

to the formation of a Cabinet, because it has full confidence that His Excellency will follow the precedents laid down and will do the best in the interests of the country in forming his Cabinet. I hope, therefore, that the House will accept the motion to adjourn on the ground that it is proper, that it is expedient, and that it is respectful to the memory of the late leader of the House that we should adjourn until after his burial has taken place.

Motion agreed to on division.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is an item on the Order paper which requires to be disposed of in order that the business of the House may be kept in proper shape. I, therefore, move :

That the Order of the House in regard to the attendance of Michael Connolly at the bar of the House this day be discharged, and that the said Michael Connolly be summoned to appear at the bar of this House on Tuesday, 16th June instant, at the hour of four o'clock in the afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 16th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Ontario and Qu' Appelle Land Company.—(Mr. Trow.)

Bill (No. 103) to further amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Barron.)

QUEBEC SKATING RINK.

Mr. DEWDNEY moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on Friday next, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to authorize the Governor in Council to convey to the Quebec Skating Club certain Ordnance lands in the city of Quebec, subject to such provisions and conditions as the Governor in Council deems proper.

A NEW MINISTRY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to read to the House a statement that has been entrusted to me by the Hon. Mr. Abbott, a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, as follows:—

Having obtained the requisite permission from His Excellency, I desire to make a statement of proceedings after the death of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. It was felt by His Excellency that the state of public affairs did not necessitate the formation of a new Cabinet until the grave had closed over the late Premier and the last honours had been paid him. On the morning following the funeral, His Excellency, exercising his constitutional right, applied to the Hon. Sir John Thompson for his advice with respect to the steps which should be taken for the formation of a new Government. Later, on the same day, by Sir John Thompson's advice, I was

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

myself summoned by His Excellency, and, after consideration, I accepted, on the following day, the duty which His Excellency desired me to assume. I, therefore, communicated with my colleagues and requested their consent to remain in their respective offices, and with their assent submitted to His Excellency my recommendation that they should be continued in the positions, which His Excellency was pleased to approve, and he also sanctioned my assuming the departmental office of President of the Council. The vacancy caused by the lamented death of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald has not been filled, and pending the appointment of a successor the affairs of the Department of Railways will be administered by a member of the Cabinet.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved second reading of Bill (No. 14) with respect to certain matters affecting the Administration of Justice.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Mr. BARRON. I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to the fact that in some of the counties to which is attached jurisdiction such as it is now proposed to add to the county, the county court judge already, under the Ontario Government, does the work and receives salary from the Provincial Government. If this becomes law, I suppose it will not interfere with the jurisdiction, so far as it is claimed by the Local Government.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The jurisdiction is now exercised in various parts of the Dominion by the judge of the adjoining county, or another judge who may happen to be called in. He is not, I think, called in by the Provincial Government, although it is very likely the Provincial Government approves of the arrangement. He does not receive any salary, but doubts have arisen as to his having jurisdiction when so called in, and conflicting decisions have been rendered on that point; the First Minister of Ontario has requested that this legislation should be introduced. In fact, nearly all the provisions of the Bill are enacted to remove doubts which have arisen in Ontario, and in pursuance of an arrangement arrived at between the Attorney General of Ontario and myself.

On section 4,

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desire to amend this clause by inserting in the second line after the word "offices" the following words:—"either by the Governor General in Council, or, previous to the passing of the British North America Act, by other competent authority." I think the Committee will agree with me that the provisions of sections 1 and 4 should be made retroactive, to remove doubts which have arisen as to jurisdiction of judges who assumed the authority it is here intended they shall have. I, therefore, propose to insert in clause 1 the words: "shall be deemed always to have extended."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if, in conferring upon these county court judges this additional duty, by which they will be compelled to go into the additional territory that may be assigned to them by the Provincial Governments, he contemplates making any provision for increased remuneration? We have some very large districts, and additional

expense will be thrown on the judge in the shape of travelling expenses. If a judge is to perform his duty in two districts and save the appointment of another judge, some additional pay should be given him, or at least an allowance for travelling expenses. I have in my mind the position of a judge who has two districts under his care at present. It was only yesterday he told me that his travelling expenses to one district and return home cost him \$45.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It is not contemplated to insert anything in this Bill upon that subject. The Bill is not intended by any means to make provision for the case of a judgeship being left vacant and another judge being called on to perform permanently the duties in addition to his own, but it is intended merely to provide for an emergency. We should never call upon a judge of one county to exercise jurisdiction in another county permanently. Those duties are now exercised at the request of the provincial authorities or of a judge who may be ill: and it is intended also to apply to the case of a judge suddenly removed by death or other disability when there is business requiring immediate judicial attendance. When cases arise under section 3 for the calling in of any county court judge, we will have to consider whether provisions should not be made for paying him, inasmuch as he receives no salary if he is of the class mentioned in section 3. If such cases arise, it would be necessary to ask for an appropriation in that regard, but it is not proposed to make any such provision in the Bill. In fact, section 3 could only be enforced if the judge were willing to act without remuneration, or if he would trust to an appropriation being made by Parliament afterwards. The object of the Bill, as I have stated, is not to introduce any new system of administering the county court jurisdiction, but rather to remove doubts as to the class of cases in regard to which one judge, as a matter of courtesy or of necessity, is called upon to perform duties for another judge.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Section 2 compels the judge to act. It would be better to say that it shall be lawful for a judge to exercise the duties in such a case.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. The second section imposes the duty upon any judge to go to any district that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may decide. I do not think the Local Government pays the expenses in these cases, and there ought to be some restriction on their powers, or some provision made for these expenses. It is imposing a very onerous duty upon the judges.

Mr. BARRON. If any county court judge is asked by the Lieutenant Governor in Council to go to another district, his expenses are paid by the Local Government, in the same way as the county court judge in Victoria, who has been asked to take the Division Courts in the County of Haliburton, is paid by the Local Government.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The additional duty is imposed upon the county court judge of going to an adjoining or any other county, and no provision whatever is made for his remuneration, although he may be compelled to go. If the object of the Bill be what the Minister of Justice says it is, I do not see the necessity for the first part of section 2

at all. It would be sufficient to provide that the county court judge shall have power to hear cases in any other county, but, if it is left as it is, the county court judge ought not to be compelled to leave his own county and go to another without some provision being made for his remuneration. The fact that the Local Government makes some provision does not affect this matter at all. When the Lieutenant Governor in Council orders the judge to go to another county, the judge receives remuneration, but by this Bill the Federal Government takes power to compel a county court judge to go to another county, and I think that is unfair to the county court judges. It is true that in the western part of the Province of Ontario the county court judges have very little to do. In most of those counties there are two judges, the senior receiving \$2,600 and the junior \$2,200 each, including \$200 for travelling expenses, although there is really work for only one judge, and the Government might very well call upon one of those judges to discharge duties elsewhere. But, in general, I think the point taken by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) is correct, and that, if the Government can call upon any judge to go from one end of the province to the other, they should not do so without providing for his remuneration.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would ask the Committee to remember what I have already stated, that this is not an attempt to introduce a new system of administering justice, but to provide for cases of emergency. Whenever a judge is called upon under section 2 to discharge a duty which is onerous to him, I think he may rely upon it that Parliament will do what is just in regard to his disbursements. Of course, it would be absurd to ask for any salary, because we have a right to his services during the whole year. I would ask my hon. friends opposite to remember that section 2 is simply a re-enactment of the legislation of the Province of Ontario in regard to this matter. Doubts have arisen as to the right of the Local Legislature to pass such legislation, and we have introduced that provision to set those doubts at rest. The Federal authority is not taking the power to itself to order a judge from one end of the province to another. We only take power to make an Order in Council of that kind when we are called upon by the Local Government to do so. The Provincial and the Federal authorities must, therefore, concur, and I think it is not unreasonable that this provision should be made. Under the rare cases that will arise under this enactment, no doubt a fair provision will be made by Parliament for travelling expenses, as it is made by the Local Governments when, for instance, a Queen's Counsel is called upon to hold a criminal court, and Parliament has been asked to give the same indemnity for expenses to the *ad hoc* judge as would be given to the judge appointed by the Federal authorities. No difficulty has ever occurred of the kind referred to, and whenever it does occur, I have no doubt it will be met by this Parliament.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). After the explanation of the Minister of Justice, I do not think there will be any difficulty in the matter. We are pretty sure that if judges are called upon to perform these duties, they will make application, either to this Parliament or to the Local Legislature, for remuneration, and no doubt they will get it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I must ask the Committee to leave the Bill in committee in order that I may draw up with some care a clause to meet the needs which have been developed in the discussion. I move that the Committee rise and report.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I believe there are cases still in litigation, and it would not be fair to take away their rights by Acts of Parliament. I hope the hon. gentleman will have regard to these cases.

