information. The Minister of Finance made a speech not lasting two minutes, in which he said—and it does not cover twenty lines—he hoped some reduction would be made. I made a remark about the Department of Agriculture having spent \$1,300 a year, and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) said a word or two. No discussion took place, no explanations were given. It was intimated on that occasion, and the Minister of Finance knows it was intimated, that explanations would be asked about all the departments; and when he threw his insult across the floor he was stating what he ought to have

known was not correct. The statement I made, that there had been no discussion, was literally true. There had only been a little desultory conversation. The hon. gentleman had better be a little more careful in his statements. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville) for example, and some other members were not present when the conversation occurred on Friday night, and they appeared to be under the impression that the usual yearly discussion with respect to the newspapers taken by the different departments, ranging in each case from \$300 to \$1,300 a year, had taken place. There was not that discussion. It was understood by myself and my friends that the discussion was left open and would be renewed to-night, and therefore the hon. gentleman was wrong in his denial of my statement, and I was perfectly correct. There was not a discussion on Friday night covering more than a column of the *Hansard*. The hon. gentleman can call it a discussion; but it was not that discussion which always occurs over that expenditure each year. I suppose the hon. gentleman will not call a question and a reply a discussion. The understanding arrived at on both sides was that all these matters should be open for discussion to-night, and the item of payments to newspapers was supposed to be one.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot help but return the kindness of the hon. gentleman, and thank him for the very courteous remarks addressed to me. I still think I am correct in what I said. I stated there had been a discussion. I do not know what standard the hon. gentleman has as to what constitutes a discussion, and I will leave that matter with the House. At least four, probably five or six members spoke. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) spoke and addressed some question to me. The hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Flint) also spoke and addressed some questions to me, and other members spoke. Now my hon. friend complains because my remarks did not fill more than twenty lines of *Hansard*. That is not a demerit. There may be a contrast between the hon. gentleman and myself in this particular, and it may be possible for me to put into twenty lines quite as much of the real gist of a matter as my hon. friend does in forty lines.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. A short time ago the Minister of Finance assured the Committee that the Government had made quite a reduction in the expenditure for newspapers in the Departments for the last year. The hon. gentleman said that if I would examine the Auditor General's Report for the past year and compare it with the present year I would find a considerable reduction. I have turned up the report for 1889. It shows an expenditure under this head of \$10,099.99, while for this year, 1890, the expenditure was \$10,533.58. The Finance Minister is progressing the wrong way, and if apologies are in order the Minister of Finance should now get up in his place and declare that he made a mistake, as I acknowledged I made a mistake a little while ago, unwittingly. I want him to do the same. Here are the sums, I can refer to the page. If he will look at page 64—C of the Auditor General's Report for 1889, he will find that \$10,099.99 was the amount paid for subscriptions to newspapers in the departments. If he will look at page 74—B of the last Auditor General's Report, he will find that last year \$10,533.58 were

paid. Now, if that is the way he is improving, what is the Government going to come to? I think that when he seeks to give this House information, he ought to be a little more accurate, he ought to examine the records. The Government were delighted a little while ago when they caught me napping, and for once, they thought they had made a point. Now, the Minister of Finance is much larger game than I am, and I have caught him, and I call upon him now to acknowledge that he committed an error.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What would he say on the stump if you were not there to watch him?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my hon. friend, if he will consider for a moment, will give me credit for saying that there were considerable deductions in some of the departments.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exactly what I meant to state, and I want my hon. friend to do me the kindness to look at those I mentioned. Take the Governor General's Department, for instance. I said that it came down from somewhere in the region of \$900 to \$500.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But it went up in other departments. You did not tell us that.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but I blame some of the Departments for not carrying out the system, while in others it had resulted in economy, and I have proposed an arrangement by which next year the effects will be seen in all the departments. Now, whatever apology is necessary for that amount of poor understanding on my hon. friend's part, and for poor expression on mine, I am willing to make.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But I think they are commencing at the wrong end. I think the Governor General ought to be in possession of public information; he ought to get the newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. He has all he needs.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. But you have cut him off.

Mr. FOSTER. I may say that it was with the thorough co-operation of His Excellency that it was done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. We have had this statement made from the Treasury benches four or five successive years; at least that length of time their attention has been called to this gross abuse of spending nine or ten thousand dollars for subscriptions to newspapers for the benefit of the Departments. Four or five times over a reform has been promised, and as my hon. friend shows, the only reform they have practiced is to spend seven or eight hundred dollars more.

Mr. MULOCK. Since the Minister of Finance condescended to take up part of my remarks, I will venture to summarize by asking a question. He tells us that the High Commissioner did not, according to his own statement, make the proposals to the Grand Trunk Railway which were attributed to him. I did not say that he did, I simply said that he was so reported. I asked the Minister of Finance, and I now renew the question, if he would tell us what is the attitude of the Government in regard to the action of the High Commissioner, about which I believe there is no question. I will say nothing at this moment about the High Com-

missioner's attack upon the Grand Trunk Railway in the English press, or his onslaught on a portion of the people of Canada; I will limit my question to the point I mentioned.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Shall the item carry?

Mr. CHARLTON. Surely this is a question of sufficient importance to merit the courteous attention of the Government. We have a right to know, and the country has a right to know, what view the Government take of the conduct of the High Commissioner. We assert that his conduct was improper, that he has been guilty of conduct not in accordance with the duties of his office, that he has been meddling with that which does not concern him, that he has been making an attack upon a very important corporation of this country, that that attack was not only unwarrantable, but it was unjust, and we want to know what view the Government take of that matter. It is an important question; it cannot be burked or treated with silent contempt.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course, the natural inference, when the Government have nothing to say after hearing their officer assailed, is that they cannot possibly defend them. That is the natural inference, that is the inference which everybody in the country will draw. Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner, has been solemnly arraigned here before the High Court of Parliament for having attacked the Grand Trunk Railway, for having brought unreasonable charges against it, for having threatened it, for having attempted to bulldoze it, and the Government, recognizing that his conduct has been very improper, have nothing to say in his defence. I do not know that my hon. friends need require any other answer. It is quite clear that they cannot say one word in his defence.

Mr. DEVLIN. I did not bring up this question the other night about newspaper subscriptions; it was started by somebody else, I think. I merely asked the question whether the Liberal papers were received in the Departments as well as the Conservative papers. Afterwards I expressed the opinion that the item of subscriptions for newspapers seemed large. There are some other items to come up shortly in connection with this question which will be very interesting. We have heard a good deal said about the statements made by the High Commissioner. I do not know if the High Commissioner charged the Liberal party with having used American gold in the elections. I know as a matter of fact that in our county we saw very little American gold, in fact there was none of it except what may have been in possession of the Conservative party. It was said that they possessed all the American gold that was in the constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. I must ask you, Mr. Chairman, whether this is pertinent to the discussion. This afternoon I appealed to the House to keep ourselves to the discussion of the subject of the item before us, and the House, I think, agreed with me, and they dropped the discussion on trade. I think now it is not necessary to go into the question as to whether American gold was or was not used in the election. I do not think that is regular on this item.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). What the Minister of Finance says is quite right, but the matter is
Mr. MULOCK.

largely in his own hands. When questions that demand an answer are asked, questions of importance that the country expects to be answered, and the hon. gentleman sits down and all the other Ministers refuse to say anything, then confusion arises. If they would answer the questions that are put in the interests of the public, that we have a right to ask, then the discussion would be kept within proper bounds. The Minister of Finance surely sees that when he refuses to answer a plain question that the Opposition are quite within their right in asking, that their duty demands they should ask, and when he will not answer, and none of the other Ministers will answer, when they are unable either to grasp the situation or are without sufficient information or courage to answer, then some one tries to see whether they have any information on any other subject, and so it goes on. If the Minister of Finance would answer questions that are pertinent, then we could keep the discussion within reasonable bounds.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not refuse to answer any questions that are pertinent. Any questions with reference to the expenditures in the Estimates are pertinent, and we ought to answer them, and I will try, so far as I am concerned, to answer them. But there are a great many questions, outside of these entirely, that I think are not pertinent questions.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). In discussing this matter of the High Commissioner, the Minister of Finance himself admitted that he is occupying that position now in England. The hon. gentleman knows, as a matter of fact by common report, that the High Commissioner is writing letters in the newspaper press, is engaged in a controversy and is attacking the Grand Trunk Railway, that he is engaging in a course that tends, as far as he is able to make it, to injure the company and to depreciate the value of its stock. The question asked is: Does the Minister sanction the High Commissioner in following that line of conduct? It is a plain and intelligent question, one wholly within the scope of this discussion, and we are entitled to an answer to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Then if the hon. gentleman is determined not to go any further with the Estimates until I have answered the question, I will give the answer. The attitude of the Government at the present with regard to that is one of attentive consideration.

Mr. CHARLTON. That is not a satisfactory answer; it is an evasive answer. A certain line of conduct followed by the High Commissioner has been pointed out; it has been pointed out that he is guilty of certain offences, the offences the people understand perfectly well, and the Minister of Finance well understands them. The High Commissioner is acting as a partisan, as a party bully. He strove to coerce the Grand Trunk Railway corporation into a certain line of conduct, and failed. He carried to England the animus engendered by that failure, and he is now making attacks on that corporation. He is certainly doing that in violation of his duties of High Commissioner, and his conduct is derogatory to his office. This action reflects on the Government. It is a serious matter and cannot be dealt with in this trifling way, by the Minister of Finance rising and telling the Committee that the matter is under consideration.

This is not a satisfactory answer. We want to know whether the Government approves or disapproves of the action of the High Commissioner? The country wants to know, the country demands to know, and we are here to-night to ask an answer to this question.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. I believe the point of order was raised, that on Friday it was understood that all items except the last one were all to be passed, and they were passed. Accordingly hon. members should not now discuss any item except that respecting the High Commissioner? Hon. members who during the afternoon and evening have been discussing newspaper patronage have been out of order, as I understand there is nothing now before the Committee except the item respecting the High Commissioner.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sorry to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that you did not occupy the Chair at the opening of the sitting to-day, when it was understood that all questions regarding contingencies of all the departments were open for discussion. We have discussed not only the High Commissioner, but matters connected with the Printing Bureau, and others.

Mr. FOSTER. It is true that the arrangement made was that all the items should be passed, except the last one, but that discussion on any of the contingencies of the departments should be allowed. My point of order against the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) was of a different kind.

Mr. DEVLIN. After referring to some other matters I touched upon the question of the expenditures of the office of the High Commissioner. I still think I am perfectly in order in touching upon that question. For my own part I believe the course of the High Commissioner, and I say it frankly, in coming to Canada, was perfectly justifiable. Why do I believe that? Because he was called out by the Prime Minister. I do not suppose that when the invitation was extended to him by the Prime Minister the High Commissioner knew exactly the object of the mission. No doubt he thought it might be in connection with some interest with which he was connected as High Commissioner, and not a political mission. But I believe also that when he ascertained what the mission was he should have returned to England and continued to have performed the duties for which he was specially appointed. Nevertheless, it is nothing new for the High Commissioner to interfere in political matters, notwithstanding his exalted position. In 1886, he was invited to open the exhibition at Charlottetown. On that occasion he took opportunity to deliver a purely political address. In 1878 he promised a treaty of reciprocity. In 1886 he proceeded on behalf of the Government to Charlottetown, although he was not exactly a representative of the Government, and he promised a treaty of reciprocity would be entered into within two years. The promise did not mature any more than in 1878. We know that on that occasion he had very few, if any, good words to say for the Opposition. By him, as well as by many others immediately connected with him, the party of which we are members has been branded as a party of traitors. But traitors to whom? Is the number of traitors not a very large one? We know that the Province of

Quebec has declared by a very large majority against the continuation in office of the present Government, and against the policy of the present Government. So when Sir Charles Tupper charges us with being traitors, he makes a like charge against a large majority of the province. This is a serious accusation to bring. It is an unjust accusation to bring against a people, who on many occasions have shown themselves more loyal and more truly devoted to the institutions governing us, institutions which we received from England, than some of the people who have been denouncing us as traitors. Not only have the people of the Province of Quebec been placed under this stigma, but the people of Ontario have likewise suffered, because one-half of the electorate of that Province belong to the Liberal party. It is very easy to bring forward such accusations, but it is an entirely different matter to substantiate them—and this has not been done. In common with hon. members on this side of the House, I protest against the course which has been adopted. I do not think we should pay large sums of money to one whose duty, presumably, it is to look after the interests of Canada in the mother country, to negotiate a treaty with Spain or some other country, and yet who disregards those important duties and comes out here and calls us strong names. I take objection to the statement made by the Minister of Finance, that we had fully discussed the question of subscriptions to newspapers. That was my object in rising. I did not bring up the discussion, nor was it understood that the discussion was closed with the few remarks made on that occasion.

Mr. CASEY. If the Minister of Finance thinks the House and the country are going to be satisfied with the trifling answer he made to the demands of this side of the House for a reply, he is utterly mistaken. He may understand the duties of his position, or he may not, but he does not understand public opinion in adopting such action. Here we have a civil servant, a man who, although he has been a Cabinet Minister, and is the father of another Cabinet Minister, holds the same relation as a junior clerk to the Government, and the Government who are responsible for his actions are questioned in regard to the course he has taken. It was asked whether the Government endorsed his action and the Minister of Finance said that "the Government would take it into their attentive consideration." What are the public to think of such an answer to this question? They will take the Minister of Finance into their attentive consideration and what their consideration of him will be goodness only knows. It is a perfectly childish answer to give to a gentleman in this House, and if the hon. gentleman had been here long enough he would know that. I repeat that Sir Charles Tupper is as much a member of the Civil Service of this country as any clerk in the departments, and he has no more right to take part in a political campaign and to address nasty language to one-half of the people of this country than the youngest clerk in the service. Whether the members of the Government choose to remain silent or to give offensive and slangy answers to questions, they are nevertheless responsible for the acts of the civil servants, and it may be necessary before this matter is disposed of, to point out that Sir Charles Tupper having violated

his duties as a civil servant is no longer fit to continue in the service. I wish to impress upon the Minister of Finance that his answer has been insulting to the House and that no member of experience in parliamentary practice would have given such an answer. I was a member of this House in the old days when the rules of Parliament were enforced and long before the hon. gentleman ever thought of coming here, and I know that no experienced Minister would have given such a reply. I may tell the Minister of Finance that to satisfy the public he will have to answer "yes" or "no" to this question: but whether the answer be in the affirmative or negative the Government are responsible for the conduct of this civil servant. I will not enter into the details of the question of Sir Charles Tupper's attack on the Grand Trunk Railway further than to say that the Government is responsible for the insulting and insolent conduct of the High Commissioner towards almost half of the electors of this country, and towards one of the greatest corporations of this country, a corporation which took a greater part in developing Canada than the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance, or whatever other Minister is in charge of the matter, what reply he has to give to the question I asked the other night in reference to the High Commissioner being appointed a director of a gas company which is going to do business in the United States. I would like to know if the High Commissioner is acting by the consent and authority of the Government, and if it is not possible that the High Commissioner who draws a salary from this country can find wide enough scope for his energies and financial skill in the Dominion of Canada. I would like to know if he has accepted this position with the endorsement of the Government, or if it is a matter which the Government have under their serious consideration. I would like to know if the public servant who belongs to a company carrying on business to the extent of ten million dollars and operating in the United States, does this with the consent of the Government. I will read the statement from the *Empire*:

"Sir Charles Tupper has been appointed director of the Water Works and Gas Works Securities Corporation, which has just been organized here with a capital of £2,000,000 sterling. The object of this new corporation is to buy up water works, gas works and other concerns of the kind in Canada and the United States. There is every prospect of an early settlement of the question of the power of the trustees to invest in colonial inscribed stock. A simple bill approved by the colonial representatives in London is being drafted for the Imperial Parliament. Legislation may be also necessary in Canada and the other colonies."

Have the Government been consulted about the legislation which it is said will be necessary? Has the Minister of Justice been consulted about the legislation necessary in order to enable our High Commissioner to direct his capital, which was paid by the people of this country, to the purpose of developing concerns in the United States, and if so, has the Government given its consent to that?

An hon. MEMBER. Answer the question.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, if they will not answer that question, I might ask how many members of the Government are interested in business matters in the United States? When these gen-

Mr. CASEY.

tleman are calling us disloyal, I would ask them if it is compatible with their professions for them to apply the capital which belongs to the people of this country to develop the industries of the United States, when we have great undeveloped resources in this country awaiting capital. Surely the Government should not be disloyal to Canada, yet there is no greater disloyalty than that the members of the Government or their High Commissioner should invest our capital in the United States. I say "our capital," because it is our capital. The High Commissioner got that capital from us; when he went into politics he was as poor as a wet hen, he was said not to be worth anything, all the money he has was made in public life and that money he now invests in the United States.

Mr. LAURIER. It seems to me that my hon. friend the member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) is now drawing the attention of the House to a question of very great importance, and that he is treated with too great levity—

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER,—by the other side, I mean to say. I ask any hon. gentleman in this House if it is proper for a person occupying the high position Sir Charles does in England, which is practically that of our ambassador to the Court at St. James, to enter into any such scheme as is now being mentioned by my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Landerkin). If the emoluments of Sir Charles Tupper are not sufficient for the dignity of his office, then let the emoluments be increased if necessary. But I claim that Sir Charles Tupper should give all his attention to the business of the country, and to nothing else. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House should remember that at one time the Minister of the United States at the Court of St. James, General Schenck, was connected with a certain concern which turned out to be not altogether savoury to the public, although General Schenck had done nothing for which he could be impugned. Moreover, we have seen the name of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the name of Sir Charles Tupper coupled with that of the Direct Meat Company which was not what it should have been either. Therefore, simply as a measure of caution, the Minister who represents Canada at the Court of St. James ought not to be engaged in any such transactions, and I submit for the honour of Canada that if the emoluments of Sir Charles Tupper are not sufficient, let them be increased, but let him give his whole time to the business of Canada and to nothing else.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has certainly treated this matter in a way very different from the very light and trifling and gassy manner in which it was treated by my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Landerkin). So far as I am concerned, and I think the same is true of the Government, the first intimation we have had of Sir Charles Tupper being connected in any way with such a company was when we heard the statement from a newspaper read in the House. It is simply a newspaper report, and as a newspaper report it has not reached the Government in any authoritative or official way, and I do not think we are called upon to treat as serious matters without consideration, what may be simply reports of newspapers. With regard to the Dead Meat Company, I am not aware that Sir Charles Tupper had

anything to do with that in an intimate way. I think that he had nothing to do with it, except in the mere writing of a letter which conveyed no promise of influence or support. The same is true, I think, of Sir Hector Langevin, so far as my recollection goes.

Mr. LAURIER. I am very glad to hear that the only defence the Government have on this occasion is that they have received no official notice. They will have official notice by-and-bye, and we can anticipate the course they will take.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to point out to the House that the hon. Minister of Finance is not justified in dealing so lightly as he does with a letter which Sir Charles Tupper addressed to a number of promoters in London whom he knew were connected with the getting up of this same Dead Meat Company. If the hon. gentleman is not aware of it, I can tell him that Sir Charles Tupper's conduct on that occasion has been advertised upon in terms of deserved severity by several of the most distinguished financial journals in England; and he will find that the conduct of our High Commissioner has very considerably discredited us in the eyes of English investors. As I pointed out when I brought this matter to the attention of the House last session, the statements made in that letter were of a most reprehensible and scandalous character. It was also extremely unfortunate that the hon. Minister of Public Works should have allowed his name to appear as a director of any such company; and although the House received his assurance that he had not read the prospectus, he never took steps to disassociate himself from that enterprise until his connection with it became a matter of censure on the floor of this House. But Sir Charles Tupper had seen that prospectus, and knowing the conditions of things in Canada, had been extremely indiscreet, to use the mildest term, in writing a letter which was used on the stock exchange to induce people to put their money into a thoroughly rotten enterprise, which was a disgrace to Canada and all connected with it.