Committee rose and reported progress.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

The Order being read :

Michael Connolly, the witness named in the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, to attend at the Bar of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms will please see that Mr. Connolly is in attendance.

The DEPUTY SERGEANT-AT-ARMS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Michael Connolly is in attendance.

Mr. SPEAKER. Admit the gentleman.

MICHAEL CONNOLLY came before the Bar.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. For convenience, I move that the report of the sub-committee and the exhibits annexed thereto, be read in the presence of the witness, in order that he may have full cognizance thereof, after which I propose to put a question to him.

Motion agreed to, and the Assistant Clerk read the report, as follows :—

The Select Standing Committee to whom was referred certain statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., with instructions to enquire fully into the said allegations, and especially, but without limiting the scope of such enquiry, to investigate all circumstances connected therewith, and the payments and other matters mentioned in the said statements, beg leave to present as their First Report, the following Report of the Sub-Committee, to which they have unanimously agreed, viz. :—

REPORT OF SUB-COMMITTEE. HOUSE OF COMMONS, 5th June, 1891.

The Sub-Committee on Privileges and Elections have unanimously agreed to the annexed Draft Report on the reference to them in the case of Michael Connolly, a witness refusing to produce certain books required by the Committee; and they recommend it to the Committee for adoption as the Report to be submitted to the House.

D. GIROUARD, *Chairman*.
J. N. S. D. THOMPSON,
J. A. CHAPLEAU,
DAVID MILLS,
F. LANGELIER.

DRAFT REPORT SUBMITTED BY THE SUB-COMMITTEE.

The Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections have the honour to report that, in pursuance of the reference made to the Committee by the House on the eleventh day of May last, several witnesses have been in part examined, and a large number of documents have been produced.

One of the witnesses so examined in part was Michael Connolly, a member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Company, mentioned in the reference. The said Michael Connolly's summons required him to produce a number of documents and books of account.

The witness having attended with documents and books of account containing entries relating to the matters under enquiry, and being under examination, was required to produce the books and place them under the control of the Committee.

This demand he distinctly refused to comply with. He was likewise required to hand certain of these books to a member of the Committee who expressed a desire to look at them in order to put certain questions to the witness relating to certain matters of account which were supposed to be entered therein. This was also refused by the witness.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

The proceedings of the Committee, and the testimony of the witness, will appear more in detail by the Exhibits hereto annexed, marked "A" and "B," being the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee, and the shorthand writer's notes on the evidence.

Alexander Ferguson, Esquire, Q.C., referred to in the exhibits, was counsel for the witness and for another member of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Company.

Your Committee, being of the opinion that the discharge of the duties of the Committee, imposed on them by the House, requires that the books should be placed under the control and in the possession of your Committee, and that the books be placed in the hands of members of your Committee for the purpose of interrogating the witnesses, report the refusal of Michael Connolly to obey the orders of your Committee in these particulars, and request the action of the House thereon.

All which is respectfully submitted.

D. GIROUARD,
Chairman.

WEDNESDAY, 3rd June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT :

Messrs. Girouard, *Chairman*,

Adams,	German,
Amyot,	Girouard,
Baker,	Ives,
Beausoleil,	Kirkpatrick,
Burdett,	Langelier,
Cameron (Huron),	Laurier,
Chapleau,	Lavergne,
Coatsworth,	Lister,
Costigan,	McDonald (Victoria),
Curran,	McLeod,
Choquette,	Mills (Bothwell),
Daly,	Moncreiff,
Davies,	Mulock,
Desaulniers,	Quimet,
Dickey,	Tarte,
Edgar,	Thompson (Sir John),
Flint,	Tupper,
Fraser,	Weldon.—36.

The minutes of the last meeting were read and confirmed.

Mr. Michael Connolly was recalled, and, in answer to the Chairman, stated that the books and papers which he had been ordered to bring with him had arrived, and he now produced them.

Mr. Ferguson stated, on behalf of the Messrs. Connolly, that they wished it to be understood that these books and papers were not produced before the Committee in the ordinary sense of the term. There was a great deal in the books which had no relevancy whatever with the subject under investigation, and the Messrs. Connolly did not think that their private books should be thrown open to the public, as they would be more or less, were they produced in the ordinary way. They were quite prepared to submit them to an expert accountant appointed by the Committee, or to search the books themselves and give any information required by the Committee, but they could not give up possession of the books.

This not being considered satisfactory, it was moved by Mr. Edgar, that the books of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., now produced by the witness, Michael Connolly, be kept under the control of the Committee until further orders.—Motion agreed to.

Mr. Connolly submitted a list of the books and papers which he had with him; he then produced seven books and papers, which were filed and marked as exhibits as follows :

Exhibit X 2.—Specifications and contract for Esquimaux Graving Dock.

Exhibit Y 2.—Contract for closing and opening of Princess Louise Embankment.

Exhibit Z 2.—Contract for dredging Quebec Harbour Works.

Exhibit A 3.—Contract for Quay-wall and entrance for Wet Dock.

Exhibit B 3.—Contract for dredging Wet Basin, Quebec Harbour.

Exhibit C 3.—Contract for Lévis Graving Dock.

Exhibit D 3.—Trial balance sheet, British Columbia Graving Dock.

Witness being ordered to produce cash books in connection with the Lévis Graving Dock, declined to do so; stating at the same time that he was willing to do with them as he had already suggested.

The Clerk being ordered to lay the said cash books on the Table, the witness declared that he would not allow

any man to lay hands on the books, but he consented to have them marked and identified. And after some discussion the books were accordingly identified and marked as Exhibits P 3 to U 3.

The Committee then adjourned till to-morrow, Thursday, at 10.30 a.m.

THURSDAY, 4th June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Messrs. Girouard, *Chairman*,

Adams,	Fraser,
Amyot,	German,
Baker,	Girouard,
Barron,	Ives,
Beausoleil,	Kirkpatrick,
Burdett,	Langelier,
Cameron (<i>Huron</i>),	Laurier,
Chapleau,	Lavergne,
Coatsworth,	McDonald (<i>Victoria</i>),
Costigan,	Mills (<i>Bothwell</i>),
Choquette,	Moncreiff,
Curran,	Mulock,
Daly,	Tarte,
Davies,	Thompson (<i>Sir John</i>),
Desaulniers,	Tupper,
Dickey,	Weidon,
Edgar,	Wood (<i>Brockville</i>).—35.
Flint,	

The minutes of the last meeting were read, amended, and confirmed as amended.

Mr. Ferguson stated, in regard to the books belonging to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., that, after the adjournment of yesterday's sitting, they had been put in a box in the next room (No. 50) under lock and key, the key being in the possession of Mr. Connolly, that they were still there, and that they were at the disposal of the Committee in the same way that they were yesterday.

Mr. Michael Connolly, being recalled, was ordered to produce the cash books in connection with the Lévis Graving Dock contract.

Having brought the books, and being requested by a member of the Committee to hand them to him that he might have an opportunity of examining their contents, Mr. Connolly refused to allow the books to pass out of his possession.

On motion of Sir John Thompson, it was

Resolved, That a sub-committee be appointed to report to the House the facts which have transpired in relation to the books of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. from the minutes and stenographer's notes, and that such sub-committee consist of the Chairman, Messrs. Mills (*Bothwell*), Langelier, Chapleau, and the mover.

Mr. A. Gobeil, Deputy Minister of Public Works, was sworn and examined.

During his examination certain letters and papers were read and filed, and marked as Exhibits B 3 to Q 4, both inclusive.

The Committee then adjourned until to-morrow at 10.30 a. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Wednesday, 3rd June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a. m., Mr. Girouard in the chair.

Investigation into certain circumstances and statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., resumed.

Mr. MICHAEL CONNOLLY (recalled).

WITNESS.—I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that all the books we have in our possession are here in the building and we are ready here to submit them to inspection, but I do not think we ought to have them open to the public. If there is any particular entry wanted I am ready to read it.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Will you produce on the table of this Committee all the books, contracts, vouchers, letters, receipts, cheques and other documents in your possession or under your control in connection with: first, the dredging of the harbour of Quebec since 1882; second, the cross-wall in connection with the same work; third, the dredging of the wet basin in the same harbour; fourth, the south wall or retaining wall in the same harbour; fifth, the graving dock at Lévis; sixth, the graving dock at Esquimalt, as ordered by a subpoena issued by this Committee upon the 20th May last, and again by a second summons dated the

20th May last, and again by an order given on the 20th May last to you?—A. Here is a list of the documents we have, and if there is anything here that this Committee—

By the Chairman:

Q. Is this a list of the documents asked for by Mr. Tarte?—A. I believe it is.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. Do you produce the documents asked for here?—A. Yes; I do.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Will you read the list you have produced?—A. Lévis Graving Dock—two cash books, two ledgers and two journals, Quebec Harbour Improvements—two cash books, one ledger and one journal, South Wall—ledger and journal, Esquimalt Dock—two ledgers, three journals and one cash book.