Mr. CASEY. I just rise to point out the number of things which the hon. Minister of Finance disclaims a knowledge of. We may be here for several months, but I think it will take a good many months at this rate to find out all the things the hon. Minister of Finance does not know.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I am very sorry I did not impress the hon. Minister of Finance with the earnestness with which I addressed the House on this subject. I am very sorry that this matter escaped the notice of the Government, because it appeared in the *Empire*, which is published in the interest of the Government. It is rather hard for the *Empire* to be told in the House of its friends that it is not read. I also notice that the hon. Secretary of State told the House that the *Empire* advertised the sale of the Statutes for six months and got nothing for it. That is rather a reflection on the circulation of the paper; and if the friends of the Government will not do so, I wish to stand up and say a word for it; and I hope the members of the Government will be more considerate of those great men at the helm of that paper. I think it is a matter we should enquire into seriously, and if the hon. Minister of Finance has mistaken the tone and temper in which I addressed

the House on this question, he has greatly misunderstood me. I made this enquiry because I believed I had a perfect right to do so, and I think the country will agree with me that it is not a proper thing for an officer of the people of Canada enjoying a salary of \$10,000 a year and perquisites amounting to \$2,000 more, to take that money and invest it in Yankee enterprises. I appeal to the people on national grounds to stand up for Canada, and when men holding high positions receive large sums of money from the country they should have the patriotism to invest it in Canadian securities and Canadian enterprises.

Mr. MULOCK. I would just call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance to a matter of some importance, which I think might well receive the attention of the Agent General of Canada in England. At all events, I think it is better entitled to his consideration than those outside enterprises which have been referred to. By the *Canada Gazette* of May, the current month, it appears that our trade with Great Britain is undergoing a very serious change. I think it would be well if the Minister of Finance could spare one moment while I call his attention to a matter with which he is no doubt already familiar.

Mr. FOSTER. I read it to-night.

Mr. MULOCK. I am sure every one who has read it has done so with a great deal of sorrow and some alarm. In the *Gazette* in question appears an article entitled: "British trade with Canada," according to which our imports from England for the four months terminating in April last amount to £1,567,420.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I ought to appeal to my hon. friend that this is travelling out of the record. It will come up very well in the discussion on the Budget.

Mr. MULOCK. I acknowledge the force of the objection, and will just make one point. According to the statement, our trade with exports to Great Britain are only one-sixth in April, 1891, what they were in the corresponding month last year.

Mr. FOSTER. This is really quite unfair. If the country is to be put in a fair position with reference to the point raised, there ought to be a rejoinder; and to proceed with the rejoinder now would only open up a discussion on a subject which we are not at all discussing.

Mr. MULOCK. I will not quote the figures, but would simply say that the appearance of those figures—

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might just as well read the figures as make the statement.

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Finance Minister to see that the attention of the High Commissioner is given solely to the interests of Canada and that he will not allow this state of affairs to continue if it can be remedied.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I see that the item of telegrams is increased very largely. I do not know whether the business of the country requires more telegrams to be sent now than formerly, but the expenditure seems excessive, amounting to \$16,223 last year. In the Militia Department, no less than \$1,706.73 were used in telegrams, and as we had no war last year the hon. Minister should explain this extravagance. I do not see that

there was such haste required in the management of his Department as to necessitate this extensive telegraphing. In the Governor General's office \$1,704.72 were spent. I was under the impression that a lump sum was allowed the Governor General for travelling and other expenses such as this.

Mr. FOSTER. Not telegraphing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The Privy Council spent \$1,249.91, which included, I suppose, the cost of telegrams sent Sir Charles Tupper. The Secretary of State's Department, spent \$781.50; the Justice Department, \$1,167.48; Public Printing and Stationery, \$82.20. In this respect the Secretary of State was very economical. Indian Affairs, \$703.51; the Audit Office, which I believe is the cheapest branch of the public service, only spent \$14.29; the Finance Department, \$837.50; Inland Revenue, \$606.91; Customs Department, \$1,061.87. Customs has been a little extravagant, although the hon. Minister is generally very economical. Post Office Department, \$731.64; Agriculture Department, \$1,028.63; Marine Department, \$752.87; Fisheries Department, \$502.97; Public Works, \$710.30; Railways and Canals, \$353. The fact is the total expenditure in telegrams last year amounted to nearly as much as it costs for the services of the charwomen, which cost us \$17,997.20. Some of the Ministers ought to explain why this expenditure is going on increasing. Last year we expended \$15,643.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. I am glad to say that the telegraphing which the hon. gentleman complains of is that which is required on a peace footing, and that we are not at present in a state of war. When we had trouble, there was as much expended in a month on that service as it now costs for a year. The amount may seem very large, but every district in the Dominion contains a portion of the militia force, and the requirements of the service entail a considerable use of the telegraph. I believe the hon. gentleman will see that the amount is smaller than it used to be, and I hope, if we continue to enjoy profound peace, it may be reduced still further.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I cannot see that it is smaller. On the contrary, it is larger. The statement of the hon. gentleman is on a par with that made by the Finance Minister, and it takes the Opposition all their time watching the blue-books to keep the Ministers straight. The expenditure in 1890 in the Militia Department was \$1,706.73, and in 1889 it was only \$1,188.16, so it is going on increasing instead of decreasing.

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. The country is increasing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I doubt that very much.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether any allowance or any sum of money in any shape is paid by the Government to the Reuter Association to send cablegrams of our doings across the Atlantic?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that there is.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Are you sure that none is paid?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know of any at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER. Is the Minister in a position to say that there is not or simply that there may not be?

Mr. SOMERVILLE.

Mr. FOSTER. I only say that I am not aware that there is, and I do not think there is.

Mr. LAURIER. Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are special rates charged for these cablegrams, or do the Government pay the ordinary rates?

Mr. FOSTER. The ordinary rates are paid, except by the Meteorological Department. A large amount of telegraphing in some of the departments is easily explained. It is a short and sharp way of doing business, particularly if it is important. In the Governor General's Office and in the Privy Council Office this amount is growing because of the quantity of telegraphing that has to be done in regard to important matters, such as the Behring Sea question and other questions of that kind. It is a difficult thing to bring this down. There is a tendency on the part of members of Parliament to send telegrams "collect" to members of the Government, when they desire some information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. For example, telegrams on election matters? Would that come within the purview of public business?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that would not be under public business.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure of that? As to the Meteorological Service, I think they are specially charged to that department.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to know if this charge includes the telegraphing of the Land Board at Winnipeg as well as that of the department here?

Mr. DEWDNEY. I can hardly give that information now, but I do not think it does. I think the Land Commissioner pays his own telegraphing out of his contingent account.

Mr. McMULLEN. I can quite understand that the amount of \$2,412 would not be unreasonable if it included the two branches. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will give the Committee the information when we come to some other item.

Mr. DEWDNEY. Yes; but I think most of the telegrams sent from Winnipeg are paid for here.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see by the Auditor General's Report that \$50 was paid for advertising in the Christmas number of the *Ottawa Citizen*. What was that for?

Mr. BOWELL. I think that advertisement contained all the instructions or information necessary for immigrants coming to this country, telling them what was necessary to do in making their entries, what articles were free under the Tariff Act, and so on; and, as that Christmas number was principally for foreign circulation and a large edition of it was printed, it was deemed advisable to give the information through its columns. While I am on my feet, I desire to refer to a matter to which my hon. friend from North Brant (Mr. Somerville) has called attention. He objects to the large amount of \$1,081.67 for telegraphing. If he would reflect upon the amount of business transacted by the department over the wires, I do not think he will find that a very large amount, especially when he compares it with the amount which was expended before the completion of the Pacific Railway line. In 1877, when there were but

two companies, the amount paid was \$1,510.66. Although the telegraphic connection had not extended throughout the country as it has been now, the amount expended was nearly 50 per cent. more than it is to-day. The member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), in the indignant tones which he usually uses, referred to what he termed the gross and extravagant expenditure in reference to this matter, but he has forgotten the amount which was expended when he was Minister of Finance. In the year ending the 30th June, 1877, I find this result. I may frankly admit that the mode of keeping the accounts at that time was different from what it is now, and that there is a considerable difficulty in making up a correct comparison. However, in the Public Accounts of 1877, I find the following amounts paid for advertising and printing. There are, however, additional items for printing, printing paper and binding, but simply for advertising and printing, I find that the Governor General's office paid \$1,302.81; the Privy Council, \$745.75; the Secretary of State, \$799.70; the Department of the Interior, \$435.36; the Department of Justice, \$590.65; the Department of Militia, \$903.07; the Finance Department, \$681.55; the Public Works Department, \$729.20; the Department of Marine, \$1,996.11; the Department of the Receiver General, which does not exist now, \$435.89; the Department of Customs, \$6,856.97; the Department of Inland Revenue, \$621.96; Department of Agriculture, \$545.15; the Post Office, \$2,370.69; and the Treasury Board, \$66.52. The Inland Revenue was \$545.15; Agriculture, \$545.15; Post Office, \$2,370.67. The Treasury Board this year spent \$8; the last year to which I called the attention, 1877, the expenditure was \$66.52. Now I do not give these to the Committee for the purpose of comparing them with the expenditures made by our predecessors, but I desire to call attention to the fact that the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), who was primarily and mainly responsible for these expenditures, particularly so far as his own department was concerned, was the last man in the world who should have used the strong language that he did with reference to the expenditure to which he called attention. I have not had time, since sitting here, to go into a further examination of the figures to show what amount was spent for printing, publishing, binding and other items, nor do I intend to say they are included in the items referred to in the Auditor General's Report for this year. I refer merely to the question of advertising and printing.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If the hon. gentleman desires to make a comparison between the expenditures under the régime of Mr. Mackenzie and the expenditures under the present Government, I think he will do well to direct the attention of the House to the fact that while there was just as much in reality to do then as there is to-day, their total expenditures were \$23,500,000 against \$36,000,000 by his Government. If he wants to go into details I call his attention to the fact that our total expenditure for Civil Government, contingencies and all, amounted to \$823,000 against \$1,404,000 which is asked to-day. I would like to call his attention to the fact that the same diminution exists in every single department, that although there has been comparatively a little

increase in the population, although circumstances have so altered that to a very great extent the expenditures of the country ought to be less in many important respects than they were then.

Mr. BOWELL. So they are.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They are not by any manner of means, the expenses are larger to-day. There is not a single department of the service, I think, not even including his own, in which they are not larger than they were.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you refer to the Customs Department?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Customs were, I think, in 1878, a matter of \$714,000; they are about \$900,000 at the present time, at least that is what the hon. gentleman asks; and, in every imaginable direction, wherever you go, whether it be Indians, or Mounted Police, or Customs, or Excise, or Civil Government, or Militia, or Public Works, be they what you please, you find an enormous increase, you find the very grossest extravagance; and I tell the hon. gentleman that in every department down to that of his colleague of the Public Works, down to the Department of the Interior, down to Civil Government, down to every solitary thing they have to deal with, there has been an enormous increase. Whether he has stated correctly or not the facts as to the Customs Department, I am not in a position to say, because I am aware that on two or three occasions when these matters have been under discussion, it has turned out—

Mr. BOWELL. Do you mean in reference to this statement I have just made?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. BOWELL. Here it is, you can examine it for yourself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am perfectly well aware there were alterations made in the way of doing business, and in conducting his accounts. But comparing the two statements in the gross, taking the \$23,500,000 which we expended, take the \$36,000,000 that his Government expended last year, the \$37,000,000 they ask this year, without including the Supplementary Estimates, there is no single point that he can show in which the record of the Mackenzie Government will not compare honourably and favourably with anything that has occurred in his department or any other.

Mr. BOWELL. I must be permitted to compliment the hon. gentleman on the dexterous manner in which he has evaded the question before the Committee. He has not uttered a single word in reference to the question which we discussed, but has gone off into a description of the growth of the country and the general expenditures on public works, and everything else. I do not propose to enter into that question, although we are quite prepared to defend the expenditure to which he has referred, and if he fancies for a moment that this country, extending, as it does, from one end of the continent to the other, can be carried on with the same expenditure with which it was carried on at the time he occupied the position as Finance Minister, why, all I can say is that I will make him a present of that idea. I know that no other man having ordinary common sense would ever come to any such conclusions. But I desire to call the attention of the Committee to one fact, and that is

that he spoke in indignant tones of what he termed gross expenditures, and used some other strong language with reference to the advertising and printing accounts of the different departments. That is the only point to which I drew the attention of the Committee, and I repeat again that in answer to that point the hon. gentleman never uttered one word. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he is prepared to discuss that question I will produce figures to show that so far as my own department is concerned, and more particularly that portion of it over which I have immediate control, that relating to Civil Government, tens of thousands of dollars have been saved, aye, from forty to fifty thousand, during the time I have presided over that department, compared with the expenditure that took place under the Mackenzie Administration. And if I do not sustain this statement then the hon. gentleman will be quite correct in throwing out those insinuations which are so characteristic of him when any hon. gentleman dares to impugn, or discuss, or contradict any statement, or to expose any misstatement he may make, or to insinuate that he does not correctly state the facts. The statements I made were copied from the Public Accounts of the year to which I referred. I know from past examinations that any investigation of the whole five years of the Mackenzie Administration would compare unfavourably with the Administration of the present Government, even as respects the contingent account to which we are referring. If he will look at those accounts he will find that the statement made by the Minister of Finance is literally true, in reference to the reductions which have gradually taken place in this newspaper and advertising account. If he will compare one year with another I am quite certain he will find that there is a great decrease going on. The question has been brought to the attention of each member of the Cabinet, in order to ascertain if a reduction cannot be made, in what may be considered an unnecessary expenditure, to as great an extent as possible, and I believe that next year we will find a still greater reduction than has yet taken place.

Mr. TUPPER. If the Minister of Customs needs any support in reference to one point he took in this debate, and which the hon. member for South Oxford challenged, I would like to draw the attention of the ex-Minister of Finance to the important fact that in 1878, under his economical administration, the Marine Department and the expenditure for the maintenance of the different lights, fog-horns, buoy service and all the aids to navigation in this country, amounted to \$786,156; and in 1890, \$807,417 only. The present expenditure and that of the year 1878, taking the relative responsibilities and charges upon the Government, that is, the legitimate charges, are practically the same. I take it that was his argument, at any rate in connection with one department. Let me point out to him these significant facts. Where is the difference between 1878 and 1890? The amount expended in 1878 was \$786,000 in round numbers, and the amount expended in 1890 was \$807,000. But there is this additional responsibility on the department in 1890 as compared with 1878: In 1878 we had to maintain 427 light stations; in 1890 we had to maintain 599 light stations, with the additional charges for repairs and ordinary mainten-

Mr. BOWELL.

ance and salaries and so forth. In 1878 we had 518 lighthouses as against 705 lighthouses in 1890. In 1878 we had four fog-horns to look after, and we had 32 to look after in 1890—an extraordinary and marvellous increase, which was demanded by the development of the navigation of the country. It is extraordinary that in this country we have been able to safeguard the navigation in the way we have done. But that there has been an extraordinary increase in these facilities every mariner and every man who knows anything about navigation is aware. I rose simply to point out to the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) the extraordinary disparity which exists between the charges upon one department of the Government in a year and another, and to show him why that was so. I have shown him that in 1878 the expenditure was, in round numbers, \$786,000 in the Department of which I am the head, while, in 1890, it is only \$807,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What does the hon. gentleman refer to?

Mr. TUPPER. The whole expenditure of the Marine Department in 1878, which covered all the expenditures of every kind in each year.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Does that include the fisheries?

Mr. TUPPER. No; I took only one instance for an example. That is sufficient evidence of the fallacy of the argument of the hon. gentleman.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This statement may be true as to one department, but we know that where it was costing \$23,000,000 in 1878, is costing \$36,000,000 to the people of Canada in 1890, and there are \$37,000,000 demanded for 1892. Does not the hon. gentleman see that there has been an enormous increase in almost every part of the revenue. Does he want me to go through the whole, from the administration of justice to civil government, and from civil government to the Fisheries Department? We find that for what we paid \$93,000 in 1878, we are now paying \$328,000.

Mr. TUPPER. You do not mean the Fisheries Department?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No; we were always able to make a decent bargain with our American neighbours. We sent our High Commissioner, Sir Alexander Galt, to Halifax, and succeeded in extracting \$5,000,000 from the American Government.

Mr. BOWELL. That was under a treaty negotiated by Sir John A. Macdonald.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If Sir John Macdonald had the carrying out of that treaty we would not have got anything at all. We remember that he got the navigation of the Stikkeen and Yukon Rivers under the Washington Treaty. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) says that the increase in expenditure in his department is justified. Let us take the other departments. Let us take the Department of Justice, the Indian management, our Mail Subsidies, the Militia, the North-West Territories, our Mounted Police, our Penitentiaries, Pensions and Superannuations, our Public Works, and that magnificent specimen of the operations of the present Administration—the Department of Railways and Canals, also let us take the Post Office, which, perhaps, is the least objectionable of the whole; but still it

shows a considerable addition to the public burdens. Now, let us see what the result is. Let us compare the expenditure under the Mackenzie Administration with the expenditure under the present régime. The Minister of Customs knows that he cannot get in the Public Accounts a proper statement of the difference in the cost between advertising and printing at that time and this. The amount appears to have been \$180,000. Take the four or five years of the existence of the Mackenzie Government, and you will find that for advertising and all kinds and descriptions of printing, for subscriptions to the newspapers and everything of that kind, that amount is not exceeded; and I am not afraid to say that, if Mr. Mackenzie had been continued in office, that Government would have been carried on with every attention to economy and efficiency. Every year since, the expenditure has increased. The fact that there has been an increase of at least \$1,000,000 a year is ample proof that their conduct has been marked by gross extravagance, and by gross disregard of the needs of this country. While the American people have been reducing their debt to a mere bagatelle in comparison with their population, we find that, while these hon. gentlemen entered into office with a debt one-third in proportion of what the United States debt was, they have now a debt three times that of the United States in proportion to the population. If they compare their Administration with that of Mr. Mackenzie's they will find that from 1867 to 1873, when they were ignominiously and properly dismissed from office for conduct not dissimilar from that which is now charged against some of them, they added about \$11,000,000 to the debt of Canada, while Mr. Mackenzie did not add more than \$200,000 to the debt during the time he was in office from 1873 to 1878. And after they returned again, not having improved in the slightest degree by their absence, they proceed to add a dozen million dollars or more to the annual expenditure of this country. It may be that in one or two individual instances they have not very much exceeded the sum that was charged before, but as a whole these figures in my hand show that in these items for Civil Government, which we are now discussing, they have very nearly doubled the total expenditure which was found necessary in our time, and which proper and judicious management would hardly require to be exceeded at all.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice an item here which hardly bears out the idea in reference to the economical habits of the Minister of Customs. I know the Minister of Customs believes that the Minister of Customs is a very economical manager and a very prudent one, but I see that in his department they appear to have \$6 worth of towels, and that it costs \$48 for washing. How can the Minister of Customs reconcile that with his ideas of economy?

Mr. BOWELL. I am afraid the Minister of Customs would require a much larger expenditure for washing if the hon. gentleman had any connection with the department.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That is a very brilliant thing; it appears they need more towels than washing.

Administration of Justice—Miscellaneous expenditure, including N. W. Territories..... \$25,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why does the Minister of Justice ask for this increase of \$3,500 in this item?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Because the expenses for miscellaneous justice, especially in the North-West Territories, are continually increasing. If the hon. gentleman will refer to the Auditor General's account in which these expenses are catalogued he will find that they consist principally of expenses in connection with the maintenance of prisoners there, conveyance for prisoners to trial, summoning of juries, and other fees in connection with the administration of justice. According as the population of the Territories increases these expenses are continually growing, and the estimate up to the present time is based on the actual expenditure of the current year.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What does the hon. gentleman call "miscellaneous justice"?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The miscellaneous items which appear in the Auditor General's Report under that head.

Mr. MULOCK. Would the Minister of Justice please explain the item of \$4,000 for official arbitrators?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The four official arbitrators held office before the establishment of the court. They constituted a board of arbitration to which all claims against the Crown were referred. By the Exchequer Court Act they were entitled to be paid the same salary previously paid them while they continued in office, and according as their offices lapse they are not to be replaced; but the duties can be discharged by the referees of the Exchequer Court, who will be paid by fees according to the services rendered.

Mr. MULOCK. Were these permanent officers before the establishment of the Exchequer Court?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes; and they are now used as referees for the Exchequer Court and for the Government Departments to refer claims to from time to time, without going into the Exchequer Court. The names of the four arbitrators are Mr. Cowan, Mr. Simard, Mr. Muma and Mr. Compton.

Mr. MULOCK. It occurs to me that when we largely relieve them of their duties, we are treating them very liberally in continuing them on full pay. Are they to be considered as superannuated, or have they any real duties to perform, and to what extent are references made to them in the course of a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They are to remain in office precisely as they were and for the same purpose, but instead of adjudicating upon claims subject, as the law then was, to an appeal to the Exchequer Court, they report on claims. Some of them are used almost as much as before, but one or two of them have lapsed into such age and ill-health that they are not actively employed. They are subject to superannuation, but at present they continue to hold office, in view of the fact that the offices will not be filled when they become vacant.