By Mr. Amyot:

Q. These books now belong to the Committee?—A. No; they do not belong to the Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON.—The statement I have to make on behalf of Mr. Michael and Nicholas K. Connolly is that they are ready and willing to attend before this Committee and to exhibit the books from time to time for the purpose of showing any particular entries therein, as to which witnesses may be examined pertaining to the charges referred for investigation in this matter. We take the position that these books contain a large number of accounts and transactions in no way pertaining to the subject of investigation before this Committee. There are a large number of unsettled accounts by the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., for which Nicholas K. Connolly and Michael Connolly are alone liable, and they submit that they should not be called upon to submit these books for general exploratory inspection, but that they should be called upon to produce them and point out entries and accounts from time to time as they are required for the purposes of the Committee, and that they should not be given up for general inspection and general discovery. They should remain in their own custody. The point I make is that in the general meaning of the word *production* they are not produced. The witness is attending here under a subpoena *duces tecum*, but they are not produced in the ordinary sense in which documents would be produced in a suit. He is here as a witness producing them from time to time, the books remaining in his custody.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. You have handed to this Committee a list of the books which we have now in our possession?—A. A list of the books I have here yet.

Q. But you have produced here a list of books?—A. Yes.

Q. Have you got any other papers, vouchers, receipts, cheques or notes belonging to you, or under your control, bearing on the works that are the subject of this enquiry?—A. All the papers I have are here. There is another list not enumerated in that list, but they are here. This is the list:—1. Trial balance-sheet, Esquimalt Graving Dock. 2. Contracts—(a) Graving Dock, Esquimalt; (b) Closing and opening of Louise Embankment; (c) Graving Dock, Point Lévis; (d) Contract for dredging Quebec Harbour; (e) Cross-wall; (f) Quebec Harbour dredging; (g) Letter H. F. Perley to Larkin, Connolly & Co., May 17, 1883.

Q. Is there a trial balance-sheet?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you produce it?—A. With pleasure. Here is the contract for the Esquimalt Graving Dock (marked X 2).

Q. You say you have brought the contracts here?—A. All the contracts enumerated in that list are here.

Q. What are they?—A. For closing of the opening in the Louise Embankment (marked Y 2); Contract for dredging the Quebec Harbour works (marked Z 2); Contract for the construction of the quay wall; an entrance to the wet dock, Quebec, between the Quebec Harbour Commissioners and Messrs. Larkin, Connolly & Co., dated Quebec, 6th June, 1883 (marked A 3); Contract for dredging and removing material from wet basin, Quebec Harbour Commissioners and Larkin, Connolly & Co., No. 3796 (marked B 3); graving dock contract, Point Lévis (marked C 3). This is a trial balance-sheet of the Esquimalt Graving Dock (marked D 3).

By Mr. Edgar:

Q. Is that the final one?—A. I cannot tell.

Q. Look at it?—A. It says: "Trial balance of Esquimalt Graving Dock up to date."

Q. What date?—A. I do not see any date on it.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. In the list of the books I see "Lévis Graving Dock—two cash-books." Will you produce them?—A. They are all here, and I am ready to produce any item you want.

Q. Will you produce them?—A. I must decline to give them up.

Q. Will you please put those two books on the table of this Committee?—A. The books are on the table. I am willing to point out any particular item in the books and read it to the Committee, and willing to remain here from day to day and be examined on any item.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are ordered to lay those two books on the table and leave them under the control of the Committee?—A. I am quite willing to leave them on the table and open the books and read any portion that the Committee may desire, but to turn them over to the custody of the Committee I must decline.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. I ask you to produce those two books and have them identified?

(No answer.)

The CHAIRMAN.—Let the Clerk take the books.

WITNESS.—I decline to allow the Clerk to touch those books.

By the Chairman:

Q. You are ordered to lay on the table the above two cash books for the purpose of being marked and identified?—A. I am quite willing to do that, but I do not know exactly what that means. If it means turning the books over to the custody of the Committee, I must decline; but if it does not mean that, if it is intended for the purpose of investigation, I am quite willing to do that.

Q. Are you quite willing to lay the books on the table for the purpose of being marked and identified?—A. Yes.

Q. Give us those two cash books in order that a letter may be put on each of them?—A. I may state, if you will allow me, that we have made every effort since yesterday to ascertain the address of our bookkeeper. If possible, we will have him here. He can identify everything in these books. We have nothing to hide or conceal.

The following exhibits were filed:

LEVIS GRAVING DOCK.

- Exhibit E 3.—Cash book.
- Exhibit F 3.—Second cash book.
- Exhibit G 3.—First ledger.
- Exhibit H 3.—Second ledger.
- Exhibit I 3.—First journal.
- Exhibit J 3.—Second journal.

QUEBEC HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

- Exhibit K 3.—Cash book.
- Exhibit L 3.—Second cash book.
- Exhibit M 3.—First ledger.
- Exhibit N 3.—Second ledger.

SOUTH WALL.

- Exhibit O 3.—Ledger.
- Exhibit P 3.—Journal.

ESQUIMALT DOCK.

- Exhibit Q 3.—Cash book.
- Exhibit R 3.—First journal.
- Exhibit S 3.—Second journal.
- Exhibit T 3.—Third journal.
- Exhibit U 3.—Ledger.

The CHAIRMAN.—I understand, Mr. Ferguson, that you undertake to produce the books here to-morrow?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yes.

Mr. MULLOCK.—We do not want any undertaking.

Mr. FERGUSON.—Then I withdraw my undertaking.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Can you point out in any one of the books any entry for expense, for notes of \$25,000 in 1885. I think?—A. I suppose I could. It would take me a good while to find it, though.

Q. Will you try—from 1883 to 1885?—A. What book is the entry in?

Q. The cross-wall.—A. What date?

Q. I cannot give you the date.—A. You see I will have to hunt through the whole book.

Q. You will hunt then?—A. What year was the entry you speak of?

Q. I did not make the entry myself. Did you make the entry about the notes?—A. I did not.

Q. Who did?—A. I think that all the entries in these books were made by Martin P. Connolly.

Q. Is it to your knowledge that some entry was made about \$25,000 notes, given in 1883, in connection with the cross-wall?—A. I cannot say that there was.

Q. Did you ever see any entry in the books about these notes?—A. I never examined the books. My time was

fully occupied on the works directing the operation of the men and that sort of thing.

Q. Then you are not in a position to say when that entry was made, if made?—A. No, Sir, I am not.

Q. You cannot point out to us the books, or the book, in which such entry should have been made or has been made?—A. No; all I can do is to bring the books here and hunt up any item you tell me, which, of course, I am quite willing to do.

Q. Can you tell us if to your knowledge any entry of about \$22,000 in notes in 1884 was entered in the books?—

A. These books? These books are the books of the Quebec Harbour Improvements.

Q. Have you the books in connection with the graving dock at Lévis?—A. I have.

Q. And the supplementary contracts?—A. I have them here.

Q. Are you in a position to point out to me in what book that entry of about \$22,000 notes was made?—A. I am not.

Q. Did you make the entry yourself?—A. No.

Q. You never saw such an entry?—A. I never examined the books nor audited them.

By Mr. Davies:

Q. Did you see it?—A. I may have seen it or I may not. As I said before, my time was fully occupied.

Q. Did you see the entry or did you not?—A. I won't swear that I did or did not.

By Mr. Tarte:

Q. Did you ever see any of the cheque books of the firm?—A. Yes; I have seen many cheque books.

Q. Have you some of those cheque books left with you?—A. There are none of them here. I telegraphed to Quebec yesterday afternoon, when you gave an order for the books, and I think all the cheque books, letter books and vouchers will be here to-day.

Q. Are you prepared to hand over to this Committee the vouchers that are coming up to-day?—A. I am prepared to hand over or explain anything to the Committee that I am able to explain, but to give up possession of the books, I must decline, as I said before.

Q. I do not speak of the books, but the vouchers, receipts, papers or notes that you may have in your possession?—A. I have no objection to the vouchers, but the letter books must remain in our possession. I am willing to read any letters in those books.

Q. Will you answer in a positive manner that you have no objection to handing over letter books, cheque books, notes and receipts that you may have in your possession in connection with the cross-wall, dredging in Quebec, and the graving dock at Esquimalt and Lévis?—A. I have answered that. I am willing to turn over any vouchers we have, but letter books and account books we must consider in our possession, of course allowing the Committee the privilege of hearing any entry that they may wish, or having any letter read.