Mr. MULOCK. It would perhaps be better if they were put upon the superannuation list. Could

the Minister tell us at some later stage what is the extent of the duties they perform in the course of a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I can state almost correctly now from recollection that Mr. Compton's services are very freely used in reference to claims against the Intercolonial Railway and its branches. Mr. Muma frequently assists in the same way, principally in Ontario and Quebec in relation to canal works. Mr. Cowan is very advanced in age as the hon. gentleman perhaps knows, and Mr. Simard is in a state of health that renders it almost impossible for him to be engaged.

Mr. MULOCK. I suppose the reports have a great deal to do with the findings of the Exchequer Court. I suppose that in some cases they have practically the rendering of the judgment of the court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot say that quite. The hon. gentleman will remember that under the Exchequer Court Act references may be made to those gentlemen for report. For instance, claims are made in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial Railway for damages arising from the destruction of cattle, from fires, from accidents of various kinds; and a short time ago a number of these claims, amounting I think to 30 or 40, had all to be reported upon by Mr. Compton.

Exchequer Court of Canada..... \$7,950

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to mention to the hon. Minister of Justice that I frequently hear references made to the working of the Exchequer Court. As we know, there is but one judge, who is clothed with very extensive powers; and while I do not say for one moment that he does not discharge the duties of his office efficiently, we cannot ignore this circumstance, that there is a widespread feeling throughout the country that the Exchequer Court awards very liberal verdicts against the Crown. I believe that court was established to protect the Crown against claims, and in place of the old method which I suppose depended to some extent on the will or judgment of an officer of the Government. The present incumbent of this court is a comparatively young man, which is of course no crime, nor does it necessarily follow that he is not as capable as anyone else would be for discharging the duties of his position. I do not know that he has had a very extensive judicial duty to perform. He was in the Department of Justice, and no doubt the manner in which he discharged his duties there justified the Minister in promoting him to this high position. But there is dissatisfaction in some quarters at the amounts of the verdicts rendered against the Crown, and we know that the amounts involved in the references are extremely large and are growing in size.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. To understand the working of the Exchequer Court satisfactorily, one has to compare it with the system which preceded it. I suppose every member of the House will recall, when I mention it, the unsatisfactory state of affairs which existed before the Exchequer Court was established. We had, as a first attempt to adjudicate on claims against the Crown, a "Petition of Right Act," under which the subject applied to a suit in the Supreme Court sitting as an Exchequer Court of original jurisdiction. We had, also, for

Mr. MULOCK.

the purpose of adjudicating on claims which did not come directly before the court, the four arbitrators whose salaries we have just voted. Conceding to those gentlemen all the skill and experience which men can obtain in the ordinary course of life, and aided as they were by sound common sense and good judgment, they were not a satisfactory tribunal when the claims referred to them reached such large amounts as they did in the expansion of the public works of the country. It was found that while those gentlemen proceeded on sound principles according to the judgment they could exercise, their awards against the Crown were continually increased on appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada; and if the hon. gentleman complains that awards to a considerable amount are now made against the Crown, that cause of complaint is far less than it was when the adjudication was in the hands of the unskilled arbitrators. Very often we found that those arbitrators—and I wish everything I say shall be taken without the slightest disparagement of them, because I believe they were painstaking and conscientious public officers—based their awards not solely on the evidence placed before them, but on their own observation and knowledge and their own criticism of the evidence submitted to them; and when the appeals were taken to the Supreme Court, because the Appellate Court felt bound to adjudicate on the evidence, we very often found the awards increased on appeal under circumstances which were certainly unsatisfactory to those who represented the interests of the Crown. We have now in place of that state of things a skilled judge of whom I cannot speak too highly, whether as regards his capacity as a judge, or as regards the other office of Deputy Minister of Justice, in connection with which office I must say that every transaction that I had with him developed my opinion not only of his high integrity, but of his skill and fitness for a high judicial position; and when the position became available, I thought I could do no better to serve the Dominion of Canada than to put him in a position in which he could adjudicate over claims against the Crown. I cannot find fault with the hon. gentleman's statement that there is a feeling abroad that awards are made too frequently against the Crown, because—and that is one reason why I can agree with the hon. gentleman, accustomed and trained as I am to resist claims against the Crown—I am inclined to regard the claims as often exorbitant; but laying aside that prejudice and examining the cases in which I have found large adjudications against the Crown, I must say I have generally been convinced that the judge is right, and have inserted an appeal in cases in which I could not take that view, without the slightest want of confidence in the tribunal itself. Very often when one finds that large amounts are given against the Crown, there is a natural feeling of surprise, because we hear but one side of the case; but a little investigation in some of these cases proves that feeling to be unwarranted. I really think there is no occasion for Parliament to feel anything but satisfaction with the experiment begun a few years ago of removing all these cases to a special tribunal, subject to an appeal to the highest court.

Mr. FRASER. I think, perhaps, the hon. the Minister of Justice has not gone far enough. I think

the Act might be very materially changed for the better as it is cumbersome, but so far as the judge is concerned, I must agree with him fully in his statements concerning not only his ability but his integrity and fairness. I think, however, the judge has too much to do, and it would be much better if those parties kept in office doing nothing were dismissed and another judge or two appointed. We would then have a better Exchequer Court, and business better done. These men, while they may act as assessors, I am satisfied do not do the work as well as the present judge, and when we consider the amount of business that comes before him no fault can be found. If, in place of these assessors, one or more judges were added, and perhaps the business of the Admiralty Court transferred to the Exchequer Court, an improvement would result. I only rise to say that, as an appeal always lies, I take the ground that the Crown will see that the country does not pay one dollar on any award by the Exchequer Court which it ought not. There is no doubt an impression to a considerable extent that the awards against the Crown are too large. I know, for example, during the time the Cape Breton Railway was being built, a large number of appeals were made to the Exchequer Court. The amounts offered in the first instance were so trifling that a large number went before the Exchequer Court, and the plaintiffs received sometimes twenty, thirty and sometimes forty times as much as offered, but I am satisfied the awards were all correct. We may go to the other extreme, but I believe the judge will not give one dollar more than the claimants are entitled to. I do not think the Crown should be as exacting as a private party, because when they take lands from people they should deal liberally with them. I believe the judge acts fairly and liberally towards those who seek justice from him, and I wish to add my testimony to his ability and fairness. And I think it would be an improvement if no more than one assessor were employed in that court and an extra judge or two appointed.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). In connection with this, there is another matter. I think the Supreme Court upheld that where the Crown undertook the work of a common carrier, it does not incur a common carrier's liability. That would regulate the carriage of freights over railways in the control of the Administration. I do not think that is a desirable position. I think that the Government when it undertakes the work of a mercantile company, it should be subject to the same liabilities.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an outstanding decision of the Supreme Court to the effect that a suit will not lie against the Crown in such matters. I may say, however, that in advising the various departments on that question my department invariably advises that, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, the liabilities of the department would be that of a common carrier, and the Department of Railways always acts on that advice. I am inclined to think, but I do so with great deference to the Supreme Court, that the decision in question would not be upheld now, in view of recent decisions elsewhere, and we also endeavour to be guided by the principles which govern common carriers, irrespective of the exemption of the Crown.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It seems to me that matter ought to be placed beyond doubt by actual

legislation. There is another feature I may observe in this connection, and that is that, according to the more recent decisions in England, they distinguish between the liabilities of a department and the liabilities of the Crown. No such distinction is made in the cases to which I referred.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not think anything I said would reflect on the judge. I did not so intend it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, no.

Mr. MULOCK. I merely referred to the situation in hope that the Minister of Justice would see that every possible precaution was taken to aid in the administration of justice, for, however able the individual may be, we know that the decisions of the very wisest of individual judges are frequently reversed on appeal. In our province, where there are men on the bench who have served long years at the bar, we regard them as so mortal and fallible that it is common to appeal from individual judges to the court of appeals and still further. In the Exchequer Court, the amounts involved are so great that I think there is a special onus cast upon the Minister of Justice to see that cases are presented before the courts fully and that the litigation on behalf of the Crown is conducted as a citizen would in his own case. I cannot quite agree with my hon. friend that the Crown is called upon to receive a less measure of justice than a private citizen. If a railway company expropriates, there should be a leaning to liberality towards the citizen where any violation of his right has taken place for the public good, and the same principle would apply to the Crown in like circumstances; but, subject to such special reasons, the Crown has its rights, and the court which stands between the Crown and wrong is the Exchequer Court.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. So far from finding fault with the criticism of the hon. gentleman, I am very glad to have heard it. Assistance and sympathy in the way of reducing claims against the Crown are not very commonly met with.

Mr. FRASER. In saying that the Crown should deal liberally with the subject, I applied my remarks to those cases which the hon. gentleman mentioned. I see no difference between the Crown and a railway company with respect to lands taken by either from the citizen for the public good, and in each case the citizen should be dealt with on the side of liberality.

To pay for salaries or commutations of
the Judges, Registrars and Marshals
of the Vice-Admiralty and Maritime
Courts.....\$5,500

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The vote appears to be larger than last year, for the reason that we are voting a part of the amount which was formerly authorized by statute. My reason for asking this is that the Bill relating to the Admiralty Courts, which is now before the House, will make provision for all of these courts, and will place the allowance of the judges at the discretion of the House—their salaries to be voted from the consolidated revenue. I might say a word or two about the Bill in advance, with a view of explaining this item. It makes permanent provisions for the exercise of maritime jurisdiction. Certain other sections make provision as to what shall be done temporarily with the existing maritime courts, and it is to meet these provisions that this item is in-

serted here. We propose that the officers appointed under the Imperial Act shall be continued in their present positions. I know that complaints have been made that the remuneration of these officers is unequal. We do not propose now to redress this grievance, but we propose that the salaries shall be voted this year at the same amounts that existed under the Imperial Act. It has been proposed by this Bill that we shall continue the existing officers and not commute their salaries. We do not propose to commute with any of them, but we do propose to offer them the offices at the salaries they are now receiving. That is the reason why we take this vote. When we have these officers under our own jurisdiction we may make different terms, and the officers shall have nothing to complain of.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the annual amount?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. \$5,500.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). This is the present salary paid?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. There is one of these judges in Toronto?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MULOCK. I would like to say that the judge we have has nothing to do. I am convinced it is almost a sinecure. The Minister can correct me if I am wrong.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is true that there is not much business there, but it is absolutely necessary to have a maritime judge in the Province of Ontario. We only propose to have one at present, but we take power to increase the number of districts as may be necessary, but the deputy judges hold offices in other districts where there is a considerable amount of business done, and they are paid by fees.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to have a return of the amount paid during the last five years.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I will have the return brought down when the Bill is before the House.

Mr. MULOCK. Has not some question been raised in Toronto as to the rights of the province in regard to the establishment of maritime courts?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The question as to our right to legislate was raised, and it was decided in our favour by the Supreme Court.

Dominion Police.....\$21,500

Mr. FOSTER. There is only the increase of one policeman.

Mr. MULOCK. Before passing from the other item, I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice to a question which has been before the House for some time—I mean the proposition to increase the salaries of the Superior Court judges, and I would also refer to the status of the County Court judges. I do not think the latter are sufficiently remunerated, and, in consequence of that, some of them are obliged to engage in extra work, frequently taking references and things of that kind, no doubt having regard to the emoluments. To that extent they are rendered unable to discharge the duties of their office. Take the case of the junior judge of the County of York. He is on the same footing

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

with a judge in the rural districts. The junior judge of the County of York receives \$2,000, with \$200 allowance when he goes away from the city. I say it is impossible for a junior judge who lives in Toronto to live on such a small salary. While I do not desire to discriminate against a rural judge, I say that \$2,000 is too small a sum for the junior judge of the County of York, who has to live in Toronto. If the junior judge were properly remunerated he might be able to discharge his duties without the number of judges being increased, but the Ontario Legislature has provided for an additional judge there. Of course, the city of Toronto is growing, and there is a great deal of commercial business done there, and the judge has jurisdiction not only in the city but also in the county, which is united with the city for judicial purposes. The person who occupies the position of junior judge for the County of York is a very able man, and I think that the fact that he receives the salary he does is not only unsatisfactory and unfair to him, but it is a degradation to the administration of justice itself. As to the remuneration of the Superior Court judges, I think that should be settled. For some years past I have heard propositions made for an increase in the salary of those judges. I do not think it is proper that this question should be constantly brought before the public. It is not fair to the judiciary. They are not able to speak for themselves or to reply to criticisms, and I think the position of a judge should remove him from outside criticism. A question like this is a delicate question, bringing the judiciary, as it were, in opposition to the public, who consider themselves, as they properly are, the paymasters. It is a question which should not be kept open; it ought to be dealt with, and dealt with properly. The salaries now paid are the salaries paid, I think, ever since the Superior Court was established, and a dollar to-day is not worth anything like what a dollar was when the courts were established. The remuneration of the Superior Court judges in the Province of Ontario needs, in my judgment, immediate attention. The salaries are not adequate, and I believe that a good, sound public opinion will sustain the Administration in dealing properly and at once with this matter. It is not popular, I presume, to increase salaries. I dare say there are a good many people who think the judges are overpaid. At all events, I am prepared to take my share of the responsibility in advocating that they be put on a proper footing. I say there is nothing between the people and anarchy except the judges, and if we are interested in any one thing we are interested in selecting to the bench—I am assuming we have always done so—the very fittest men. Whilst no salary that we can assign will, in itself, induce men in great practice to withdraw from practice to the bench, as there ought to be a fitness in all things, so I say a salary ought not to be assigned insufficient to enable a judge to maintain his family. The Minister of Justice, I see, does not approve of my remarks. He smiles upon them as if he thought there was nothing in them. I am sorry I have not awakened his sympathy.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. On the contrary, I was smiling with satisfaction to see how much information my hon. friend the Minister of Finance was getting on this question. I hope he will pay

the fullest attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. I sympathize entirely with what he has said, and as soon as I can convince my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, right and justice shall be done.

Mr. FRASER. No such small matter should stand in the way of justice. I know the Minister of Finance will not take that for a personal allusion.

Mr. FOSTER. The contrast is very remarkable.

Mr. FRASER. I mean that no opposition from any single member of this House should stand in the way, and I must say I think that if the Minister of Justice had thoroughly made up his mind so small a matter would not be allowed to stand in his way. I agree fully with what the hon. member has said. I do think that the question of the salaries of our judges should not be allowed to be discussed in papers from time to time, but they should be put in an independent position. In England there is no question about it, and we very seldom hear any complaint about the large salaries paid to judges in England. Of course, we cannot afford to pay them as large salaries in this country; neither do the judges expect it. But I know there is an inequality, and know the judges in some other provinces get more than they do in others. While, of course, certain litigants are always saying that justice is not meted out to them, I am sure that not only this House but the country would sustain any Government that would set this question at rest. I do believe that our judges are not so well paid as they should be, and that the conditions of life have so changed within the last ten years as to make it impossible—I know this to be the case in Nova Scotia—for the judges to live on the same salaries now that they could live on ten years ago.

Mr. TROW. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that we ought to place the judges on an equality. In counties with a population of 40,000, 5 cents a head would about make up their present salary of \$2,200, and where there are 60,000 inhabitants the judge should be paid a higher salary in accordance with the increased work of the administration of justice. The County of York and a few other counties in Canada are placed on a par with a county that has about 20,000 inhabitants.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not surprised at seeing so many hon. gentlemen of this House, who are members of the bar themselves, advocating a raising of the salary of the judges, because, I presume, they are prospective judges themselves. But outside of that it seems to me they are so accustomed to making very heavy charges for services that anything like a moderate salary, or what would be a competent salary for men in other lines of life would not be considered by them a competent salary at all. I do not think the proposition to raise the salary would be popular with the people of the country. We know for a fact that if a judge happens to die, almost every lawyer in the county is willing to take the position, whatever the salary may be. As long as we find that to be the case I do not see any difficulty in getting even the best men to take the position of judges. Now, I am not saying that their salaries are too high or too low; I only say that the feeling in the country is that their salary is about in proportion with

the salary of men of equal ability in other lines of life.

Mr. DAVIN. The inadequacy of judicial remuneration is still more striking in the North-West Territories and Manitoba. My hon. friend behind me (Mr. Fraser) speaks about the expense of living in Nova Scotia. Now, it is well known that in Manitoba and the North-West Territories the expense of living at this moment is far greater than in any other part of the Dominion of Canada, and yet our judges are paid less than in Ontario. In a previous session I spoke on this matter, and I spoke with some feeling, but without the least personal interest, as although I happen to be a barrister I do not practice, and I have no ambition to be a judge. I spoke with some feeling because I knew the *angustia res* of those gentlemen who had to maintain a high position on a very small salary. I am persuaded that if the hon. and learned gentleman would bring in a Bill dealing with this question, and if the Government, and especially the Finance Minister, who is nothing if not economical—and that is a virtue in a Finance Minister—if the Finance Minister will second the action of the hon. and learned gentleman, and if those gentlemen who belong to the same party as myself, but who take a very strong adverse view on this question, will support the Government, it will be found that, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, the Government, in doing justice to the judiciary, will be supported by a strong and healthy public opinion. It is not possible to exaggerate the importance of having the status of the judge, financially and socially, such that it will attract to the bench the very best talent in the country, and that you have a bar that will devote their whole time to law, and will fix their ambition on the bench, instead of having a bar, as we have in this country, that divides its attention between law and speculations of all sorts. In England, where the judges are properly remunerated, you have men of the highest talent, who devote their whole time, and all their energies—their days and nights—to law, and consequently you have judges on the bench who, when an important case is brought before them in Westminster Hall, do not need to stop and consider the judgment they will give, but are able to pronounce a judgment right off, for they have the cases at their finger ends. There you have the best legal talent of the country on the bench. And what does that mean? What it means is this: You have men of the highest character, of the highest ability, of the highest learning, of the most profound integrity, dealing with the important questions of property and the liberty of the subject brought before them. If the hon. Minister of Justice intends to take a step in this direction this session, and I hope he does, I will strongly, at least as strongly as my poor abilities will enable me to do so, support him; and I venture to say this, that he will be supported by the people of the country.

Mr. DEVLIN. I desire to ask the Minister of Justice if he is aware of the pressure of business in the Ottawa district. In fact, the business is so great that it is contemplated to divide this district, making one Pontiac and the other Ottawa division. I know not whether the Minister of Justice has advised the appointment of an additional judge. However, it is well known that the business is so considerable as to require this division to be made,

and the judge at present holding the position has a very great amount of work to do. In fact, I may call the Minister's attention to this, that so great is the amount of work that on several occasions an assistant judge has been invited to attend, and frequently the term of Queen's Bench, which is held twice a year, has been presided over by a judge specially invited for the purpose from Montreal, because the district judge residing at Aylmer had so much to do that he could not attend. Such was the case in June last, and I believe it was so on a late occasion. I cannot exactly understand why judges in the rural districts are paid only \$4,000 a year, while judges presiding over courts in the cities are paid \$5,000. It is well known that judges in the rural districts have to preside over the Court of Queen's Bench as well as the Superior Court, whereas in the city it is not so. Their responsibility is as great, if not greater; their living expense is equally costly, their position is equally as high, and it seems to me they should, at all events, receive the same amount of remuneration as judges of the Superior Courts residing in cities.

Mr. GIROUARD. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but as a member of the legal profession I cannot allow the statement made by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) to pass without contradiction. I take the liberty of correcting the statement of the hon. member when he says the judges are paid as highly as other men in the same station in life and requiring the same education. I call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to the fact that the heads of great corporations are paid something like \$20,000 or \$25,000 a year, although the duties they perform are not more important than the duties performed by the judges of this country. It is not necessary to call attention to these large salaries paid to the heads of great corporations; let us consider the salaries paid the clerks of those corporations, not only of one or two of the great corporations, but even the clerks of banks and insurance companies. Several bank clerks in this country receive more than the \$5,000 which is the salary paid to the judges of the highest court of the land, with the exception of the Supreme Court. Take even the cases of secretaries of those banks and corporations, and they receive \$5,000, and more. Take the lawyers of some of the great institutions, and they receive more than \$10,000 a year for performing duties less important than those performed by the judges. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) does not belong to the legal profession, but he belongs to a profession which does not require to make an appeal to Parliament to effect an increase in their fees; they do it in their offices, and unknown to their patients. I do not rise to make a speech respecting the salaries of the judges, but I call the attention of the House to this fact, and I know it to be a fact, that to-day judges in the great cities of the Dominion, and the judges belonging to the Superior Courts, are obliged to devote a portion of their time to other matters in order to provide the necessaries of life. I think this is a state of things that should be remedied.