Q. You have stated a minute ago that you have no knowledge that an entry for \$25,000 notes was made in 1883?—A. No; I did not say that. They may be there or they may not.

Q. You said, to your knowledge there was no such entry?—A. I said nothing of the kind. I said they may be there. If you ask me to read any item, I will.

Q. Can you point out to me where that entry is?—A. I cannot. I will have to look it up.

By Mr. Daly:

Q. Will you kindly turn up the expense account of the Quebec Harbour Improvements in May, 1883?—A. I cannot find it.

The Committee then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, THURSDAY, 4th June, 1891.

The Committee met at 10.30 a.m., Mr. Girouard in the chair.

Investigation into certain circumstances and statements made in connection with the tenders and contracts respecting the Quebec Harbour Works, &c., resumed.

Mr. AMYOT.—What has become of the books, and are they in the possession of the Committee?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yesterday the books were taken by the Messrs. Connolly into the other room and put in a box which they had there for that purpose and which they had brought from Quebec, and locked them up under lock and key, the key being in possession of Mr. Connolly, and they are there yet.

The CHAIRMAN.—Are the books now at the disposal of the Committee?

Mr. FERGUSON.—In the same way as yesterday. They will be produced here when called for as yesterday.

Mr. DAVIES.—Mr. Ferguson claims control and will not give them to the Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON.—Exactly.

Mr. EDGAR.—Are the books here for the Committee to examine?

Mr. FERGUSON.—No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK.—Are they open for examination by any member of the Committee on any item connected with this enquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON.—Yes.

MICHAEL CONNOLLY recalled.

By the Chairman:

Q. Will you bring those two cash books, please?—A. Yes, Sir: here are the two cash books.

By Mr. Choquette:

Q. Let me see the two cash books. Will you hand those books to me that I may look into them?—A. No, Sir; I must decline to let the books pass out of my possession.

By Mr. Moncrieff:

Q. I would ask Mr. Connolly, whether you would have any objection to let any member of the Committee look at any page of the book while you stand by and have possession of the book?—A. Not the slightest.

Q. You are perfectly willing that I should go there and turn over every page of the book?—A. No: not every page. I wish them to specify what particular page they want.

Q. Of every account belonging to this investigation?—A. Yes: every account from start to finish.

Q. At the same time keeping control of your books?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Kirkpatrick:

Q. Why didn't you allow Mr. Choquette to look at your book?—A. Because he did not specify the account.

By Mr. Daly:

Q. I would like to know if Mr. Connolly has any specific reason for not wishing to produce the books in the manner required by Mr. Choquette?—A. I have, Sir. There are a great many unsettled claims in those books and a great many other matters not pertaining to this enquiry, that I do not want other people to prowl through.

Q. Can you give us the names of those people?—A. There are a great many contractors here that I do not want to have see our books.

Q. And there may be friends of the contractors on the Committee?—A. Just so.

By Mr. Amyot:

Q. Would you kindly state the names of some parties who have claims against Larkin, Connolly & Co. in 1883?—A. I must decline to state that.

Q. Do you give the same answer to 1884, 1885, 1886 and following years?—A. I must decline to give the name of any of our creditors.

Q. Would you give us an idea of the amount of claims there are?—A. They are not the subject of enquiry before this Committee.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved that the following question be put to the witness:—

Are you willing to place in the custody of the Committee of this House on Privileges and Elections, or in the custody of the Clerk of this House, for the purpose of reference to the said Committee, the several books of account which you produced when you appeared as a witness on the 3rd day of June instant before the said Committee, for the purpose of enabling the said Committee to pursue the investigation of the charges which were referred to the Committee by the order of this House on the 11th day of May last, and in relation to which you have been in part examined before the Committee?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. DALY moved:

That Michael Connolly, now at the Bar of the House, be heard by Counsel.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the question must be put and answered, unless Counsel desires to be heard in opposition to the question being put.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FERGUSON, Q.C. (*Counsel*). I am instructed, on behalf of Mr. Michael Connolly, now at the Bar of the House, to read the following statement as his statement; showing the reasons why he declined to give up the custody and possession of the books which he was requested to do by the Committee

on Privileges and Elections. The statement is as follows:—

"In obedience to the subpoena served upon me requiring me to bring with me certain books and papers, as follows, that is to say: All the books, contracts, vouchers, letters, receipts and other documents in my possession, belonging to me, or to the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., in connection with—1st, the dredging of the harbour of Quebec since 1882; 2nd, the cross-wall and lock in connection with the same harbour; 3rd, the Langevin memorial fund; 4th, the graving dock of Levis; 5th, the graving dock at Esquimalt; 6th, the dredging of the wet basin in the Quebec harbour; and 7th, the south wall or retaining wall in the same harbour, I appeared before the Committee of this Honourable House on Privileges and Elections on the 3rd and 4th of June instant with the books and papers called for. The books of account of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. that I brought with me in obedience to the subpoena, consisted of ledgers, journals and cash books, which contained some accounts and entries relating to the contract and public works referred to in the matters under investigation by the Committee, but they also contained a large number of accounts and entries which had no relation to or bearing upon said matters under enquiry. That these other accounts and entries related, amongst other things, to unsettled claims of the late firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. against other parties, to the indebtedness of the firm to other parties, to their dealings with sub-contractors and employes, to the cost of doing the work, and the books also contained much valuable information of a practical character as to the carrying on of such works acquired only by years of practical experience, and many other matters of a private character. That these books are, and have for some time past been the property of the firm of M. & N. K. Connolly, composed of myself and N. K. Connolly, who were members of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co., and who acquired the interests of the other partners in that firm, and its assets, accounts and books. That I was not, nor was my partner, N. K. Connolly, one of the accused in respect of the charges under investigation before the Committee. That after being served with said subpoena, I was advised by Counsel that I must take the books to the Committee in obedience to the subpoena and submit to examination upon them as to any accounts or entries in them relating to the matters in question before the Committee, that I must also open them for inspection of these accounts and entries before the Committee and for the examination of any witness who could give evidence in regard to them, but that I would not be obliged to hand over the custody or possession of them or to have them examined indiscriminately by the Committee or by any one else. I was informed by Counsel that only to the extent mentioned would a court of justice, under the circumstances, enforce the production and discovery of the contents of the books, and that this honourable House, guided as it would be by the principles and rules adopted in respect of such matters in the courts of justice, would equally respect the private rights and interests of a witness under such circumstances, and would not require that I should part with the custody or control of the books or oblige me to submit them to the Committee for a

general inspection of their contents. That, acting upon his advice and in obedience to the subpoena, I brought the books before the Committee, and they were marked for identification by the clerk of the Committee, but I always retained custody of them. When asked by the members of the Committee to give up control of them and allow them to be generally inspected, I respectfully but firmly declined to do so on the grounds stated in the evidence and minutes of the proceedings of the Committee by myself and my Counsel, and which I have in this statement shortly put forward. That I, at the same time, submitted my willingness to attend with the books from time to time, whenever required, for the purpose of being examined upon them and having them inspected in regard to the accounts and entries relating to the matters in question, or so that they might be used on the examination of any other witnesses who could give evidence in regard to said accounts or entries, more especially Martin P. Connolly, the former book-keeper of the firm, who was in attendance on the Committee, and ready to be examined. That it was further stated in my behalf to the sub-committee appointed to prepare a report on this matter, that I was willing to attend with the books before a sub-committee of three for inspection from time to time, whenever required by the sub-committee, in so far as they related to the charges under investigation, in my presence and that of my counsel, with liberty to Mr. Tarte and his counsel and an expert, first agreed upon by all parties, to examine those portions of the books which related to the charges before the Committee. If I were forced to give up the custody or control of the books and submit them for general inspection, I believe my partner and myself would be greatly prejudiced in our private interests by the accounts and entries above referred to, not in question herein, being exposed to inspection. In view of the above facts and of the statements made by my counsel and myself in this statement and before the Committee as to my reasons for not giving up the custody of the books, I most humbly and respectfully submit to this most honourable House that I have fully complied with the requirements of the subpoena served upon me, that I have produced and submitted said books for inspection and examination to the same extent and in the same manner as would be required of me in any court of justice under similar circumstances, and even to a further extent, and that I ought not to be required by this honourable House to give up the custody of them or to allow a general examination of them to be made by the Committee or any one else. I also most respectfully submit that I should be forthwith discharged from further attendance at the Bar of this honourable House."

I may add to this statement, Mr. Speaker, that if this Honourable House sees fit, notwithstanding the reasons the witness has assigned why he should not be called on to give up the custody of his books, to still order that he should give up the custody of his books to the Committee, he is prepared to bow with submission to the Order of this honourable House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved :

That the witness, Michael Connolly, do now withdraw.

Mr. LAURIER. Subject to the Order of the House?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Oh, yes. I presume that no other member of the House has any question to submit, and I propose to offer a resolution on the subject. I presume that the question has been answered by the paper which has just been read, and I propose to treat that as being the answer to the question propounded.

Motion agreed to, and witness withdrew.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, everything connected with this transaction has, I know, received the most careful attention of the large Committee that was ordered by the House to pursue the investigation; but it is necessary besides, now that it has assumed this important phase, that members of the House who are not members of the Committee should carefully consider the course which this House ought to pursue in regard to the transaction. Therefore, before offering a resolution to you, I propose to call the attention of the House briefly to the circumstances which now present themselves, and which seem to me to call for our action. The Committee having undertaken the duty, in accordance with the order of the House, to make this investigation, issued a summons to this witness to appear on a certain day and to bring with him certain books of account, in which it was believed there were entries relating to the transactions which formed the subject of the charges referred to the Committee. On page 219 of the Votes and Proceedings it will be seen what those books were. There were a set of books in relation to the Lévis graving dock, which included cash-books, ledgers and journals; a set of books relating to the Quebec harbour improvements; a set of books relating to the south wall, and a set of books relating to the Esquimalt graving dock. I am relieved from the necessity of showing the House that entries in these books may have been, and likely were, pertinent to the subject of the Committee's investigation, by the statement which has just been read to the House, in which it is stated :

"The books of account of the firm of Larkin, Connolly & Co. that I brought with me, in obedience to the subpoena consisted of ledgers, journals and cash-books, which contained some accounts and entries relating to the contract and public works referred to in the matters under investigation by the Committee."

Therefore it is unnecessary for me to say to the House that these books are likely to contain entries bearing on the important enquiry the Committee is pursuing: the witness says they do contain those entries. The answer which the witness makes as his reason for not giving up the books, is briefly expressed in the passage following that which I have just read:—

"But they also contained a large number of accounts and entries which had no relation to or bearing upon said matters under enquiry."

This is the case with every set of account-books which a witness is ever called on to produce in any court of justice or in any kind of enquiry: and if the mere fact that the books called for contain entries not relating to the subject of enquiry, relieves the witness of any obligation to produce them or to submit them to an examination, then no witness would ever be obliged to submit books of accounts or to be examined with regard to them. The position, however, which the witness occupied when he came with these books of accounts, and when these books of accounts were identified, was the position in which a witness is placed in a court of

justice, producing them under a subpoena *duces tecum*. So far, I fully concur in the answer he has made, and to which his counsel has added supplementary remarks; but the position which he assumed, after producing the books and they were identified, was by no means, in my humble opinion, that which any witness would be allowed to assume in a court of justice. The position he took was this (I, of course, paraphrase his words): He said: "I am totally unacquainted with these books: I never made an entry in them, and have never examined them. I am willing to hold them in my hands and turn up any entry which the members of the Committee may specify." The House will see at once that no member of the Committee had had any access to these books or knew a single line in them; and the witness, who did not know what was in the books, because he had not examined them or made any entries in them, was to keep possession of them and turn up any entry he might be called on to refer to by persons who had never seen anything but the cover of the books. Of course that was quite equivalent to his refusing to produce the books at all. To show the House the analogy between the position the witness really occupied, although he was not conscious that he occupied it, if I may judge by his subsequent conduct, with that of a witness producing the books under a subpoena *duces tecum*, I may mention what actually transpired in the Committee after the refusal of the witness had been persisted in for some time. He was asked by a member of the Committee to turn up a certain page of a certain cash book and indicate a certain entry relating to a certain money transaction of which another witness had spoken. He said: "There is no entry there of any such sum of money." A member of the Committee said: "Hand your book to me that I may see for myself." That would be the right of any counsel in a court of justice. It might be that upon counsel seeing that page, he would find that the witness was not telling the truth, or he might find on the following page the very entry he was looking for, or he might find part of the entry under one date and part subsequently; but if the witness is to hold the books and allow no one to see them, he is complete master of the situation and may make any answer he chooses without fear of detection. Therefore I thought it was perfectly clear he was bound to pursue a different course. I thought he was bound to act as a witness in a court of justice, and that the members of the Committee were entitled to examine him as to the books, precisely as a counsel or a judge would examine him in a court of justice. I see he has taken the ground, in his answer, that he has complied with the law as fully as a witness would have been required to do in a court of justice. I think he has not complied with the law at all, and if these books are relevant to the enquiry, they are sealed books to us unless they can be investigated, as they would be in a court of justice. I hope the House will do the Committee the justice of believing in advance that the objectionable kind of examination to which the witness takes exception—examination into matters not necessarily involved in this inquiry—will not be gone into by the Committee. If the witness were brought before a court of justice and produced these books, the first duty of the court would be to see that no irrelevant impertinent enquiry into the

books would be allowed; but the witness must not be allowed to decide that question for himself, because, in that case, he could close and seal from the eye of the tribunal any passages he did not wish to expose. The judge would take ample precaution against an impertinent scrutiny into transactions that did not relate to the subject of the enquiry, and I have no doubt whatever the Committee will also take means to avoid any such scrutiny. I admit that an enquiry of this kind, by means of a committee composed of upwards of forty persons, sitting in the capacity of judges, is a very awkward proceeding, indeed, and a very inconvenient one sometimes, when we have to decide nice questions of this kind; but it is by no means beyond the power of the Committee to arrive at a method of testing what part of the books ought to remain closed. It may be that the witness is right in supposing that the best way to do that is to have a small sub-committee to decide whether the passages of the books he does not wish to turn up are relevant or not to the enquiry; and it is true he made to the Committee an offer that if we should appoint a committee of three he would supply those books for our examination. It was impossible that we should make any bargain or contract with the witness. We felt the Committee were entitled to dispose of the matter when he had put the books in their custody and were confident they would dispose of it fairly. I, therefore, beg to move a resolution, which is virtually an order of the House for the production of these books to the clerk of the House, in order that they may be referred to the Committee. In view of the statement made by the counsel for the witness, that, notwithstanding the protest he has made, the books would be produced if the House so ordered, I think we will wait until we see whether the statement of the counsel was made in good faith, before ordering the prisoner into custody of the Serjeant-at-arms. I, therefore, beg to move:

That Michael Connolly having been summoned by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred the statements made to this House on the 11th of May last by J. Israel Tarte, Esq., the member representing the Electoral District of Montmorency in this House, with power to send for persons and papers, and having hereupon appeared before said Committee, with certain books of account which have been identified and marked by the Clerk of the said Committee, as indicated in the Report of the Committee to this House, and having refused to place the said books of account under the control of the Committee or to permit the Committee to examine them for the purpose of conducting the investigation which the Committee were ordered to conduct by the Order of the House on the 11th May last:

This House doth now Order that the said books of account be now produced by the said Michael Connolly and delivered to the Clerk of this House.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—TREATY PAPERS.

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

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before you go into Supply, I would like to enquire of the Minister of Justice whether he has yet obtained the additional documents affecting the correspondence with Washington which were to have been produced in a day or two when we last separated?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Assent was given to the production of a further set of documents, and I will be able, I hope, to make a full statement on

the subject to the House to-morrow, indicating what the documents are which can be produced and the day on which they can be laid on the Table.

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

(In the Committee.)