Mr. SPROULE. The comparison I made was a fair one. I said the judges were equally as well paid as were men in other lines of life possessing equal ability. I might very fairly draw a comparison between the two professions, medical and legal. Take two men when they commence to study. The medical man when prosecuting his studies is obliged to devote four years of his life to his profession, during which he receives no remuneration, and is under very heavy expenses all the time. The lawyer is placed under another lawyer, and usually commences to earn money from the time he begins his studies. After the conclusion of studies both commence to practice. Taking an average, one is quite as able and intelligent and as well educated as the other. Their earnings are not, however, equal. A very fair amount of earnings of a doctor is \$2,000 a year, with much much heavier outlays than a lawyer is required to make. A lawyer earning that sum would be considered as having a very small practice. Again, consider their position after five, ten or twenty years. Let the medical man be placed at the head of an asylum, where he would have as important duties to perform as a judge of the bench, and yet if he received a salary of \$2,000 it was considered a very large one, while \$1,000 is often considered a very fair amount. Let him be placed at the head of the largest hospital in the country, and he will consider himself very well paid if his salary be \$2,000 a year. Let him be appointed health officer. The health officer of Toronto receives about \$2,000 a year for giving his whole time and attention to the work. Lawyers, as a general thing, become so accustomed to making very heavy charges in their profession that they look upon it as a small salary when they do not receive \$2,000. It is said I should look at the salaries of lawyers who are employed in connection with great corporations. It is understood that some of the lawyers of the Canadian Pacific Railway receive from \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year. But those salaries do not afford a fair comparison. I hold, notwithstanding the contention of every lawyer in the House, that the opinion prevails in the country that lawyers are paid equally as well as are other men of ability and education. A few instances may be given of large salaries paid to men controlling insurance companies and other corporations, but they have generally the control of the salaries in their own hands; and these few eminent men, either lawyers or financiers, advance their own salaries to a point which may fairly be called extravagant. We should not be guided by that rule. A fair comparison can only be made by taking the incomes of professional men in other lines, of men who are equally clever, who have spent an equal sum of money in acquiring an education, and who are quite as valuable in the line of life to which they belong.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in drawing his comparison between the legal and medical professions, has hardly carried that comparison far enough. He must know that it is human to err, and that when a judge errs his error is liable to face him at any time in future life, but when a member of the profession to which the hon. gentleman from East Grey belongs commits an error, that error is generally buried six or seven feet deep.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman forgets that when a doctor makes an error he is amenable to the law, and a judge is not.

Mr. DEVLIN.

Mr. HYMAN. The idea seems to prevail in this House that only professional men believe that the judges are inadequately paid. I do not agree with the hon. member for East Grey when he says that the opinion prevails amongst laymen that the judges are paid as much in proportion as other professional gentlemen. I do not think they are. I believe that a large majority of the laymen in this House and in the country at large feel that judges are inadequately paid, not only for the work they do but for the responsibility which they hold. I notice—and in making the comparison I do not desire to leave the impression that it is because I think the salaries of the judges in the Province of Quebec are anything too large, but simply because I think the salaries of the judges in Ontario are altogether too small—I notice there are four judges in Ontario paid \$6,000 a year each, while there are three in Quebec paid that salary. There are seventeen judges in Quebec paid \$5,000 a year each, and only ten in Ontario. The lowest payment to a judge in Quebec is \$3,500 a year, while in Ontario we have the junior judges of County Courts who are only paid what might be comparatively called the mere pittance of \$2,000 a year. I submit that these salaries are entirely too small for the responsibility of the office, and I address these remarks from the standpoint of a layman. I know and I feel that the laymen of this House, and the laymen of the country, will support the Parliament and will support the Government if they make a proposal to increase—I might say to largely increase—the salaries of the judges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In reply to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Devlin) I would say that I have not been made aware that the duties in the County of Ottawa, or in that district, have been too great for the present judge. I should hope that such was not the case. The judge in that district is a very able and efficient judge, and I was under the impression that he was not overworked. In reply to the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) I may say that while the Public Accounts do appear to show the result he has intimated, yet the *per capita* charge for the Administration of Justice in the Province of Quebec is considerably less than in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I agree with the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that this question of the judges' salaries should not be continually brought before the House. For years and years we have had this question under discussion, and I would like to ask is it not the legal members of the House who are responsible for this and who are continually bringing up this question, whether for the purpose of getting favour from the judges or of getting on the right side of them I do not know. At all events it is the legal gentlemen who are constantly bringing up this question, and with the exception of the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) I have not heard a single layman in the House, since I have had the honour of a seat here, say one word in favour of the proposal.

Mr. LARIVIERE. I hope the hon. gentleman will except me, because last year I spoke in favour of increasing the judges' salaries and I am not a barrister.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I thought he was a lawyer, for he looks like a member of the legal profession. With the

exception of the two gentlemen I have named, I have not heard a layman in this House ask for an increase in the salary of the judges; but the lawyers are everlastingly preaching that the judges' salaries are too low. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) complains that the salary of the junior judge in his county is too low. Is there anything to compel that gentleman to hold the position if he can do any better elsewhere? Why in the name of common sense does he not resign the position and take something else? The judge in the county which I have the honour to represent is one of the ablest men on the bench to-day. We have a junior judge there, too, for we are blessed with two judges; and these two judges have not got as much work to do in one month as an ordinary man does in one week. They have scarcely anything to do, and yet they are drawing big salaries. While there may be some counties throughout the province in which the county court judges have too much to do, yet I do not believe that, on the whole, the judges are overworked. I also contend that the salaries we pay to our Superior Court judges are quite sufficient. I venture to say that there are very few men on the bench who could earn as much at the bar as they are receiving in salaries, and if they can earn more why do they not resign and practice at the bar? There is nothing to compel them to retain their positions. More than that, whenever there is a vacancy to fill on the bench there are twenty-five or thirty applicants, and the Minister of Justice is beseeched from all quarters.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No, no.

Mr. AMYOT. No, Sir.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I know that a great many legal men in my own town have been trying for years to get a position on the bench, and I am told that it is the same in other counties. We must also bear in mind that there are many men who will shine at the bar and yet be a failure on the bench.

Mr. WATSON. What bar?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not the men who will command the highest salaries at the bar who make the best judges. Although I am not a lawyer, yet those who know have told me that some of the brightest men who have filled positions on the bench have been comparative failures while practising at the bar. I believe there are hundreds of men to-day practising their profession who have been almost a failure, so far as receiving large fees and getting large salaries are concerned, who, if they were appointed to a position on the bench, would fill it with a great deal of honour to themselves and credit to the profession and the country. My position is simply this: I know that the country, as a whole, is of opinion that the judges are receiving quite sufficient remuneration, and I sincerely trust that the hon. Minister of Justice will not give way to the flowery arguments which have been advanced by a few members of the profession who are in favour of raising the judges' salaries.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am a layman—neither a doctor nor lawyer—but I believe we should have on the bench the best ability to be found in this country. I do not think the County Court judges in Ontario are paid as much as they are entitled to receive. Any ordinary lawyer in practice will

earn more than we pay to one of our County Court judges. I am willing that both our County Court judges and our Superior Court judges should be paid a fair and reasonable salary, and I believe that if it is necessary to increase their salaries in order to secure the best possible ability on the bench, the country would assent to it. The junior judges especially, who get \$2,000 a year and \$200 for travelling expenses, are certainly underpaid. We know perfectly well that many lawyers doing a special business make more than \$5,000 a year, and I have no doubt there are lawyers sitting in this House who in their practice earn as much as \$10,000 or perhaps \$20,000 a year. Unless you increase the salaries of the judges you cannot expect to secure the highest ability.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not think it was necessary, until it was referred to, to pay attention to the observation of the hon. member of East Grey (Mr. Sproule), when he suggested that if any member of the legal profession who advocated an increase of the salaries of the judges did so from some questionable interest or motive. I need not say that I have not such aim. My profession is that of a farmer, and I am not making much money at either. But if the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) or the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell), would like to know why the members of the legal profession bring this matter to the attention of the House, it is because they have actual knowledge of the necessity; they know the inadequacy of the remuneration, and we only have to look across the line to see how a judiciary—

Mr. TYRWHITT. We do not want inspiration from across the line.

Mr. MULOCK. That is just what I was going to say. We do not want our judiciary to be degraded in public estimation. We want our judiciary to enjoy the fullest confidence of the people. They do enjoy that confidence, I believe; but if the present condition of affairs is allowed to continue, we are more likely to have brought about the state of things indicated by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Campbell) when we may see positions put up for tender, and a general competition for them, and then we may perhaps have the son of the hon. member for East Grey appointed to the bench just after he has been called to the bar and become qualified. We may have inferior men put in these positions, and it is necessary to guard against such a state of affairs. It is, therefore, our bounden duty—though it may not be popular, and though it may be the *role* of demagogues to denounce it—to place our judiciary in a position to command the confidence of the country. It is no argument to say that a dozen men could be got to fill the position of a judge. As I pointed out to the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) there are many persons in his riding who would be glad to take his position and perhaps discharge the duties quite as well as he does, or possibly better, for less than he receives. But that is not a fair test; and I think it is unworthy of any member of this House either to impugn the motives of those who advocate this proposition, or to appeal to demagogic arguments, if possible to intimidate the Administration from dealing properly with the question. Do I understand the hon. Minister of Justice to say that he is in favour of immediately dealing with the case, provided the hon. Minister of

Mr. McMULLEN.

Finance can see his way to provide the necessary funds?