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary. . . §99,511.59

Mr. MULOCK. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether it is at this penitentiary or at Dorchester that the manufacture of wooden-ware is carried on?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At Dorchester.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe that the total sums received from the farm of this penitentiary is nominally \$254. At what does the Minister estimate the total value of that farm? I think it covers about 200 acres, and I should think a considerable amount of produce of one kind and another ought to be received from it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot answer the question at the moment, but I will answer it before the Committee rises.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps the Minister would state what he is doing with these convicts. I see there are about 345 estimated for. What employment have you found for them in the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary; and, for that matter, I would be glad to know what conclusion the Minister has come to in regard to the troublesome question of the employment of convicts generally?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am in very much the same position in regard to that subject as I was last year, as a very large amount of work is being done in the way of construction, and in Kingston and St. Vincent de Paul gangs of men are employed in getting material, stone and other kinds of material, for carrying on the works which have been in progress for two or three years past. The capacity of the prison, without the completion of the wing which has been under construction for two or three years, is about exhausted, and the greater part of the new construction is being done by the convicts. We have also a large number working upon the farm, but the farming and work of construction, occupying in the case of Kingston, I think, some 80 men, in addition to the ordinary duties of the penitentiary, are the only resources we have in regard to the employment of labour. In Dorchester, which was indicated by the question put a few minutes ago by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), we have some machinery at which men are employed in making what is called wooden-ware—that is, buckets, tubs, pails, as well as brooms. A good deal of work in the way of construction has also been carried on at Dorchester on account of the building being new. We are not making any new work there, but the completion of the building has given us tolerably good employment for many hands. I may say that the question will come up almost immediately, if these works of construction are not carried on, as to what employment we shall give the convicts, and I have no hesitation in saying that, when we cannot get remunerative employment for them on

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

the farm, in works of construction, and in the ordinary work of carrying on the routine of the prison, it will be necessary for us to have some kind of manufacturing industries, which, as I know, are considered objectionable, but which, nevertheless, we shall be compelled to resort to in order to find satisfactory employment for the convicts. In times past, we have been able to give them a good deal of employment in making clothing for public purposes, such as the North-West Mounted Police, and it is possible that the manufacture of clothing for bodies like that and for the penitentiaries themselves will continue to give employment to many. The labour question so far has not been very serious, but it is likely to be very much more so very soon, and probably within another year. Speaking of the work of construction and the necessity of continuing it for some little time yet, I am inclined to think that in Kingston, when we have concluded the work there, we shall have to undertake the erection of an asylum for insane criminals. Under the present system, insane criminals are sent to Kingston from all parts of the Dominion, and there we have not sufficient accommodation to give them the requisite exercise. The building is very commodious as far as the interior accommodation is concerned, but the provision for outdoor exercise is very limited. I think it will be necessary for me to ask Parliament before very long for an appropriation for an asylum for insane criminals, and that will give ample work for the employment for the surplus labour at Kingston, which, as hon. gentlemen know, is the largest penitentiary we have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the number of insane criminals?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About thirty.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not know if it would be constitutional, but would it not be almost as easy, and perhaps better, to make an arrangement with the Local Government to have a large asylum there with a sufficient number of guards to take charge of the insane criminals instead of establishing a branch asylum for yourselves? I know there may be objections to that, but I think that, if the hon. gentleman starts a branch lunatic asylum of that kind, he will find that the cost will be enormous in proportion to the number of unfortunate lunatics who will have to be kept in confinement there.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It might be more economical to adopt that course, but I do not think it would comply with the plan upon which we send our criminal lunatics to the asylum. The cases are supposed to be studied under the care of alienists, who are skilled in the treatment of insane criminals, and I think it is desirable that that plan should be carried out as far as possible. No doubt if we were governed by motives of economy, it would be better to make arrangements with the provincial lunatic asylums, and change the law so that it could be done.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was not solely for reasons of economy that I made that suggestion, but because that unfortunate class, in many respects, are likely to be better treated, I am inclined to think, by men who have made the treatment of lunatics their special care for many years. The Minister is aware that if he is going

to obtain the same skill as can be obtained in the larger asylums, it will be difficult, or very expensive, to say the least. However, if he is prepared to go to the cost required, and if the objections, which I admit may exist, to mingle the two authorities together, appear too strong, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. I notice the receipts from the farms connected with these penitentiaries range from \$123 to \$250. I suppose this does not include the whole value of the products of the farm, but only the cash receipts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. If the hon. gentleman will refer to page 70 of my report for the year ended 30th June last, he will see a statement of the proceeds of the farm at St. Vincent de Paul, and on the credit side of the account the value is put at \$6,180.21. Under the item "customers," is put down \$162.10. That is all that comes into the returns here. Page 20 contains the Kingston account, and the farm is declared to have yielded \$6,669.50.

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice there has been a large amount granted in the way of gratuities, over \$7,300, on page B—110 of the Auditor General's Account. The Minister will notice there are no less than nine gratuities granted, making altogether \$7,317. Why are those gratuities granted?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The circumstances under which they were granted were these: About a year ago there was reason to believe that a very extensive revolt had been planned at Kingston. Information reached the warden from several quarters that an extensive rising was to take place on a certain day, and means were taken effectually to prevent that rising. This circumstance led to a very thorough examination of the means of preventing anything of that kind, and it was found by the department that, partly from motives of economy, and partly from humane considerations as regards the officers themselves, quite a number of officers, some eight or nine, had passed the age when persons were allowed to remain on the staff by the regulations. An order was given immediately that the regulations should be complied with, and the officers retired on gratuity, and although the amount was a large one, we thought that it was absolutely necessary to incur it in order that we might feel that we had a staff of men fully able, not only to do the routine duties, but to meet any great emergency that might arise as in the case of a revolt, which would involve a risk of life as well as of property, and we decided that the staff of guards should be composed of able-bodied men.

Mr. McMULLEN. While the statement made by the Minister may be a very reasonable one from his standpoint, my opinion is that it is not wise to establish those precedents, because we are aware that when a precedent is established in the administration of one penitentiary, the officers in other penitentiaries will expect to be as liberally dealt with. This appears to me to be a very large amount. No doubt the Minister has thought proper to make the changes in order to secure more complete safety. At the same time, I think that when we pay officials a good round sum as salaries from year to year, the country has a perfect right to expect from them a full and efficient discharge of their duty; and when their retire-

ment becomes a necessity in order to put more efficient men in their places, I do not think it is quite right, or in the interests of the country, that we should encourage demands of this kind, or make a precedent that may be possibly followed out by other Governments afterwards. It may be made the ground-work of granting gratuities to a very large extent. I was struck with the amount when I noticed it in the item on this page, and I thought it my duty to enquire into the reasons thereof.

Dorchester Penitentiary.....\$43.44

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call the attention of the department to a matter that I referred to on a former occasion. It is with regard to wooden-ware that I wish specially to speak, although I believe that convict labour there is also employed in the manufacture of other articles of general merchandise. Some few years ago the manufacturers of wooden-ware made representations to the Government with regard to the subject, and, as a result of those representations, the Government, instead of selling the output in the ordinary markets, endeavoured to meet the objection by distributing it among the manufacturers. I am free to admit the embarrassments of the question, and the manifest desire of the Minister of Justice on that occasion to endeavour to give satisfaction to the manufacturers. However, I happen to represent, probably, the largest manufactory of wooden-ware in Canada, and I have received a communication from them upon the subject, wherein they express their entire dissatisfaction with the present system, and they have requested me to raise my voice against it. Although the Government have endeavoured, as I mentioned, to consider to some extent the interests of those manufacturers, nevertheless my constituents inform me that the output of convict labour, even if it is sold at wholesale prices to the manufacturers, does, *pro tanto*, interfere with the employment of free labour. As this convict labour is so employed, even if the output is sold to wholesale men, nevertheless to that extent it displaces free labour, and the interest I refer to feels that very seriously. In the communication that I received upon the subject, and which I need not refer to more particularly, my correspondents state that not only they, but other manufacturers who joined with them in the memorial, have come to the same conclusion, and I desire now to know from the Minister of Justice whether he has considered the question so as to be able to give a satisfactory answer to the petition which I offered, namely, that there should be a discontinuance of the employment of convict labour in the manufacture of wooden-ware.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not able to give what the hon. gentleman considers a satisfactory answer to that question. The facts are, that the present machinery was employed in the two penitentiaries which were amalgamated when Dorchester penitentiary was formed. In St. John and Halifax the same work was carried on, and to as great an extent as at present. I have not, therefore, increased the output of wooden-ware since the penitentiary was opened. But manufactories have grown up since, in different parts of the country, notwithstanding the penitentiary at Dorchester was putting out this quantity of wooden-ware. The manufacturers thought the wants of

the country or the profits of the enterprise would reward them for establishing manufactories of their own and competing with us, and having to some extent failed in achieving success in that regard, they desire us to be put down. We have the advantage of age, and the occupancy of a fixed portion of the market. In various parts of the country they objected to the prices at which we are accustomed to place our products on the market; but, on the matter being inquired into, I was able to convince them that we adhered to the ordinary trade prices, and were not, therefore, in any way taking advantage of the fact that we obtained our labour for nothing. On turning to page 87 of my report it will be seen that our output is only of the value of \$2,250. This was at the time of the preparation of the last annual report.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I notice the account is put down at \$4,196.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That was by the collection of some arrears. When we made the arrangement to which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) referred, we closed up the accounts with our agents in the Lower Provinces and collected the balances. In the warden's report he intimates that the value of the labour, exclusive of material, used in Dorchester penitentiary was on wooden-ware \$2,250, and all the items were given. I made an arrangement, in order to prevent local inconvenience from these goods being placed on any particular market and thus destroying in any way the results of local enterprise, with persons selected by all the manufacturers of wooden-ware, of whom there are only five or six in the country. The arrangement I made was to place our whole output in the hands of Mr. Eddy, of Hull, who would distribute the articles, and thus meet the great objection the manufacturers had in view, namely, that of our goods being put on the market at fair trade prices, without taking advantage of our convict system to undersell the trade. That was sufficient for the time; I think it should be sufficient altogether, inasmuch as it removes the true grievance. But I am afraid the grievance now really is that we are engaged in manufacturing at all; and that is answered by the fact that we were engaged in doing so before these manufacturers commenced operations, and I suppose if any of their goods are unmarketable that is not attributable to us.

Mr. MULOCK. I am unable to accept the last reason assigned for the continuance of the industry. I think wherever convict labour comes into contact or competition with free labour, I do not care whether convict labour was in the field first or not, it should give way. The convict system may press heavily on the general public; but it would be a great inconvenience to place the maintenance of convicts on a special industry. It is an extraordinary proposition to advance, that because it happens that convict labour was, as is alleged, first in the field, therefore it should have the right to occupy the field. If that is a valid reason, why did the Minister yield, when he adopted a year ago the system of selling the penitentiary output to an agent of the manufacturers? The hon. gentleman certainly felt there was a good argument against the competition. Yet, if because the prison industry was first in the field, it has the right to exist fully and freely, the hon. gentleman conceded something he

Sir JOHN THOMPSON.

should not have conceded. So there appears to be nothing in this argument advanced by the Minister, and I think he will not seriously press it. The real defence of the system, and it is one in which I sympathize with him, is the difficulty of finding other employment. That is probably the reason of the maintenance of the system, and for the reasons I have already mentioned, I request in the name of my constituents, the discontinuance of this system; and, unless there is some assurance given to that effect, I may deem it necessary to bring the matter before the House before the close of the session in some more formal way.

Mr. SPROULE. Almost every year we have a discussion on this item in connection with convict labour. It appears to me very strange that it should be used as an argument against convict labour, because every hon. member will admit that it is utterly impossible for a convict to be engaged in labour of any kind without his labour being brought into competition with the other labour of the country. Even if he be employed in raising grain to feed fellow-convicts, he becomes a competitor of the farmer; and yet the farmer does not complain. If he is employed in any other line, his product comes into competition with that of free labour; but when the article is sold at market value, no one has reason to complain. It should be our object as far as possible to obtain as much as may be fairly obtained from these men who are undergoing punishment, without doing injustice to any class; and no injustice is done when the prison product is sold at the regular market price.

Mr. DEVLIN. Suppose a great many people were thrown out of employment by the fact that furniture was made in the penitentiary cheaper than in the ordinary factory, would not great injury result?

Mr. SPROULE. It was not sold cheaper.

Mr. DEVLIN. Mr. Eddy is acting as the Government agent.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He purchases wholesale.

Mr. DEVLIN. Probably he is allowed to buy the goods cheaper than he could make them. In fact he does buy the goods from the Government, and sells them at a lower figure than he otherwise could do.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We charge him the ordinary trade price, except that if he buys our whole output we give him a slight advantage, such as we would give to any wholesale dealer. I do not think he will continue much longer to be our agent; he complains loudly that we charge him too much.

Mr. DEVLIN. I trust he will soon discontinue to act as the Government agent, because he will then be obliged to manufacture, and consequently employment will be given to a great many people who are now out of employment and compelled to walk the streets.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The great objection seems to lie in the fact that most of our penitentiaries are allowed to produce goods, and that these are sold out of the penitentiary. There is a question behind that one, and it is: Is it right and proper that these men should be kept at work, and thus earn something to pay for their keep? I think so. They have made themselves a burden on society by their

crimes, and society has the right to compel them to do something for their support, to decide that they shall not be supported in idleness, and that hardworking people shall not be called upon to contribute all that is necessary for their maintenance, but that these convicts shall to a certain extent be compelled to contribute to their support. If hon. members assent to that proposition, I submit that no occupation can be named to which the same objection cannot be raised as has been raised on the present item. If it is decided to make them work at all, they must be compelled to work at whatever is most convenient and advantageous. If that is the correct view to take, it is the duty of the Government not to give way to these complaints. If you admit it to be a valid objection that their work is going to come into competition with the work of people outside, you must stop convict work altogether. That is not the right view, and I hope the Government will be firm in their position, and set the convicts to work at whatever employment is most convenient and can best be done by them, irrespective altogether of complaints from outside.

Manitoba Penitentiary..... \$53,863.60

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I observe there has been a change made in the wardenship of this penitentiary. Will the Minister please state the reason he made the change, and who has been appointed in the place of the late warden?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Towards the close of last year the warden of Stony Mountain penitentiary was taken very ill; his life was despaired of, and although temporarily recovered, he is by no means fit for duty. During the spring, when it was quite apparent that he was no longer able to fill his office, he was superannuated, and the prison has been put in charge, for the present, of the Accountant of the Penitentiary Branch of the Department of Justice. Mr. Foster had a thorough knowledge of the penitentiary accounts; he is aware of the complaints which had been from time to time made as to the management of fiscal affairs at the penitentiary, and I thought it very advantageous that before making any permanent appointment to the wardenship, I should give the affairs of that institution thorough investigation at Mr. Foster's hands, and that matters there should be put on an entirely new basis before the new regime is entered upon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Did the retiring allowance which the hon. gentleman gave to the late warden, include any number of extra years' service?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The allowance, which is about \$1,200, is based on the years of actual service only, and does not include any extra computation of years.

Mr. WATSON. Is it the intention to retain Mr. Foster as warden of the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. At present he is only temporarily appointed, and I have not yet formed any opinion as to whether or not any other applicant ought to be appointed. I consider that Mr. Foster's acquaintance with the affairs of the penitentiary made it advisable that he should go there for a time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister to a few items in connection with this penitentiary. At page B-113 of the Auditor General's Report, I notice there is a marked difference in the price of coal oil used, some being at 22½ cents and some at 30 cents per gallon. At page B-114 of the Auditor General's Report, I notice an item of \$147 for travelling expenses of S. L. Bedson; \$103.77 for lunch for the Governor General and party, and \$194.21 for a lunch for the Queen's Printer.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Queen's Printer did not get a lunch. That is an amount paid to the Queen's Printer for printing in connection with the penitentiary.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg your pardon; it looked as if it were charged for a lunch.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. With reference to the other item, the expenditure was authorized by me under these circumstances: The party referred to, comprising a considerable number of persons, during their travel in Manitoba and the North-West, visited the prison, and, as it is a long distance from any place of entertainment, I authorized the warden to give them a meal.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No doubt the Finance Minister took care that it was carried out on temperance principles.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Certainly. You will observe there is nothing in the account there for anything else. The warden of the penitentiary had permission to go to Europe on leave for three months. He was not, of course, paid his travelling expenses to Europe, but I agreed that while he was in Europe I would pay his travelling expenses in visiting any prison in which I thought any information was to be had in the line of his duties. I presume that if there is a difference in the price of coal oil, there is also a difference in the quality, and perhaps the better quality is supplied to the officers' quarters. We have had two or three contracts for supplying coal oil to that penitentiary, and we have had considerable difficulty about it. In the first place the oil was supplied from Winnipeg, but it was very bad and not according to sample, and we refused to take it and called for tenders from the oil districts in Ontario. I believe the cost of the oil is increased on account of the expense of transport to the penitentiary.

Mr. WATSON. Do you require all the coal oil used should be manufactured in Canada?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As a matter of fact I believe it is Canadian oil, but there is no requirement, and the contract was let in the oil districts of Ontario.