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) may think that his standing at the bar places him so high that he is above noticing what comes from any ordinary member of this House, even though impelled by a praiseworthy desire for economy. To say that many persons in my county could be got to take my position, and do it quite as well for a less salary, I do not think is very apt. I might say the same thing with regard to him; nor do I think that any member of this House should be looked on as demagogue because he speaks in favour of economy. The hon. member might, with equal propriety, have directed his attention to his friend from Kent (Mr. Campbell), who I think spoke very reasonably and logically on the subject. Nor do I think the comparisons made by the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) were any fairer. He says that if a medical man makes a mistake, he buries it under the ground, and there is an end of it, while if a lawyer on the bench makes a mistake it lives to confront him. Now, you cannot criticize him, because he is on the bench, and, therefore, above criticism. If he is above criticism and above law, I do not think that should be a reason for raising his salary. If a doctor is guilty of malpractice, he is prosecuted for it. I believe there is at present a case in the hon. gentleman's own city in which a suit has been instituted against a medical man for \$6,000 for the death of a patient, though no doubt he was faithfully and intelligently attending to his professional duties when the accident occurred, and it was in no way due to unskilful or unprofessional conduct. If the hon. gentleman's argument is a good one for increasing the salaries of the judges, it applies with ten times greater force to doctors. I do not wish the inference to be drawn which was drawn from my remarks by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), that it was a selfish aim the lawyers of this House had in view. I said, in a facetious way, that they were all prospective judges; but the agitation is nearly always started by members of the legal profession in this House and carried on by them, and, notwithstanding their great ability, I hold it is not the impression of the country generally that the ordinary judges—I do not know anything of the Superior Court judges—are not paid a fair remuneration for their labour. I know that if there be a vacancy you can have almost any lawyer in the country, no matter what his standing, ready to fill the position of judge and glad to take it.

Mr. DENISON. As a Toronto man, I must say that the salaries of the judges are not sufficient. The salaries drawn by Superior Court judges is about what was paid them forty or fifty years ago, and times have greatly changed since then. In those days a judge of the Superior Court was a comparatively rich man, whereas to-day he is not, and his salary does not at all enable him to do credit to the position he is entitled to occupy. Whether it be unpopular or popular, I am decidedly of opinion that the Superior Court judges in Canada are not sufficiently paid. It is a well known fact that the leaders of the bar in Toronto are earning from \$10,000 to \$30,000 a year, and we cannot expect our best men to give up their practice and accept a judgeship at a salary of

\$5,000 or \$6,000 a year. If something be not done we will find a great difficulty in getting the best men on the bench, and if we do get a good man occasionally to go on the bench we will probably find that he will resign to renew his practice at the bar. We have had cases already of men not satisfied with their position on the bench going back to the bar, making four or five times their salaries as judges.

Mr. WALLACE. Name.

Mr. DENISON. There is no necessity to name. It is well known that such cases have occurred, and it is desirable that they should not occur. We want the best men on the bench, and not second class men. Canada can afford to pay her judges a proper salary. In every country in the world the judges are the best men, and are well paid, with the exception of this country.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the United States?

Mr. DENISON. I do not care what they pay on the other side of the line, or what they do, but in England, France and on the continent everywhere, they pay their judges properly, and I do not see why we should not do so here. As to the County Court judges, I am of opinion they do not receive what they ought to get. I do not know how it is in the County of Grey, but in the County of York they do not receive what they are entitled to.

Mr. WALLACE. I think it is rather an extraordinary coincidence that the hon. gentlemen outside of the legal profession who have advocated an increase in the salaries of the judges are themselves likely to appear in a short time before those judges to answer for their conduct at the last election. Of course we do not impute their motion to any idea that when their cases come before those judges they may be better considered on that ground, but the public outside may view it in that light. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Denison) has stated that judges have resigned their positions on the bench to resume the practice of their profession. He has not mentioned any names, and in Ontario I think the cases are very few, if any.

Mr. DAVIN. Sam. Blake.

Mr. WALLACE. He did that because he was not promoted to the Chancellorship.

An hon. MEMBER. Oliver Mowat.

Mr. WALLACE. He resigned to take the premiership of Ontario.

Mr. MULOCK. What about the Minister of Justice?

Mr. WALLACE. I am speaking of the Province of Ontario. He resigned to accept the position of Minister of Justice, which, I imagine, occupies the whole of his time, and leaves him no leisure to practice in the courts. I do not think the people are prepared to endorse any increase in the salaries of the judges. Men trained all their lives, whose training is as severe as that of the judges and who fill responsible positions where life and property are at stake, are getting only \$1,000, \$2,000, \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year. The further consideration must also be borne in mind that the judges receive a superannuation allowance when unfit for work, which is a very important consideration, and their labours are not very onerous. It is true that at

certain periods of the year they are pretty busily employed, but I do not think as a rule they are overworked, and they have a good deal of spare time.

Mr. DEVLIN. The point I wish to make is not exactly that the judges are overworked, but that the Superior Court judges in the rural districts, whose work is as heavy as that of the judge in the cities, receive only \$4,000 a year, whereas the latter receive \$5,000 a year. In advocating the increase, I was not actuated by any motive such as that suggested by the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), for I am one of those who have the good fortune not to have their elections contested, nor have I any selfish interest, since not being a lawyer I stand a very poor chance of being promoted to the bench; but I find it strange that already two judges have left the district of which I spoke. For instance we had a very eminent judge there in the person of Judge Wurtele, who left the district to take a position on the bench in the city of Montreal, where no doubt it is more pleasant to reside, beside the additional incentive of enjoying a well deserved promotion. Again Judge Bourgeois has removed to the town of Three Rivers, where, though his salary is not increased, the work is lighter. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the fact that, no doubt, very shortly the district will be divided into two. There will be the district of Ottawa and the district of Pontiac. The contract for the erection of the court house in Hull has been given out, and considerable money has been paid in connection with it. The difficulty in the new district of Pontiac is overcome, in connection with the site, and the work will shortly proceed. I should like to know if the same judge will have to preside over the two districts as he does to-day. We see now that the same judge has more to do than he would have to do over a smaller district or in a smaller circuit.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The reasons that have been given for the discrimination between city and rural judges are sound, and will appear to be sound to hon. members on reflection. It is true that they are the same in rank and that the judge in the district of Ottawa is the peer of the judge in the district of Montreal, but the difference arises from the difference in the cost of living, from the amount of work performed, from the amounts which are in litigation, and with regard also to the emoluments which are received by the profession in the two places. The hon. gentleman has referred to Mr. Justice Wurtele. Judge Wurtele was promoted from Ottawa to Montreal, but I am sure he is worse off in a financial point of view than he was before. The member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has put a question to me as to whether I am in favour of increasing the salaries of the judges now. If I am to answer the question in view of the inadequacy of judicial salaries I would say yes, because I have been for many years, seeing the amount of duties which the judges perform, seeing the amount earned by the profession as compared with former years, of the opinion that the salaries of the judges should be increased. It is a great mistake to imagine that, when vacancies occur on the bench, we are overwhelmed with applications from persons who are desirous to fill those vacancies. I would repudiate such an insinuation for the sake of the profession itself, even

if I had no other reasons. But the applications made to us are not numerous, and they are more rare with every vacancy that occurs; and that is especially true in the large centres of population. In fact, we find it more difficult to fill the offices as each vacancy occurs. There can be no greater mistake than to imagine that we ought to recruit our judges from failures at the bar. No doubt there have been excellent judges who had not succeeded at the bar, but these cases are very few indeed. More than that, while there is a great deal of truth in what some hon. gentlemen have said that the salaries seem to some to be liberal, I believe it is to the interest of every person in this country not only to see that the judges are a highly qualified body but to see that they are sufficiently paid, and enabled to keep up a position in which they may receive respect and deference from their fellow men. It would be unfortunate if our judicial officers should sink below the best rank in society. Many other questions arise in regard to this matter, as to whether the finances of the country would warrant a change being made, whether the proposition I previously made should be adopted, that we should commence with the Superior Court judges, leaving the County Court judges to a future time. I could not answer the hon. gentleman's question to-night, but I may do so later in the session.

Mr. McMULLEN. I find that the chief justice of the States receives \$10,500 a year, the assistant judges \$10,000 each, and the associate judges \$6,000. In the State of Michigan the judges receive \$2,500 and travelling expenses, while our judges only receive \$2,000. I think we can fairly pay as much as they pay in the State of Michigan. In one county in the States a man ran for county judge. He had run for years around the country as a peddler. He was asked what his qualifications were for the position of county judge, and he was obliged not to go to the vote. I agree with the Minister of Justice that we want the best talent and the best ability on the bench, because we are all interested in having our cases decided according to the best judgment that can be given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There will be an important committee sitting to-morrow, and I would therefore suggest that we should stop here.

Mr. FOSTER. I regret exceedingly to move that the committee rise when so little has been done. We have been sitting for eight hours, and only three items have been passed. At this rate, we have to fear that we shall be here until September or October. However, I move that the committee rise and report the resolutions.

Motion agreed to, and Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

CORPUS CHRISTI—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that when this House adjourns at its next sitting, it shall stand adjourned until Friday next at three o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House do now adjourn.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m. (Wednesday).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 27th May, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 79) respecting the Canadian Land and Investment Company, Limited.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor.)

Bill (No. 81) to incorporate the Canadian Order of Home Circles.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

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

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Septennial Benevolent Society.—(Mr. Coatsworth.)

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Saskatchewan Railway and Mining Company.—(Mr. Wallace.)

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 85) further to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act. He said: The chief object of the Bill is to provide power for the exemption of steamboats when registered in the United Kingdom or elsewhere out of Canada, under those circumstances under which we have practically exempted that class of steamboats in the past. I refer particularly to those steamers chartered in Canada every summer season, and plying chiefly on the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence, which are registered in Great Britain and which possess the Imperial Board of Trade certificates. Under the operation of the Steamboat Inspection Act as it stands, it appears, according to a recent decision given by the Minister of Justice, that the Marine Department will be obliged to insist on those vessels going through a double inspection and paying double inspection fees, although possessing a certificate, not expired, from the Imperial Board of Trade. That is the main object of the first part of the Bill. There are several other sections of less importance; one, for instance, to perfect the existing law in regard to limited certificates. Certificates are granted to vessels plying on certain waters only and limited to those waters; but, under the law as it stands, a vessel having obtained this limited certificate and violating its terms by plying outside of the waters for which it holds a certificate, cannot be punished, as it appears impossible to enforce the penalties for that violation. So the next section supplements the provisions of the existing law. Then there is also a provision inserted at the suggestion of the chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, and in consequence of the great inconvenience the shipping interest often feel from the fact that unless the Board of Steamboat Inspectors is sitting a man who has passed his examination and whose examination papers have been certified, except the formality of submitting them to a meeting of a quorum of the board, is compelled to wait and