Mr. WATSON. If we want good coal oil in Manitoba we have to get American oil, and it costs 5 cents a gallon more.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am glad to hear the statement made by the hon. Minister of Justice. I think it was full time that some change should be made with regard to the expenses of this institution. It has been the duty of members of this House during several sessions to refer to the extra expenses under Mr. Bedson's management. I think the Minister of Justice has done well in putting a man in charge, to ascertain as to how the expenses

of the Stony Mountain penitentiary could be cut down, for I think some investigation into the management of that penitentiary was badly needed and did not come too soon. I presume that the oil is American oil supplied by a Canadian manufacturer, as the amount charged is about the price of Canadian oil.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. With respect to Mr. Bedson, I believe in some respects he was a good officer, and I rather think he did very fair service during the troubles in the North-West, but I would desire to know, in connection with this gentleman, whether the Minister of Justice obtained from him any satisfactory explanation with reference to his connection with certain matters brought before a committee of this House last session, as regards certain furs that were alleged before that committee to have got into his possession? I think, in parting with that gentleman, the Minister, who is fully cognizant of these facts, probably required some explanation and should have got some. I should like to know what that explanation was: whether Mr. Bedson was one of the parties who assisted in impounding the Bremner furs, or whether he cleared himself from all connection with that matter?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have nothing more than the statement of Mr. Bedson, that he received none of the Bremner furs whatever. He made that statement over and over again, and he has declared that in no way did he participate in that transaction.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I think it is a matter of astonishment that this officer was kept in that position so long. I believe that if there was a dishonest officer in the service of the Government and the country, Mr. Bedson was that officer. I know that immediately before the retirement of Mr. Mackenzie's Administration, it was brought to the notice of the Government that this same officer had called upon certain parties in Manitoba and offered to give them contracts if they would pay him a commission of 10 per cent. upon them. Upon our going out of office I brought this statement to the attention of our successors, and it has always been a matter of astonishment to me that he should have been retained in his position so long afterwards.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know that the hon. member for Bothwell makes these remarks in sincerity, but I am sorry he has thought it necessary to repeat them now, after Mr. Bedson has retired from the service and is in a position to excite sympathy rather than censure.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I believe them to be true.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I know the hon. member believes them, or he would not have made them. He speaks very strongly, notwithstanding that he does not usually speak so strongly of public officers. What the reason is, I have not been able to surmise, beyond the fact that Mr. Bedson's management of the financial affairs of the Manitoba penitentiary has not been successful; I have admitted that myself. I believe that in some respects he was a most exemplary officer. As regards discipline, and training his men to respect him, he had no equal in the service; and he has done good and efficient service to the country in other capacities as well. I have

Mr. McMULLEN.

never had any reason to doubt his personal integrity, though I have not considered him a financial success. With regard to the letting of contracts and getting a commission on them, I may say that he had no letting of contracts at all. Ever since I have been in the department, the tenders have come to the department, and in every instance my hand has awarded the contract. I have heard it commonly stated, with regard to public officers, by disappointed tenderers or contractors, that they were offered the contract if they would share in the profits or give a commission; but the charge is generally ill-founded.

Mr. DALY. Coming from the Province of Manitoba, and being a personal friend of Colonel Bedson, I cannot allow the imputations cast upon him by the hon. member for Bothwell to pass without saying a few words. I think the attack made upon Colonel Bedson by the hon. gentleman is cowardly in the extreme. The hon. gentleman knows, from the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice, that Colonel Bedson has retired from the superintendency of the penitentiary. I know the reason why the hon. member for Bothwell has such a feeling against him. It is a matter of long standing, and it seems to have rankled in his breast for years. He will remember going to the penitentiary years ago and being refused luncheon by Colonel Bedson.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). That is not true. I was not at the penitentiary 20 minutes, and never asked for or looked for luncheon. The statement is untrue.

Mr. DALY. I say the statement is true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DALY. And when the hon. gentleman rises in this House and makes this imputation against a public officer whose conduct for integrity has been marked by the hon. Minister of Justice and by every other person who knows him, I can say myself, and other representatives from Manitoba will corroborate the statement, that there has not been a more honest officer in the service of the country than Colonel Bedson. I regret very much that owing to his illness, and the unfortunate condition in which it has left him, he is not able to continue to fill the office of superintendent of the penitentiary, and I am satisfied that the Government is losing one of the most efficient officers they have ever had in charge of any of our public institutions.

Mr. McMULLEN. I must resent some of the remarks the hon. gentleman has made. It has been the duty of this Committee for the last eight years to closely scrutinize and criticize the expenses of this penitentiary, and I think every man who has examined carefully the items of those expenses has come to the conclusion that Mr. Bedson has been playing a grab game in connection with that penitentiary for many years. The items prove it; his actions prove it; and the statement the hon. gentleman has made is not in accordance with the past experience of this House. The hon. gentleman may possibly have found Mr. Bedson a very genial, kind man in his way to him and those who associated with him there; but it is our duty as servants of the public to criticize the acts when they come before us. We have been compelled on all occasions to make a most searching investigation of the ex-

penses in connection with this penitentiary, and I must say that they show that Mr. Bedson has been a reckless officer, regardless of his own name or the credit of the institution.

Mr. ROSS (Lisgar). As the member for the district in which the penitentiary is situated, I think it my duty to say a few words regarding Mr. Bedson's career. I know intimately nearly every one who has tendered for contracts in connection with that penitentiary for many years past, and I have never heard any one of them charge Mr. Bedson with fraud, or impugn his actions in any way. With regard to his conduct of the penitentiary, everyone in the city of Winnipeg and throughout Manitoba has expressed but one opinion, that is, that he is one of the best disciplinarians we had in the country. In fact, I believe that in this respect he has no superior in Canada. One reason why the expenses of the penitentiary have appeared great has been owing to the fact that prices in Manitoba have been higher than they are in the eastern provinces, and in some cases higher than they are in British Columbia. In my county I have come in contact with some who have made charges against Mr. Bedson, who have told me that they believed things were rotten in the penitentiary. As far as I could, I endeavoured, as the member representing the district, to find out what basis these persons had for the charges they made, and they have utterly failed in every case to give any evidence for them. The only thing that could be pointed out was the amount of money paid for supplies. But with regard to Mr. Bedson playing a grab game or being guilty of personal misconduct, no one in that country believes it. Those who know Mr. Bedson best know him to have been incapable of anything of that kind, and I know that he retires from the service to-day a poorer man than any man in this House, and that is saying a great deal.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Whether Mr. Bedson is a wealthy man or a poor man I do not know; nor is it a matter of any consequence to this enquiry. It is no evidence of a man's honesty that he has become bankrupt. Whether Mr. Bedson is so or not I do not know; but I do know that the statements made to me were made by parties who said that corrupt offers had been made to them. One of those parties was Mr. McTavish, and the hon. gentleman knows him and what his standing was. Another is a member of this House at present and stands as well as any gentleman on that side, and another was a prominent member of the bar in the city of Winnipeg. Whether he is there yet or not I cannot say, but I believe he is. I have no doubt whatever of the accuracy of those statements, and the statements I make now I made twelve years ago to those who succeeded me in office; and I made them because I believed they were strictly true. The cost of the management of that institution from that day until Mr. Bedson's retirement has convinced me he was not an honest public officer.

Mr. MACDONALD (Winnipeg). As one of the members from Manitoba, I feel it my duty to say that I am certain no one coming from that province has any doubt about Mr. Bedson's honesty. I have been more than surprised to hear the remarks made by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). I have no doubt the hon. gentleman believes them to be true, but I have very grave doubts as to

their being founded on fact. I am very certain that if they were investigated, it would be found that although Mr. Bedson may have been extravagant in the management of the penitentiary, he has done nothing which reflects in anyway on his character as an honest man. I can easily understand the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) being astonished at the prices charged for some of the articles; but I believe that if the hon. gentleman had lived in Manitoba for some years, he would find the figures much more reasonable than he now considers them. Ever since I went to Manitoba, some nine years ago, I have known Mr. Bedson very intimately, and have always found him strictly honest and straightforward. I have never heard anyone who knew him speak of him as anything but a straightforward and honourable man; and I believe, if the hon. gentlemen who are attacking him to-day knew him better, they would admit that although he may have managed the penitentiary extravagantly—and I have not followed the figures closely enough to speak positively on that point—his integrity is undoubted.

Mr. WATSON. I am not at all surprised to hear the hon. gentleman eulogize Mr. Bedson, because Mr. Bedson is a good fellow who receives his friends well, but it has been a crying shame that the cost of the penitentiary is nearly double that of any other penitentiary in the Dominion. Last year it was pointed out that in the Manitoba penitentiary it cost almost as much to board the inmates as it would in a first-class hotel. Some articles of necessity cost but little more in Manitoba than in other portions of the Dominion, and others are cheaper. For instance: beef, potatoes and flour are articles which we export to the eastern provinces. While we have nothing to say against Mr. Bedson as being hail-fellow-well-met and a man who treats his friends well when he meets them, still he has been an extravagant officer. That was admitted by the Minister of Justice last year, who, I believe, instituted an investigation into the irregularities connected with the penitentiary; and if the result of that investigation were laid before the House, perhaps the hon. gentlemen who speak so well of Mr. Bedson would change their opinion as to his business management, and possibly as to his honesty.

Mr. MULOCK. I see an item for binding twine, showing a cost of 19 cents per pound. Is that a fair market price, and is there a contract for it?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. We have no contract for binding twine, and the item is so small it is hardly worth while to call for tenders. I have no knowledge of the value of binding twine.

Mr. MULOCK. I assume the Government has paid the same price that an ordinary farmer would, and 19 cents per pound strikes me as rather high. I call the attention of the Minister of Finance to this in connection with a motion of mine which he has been inducing me to allow to stand over from time to time, and I trust, in view of the experience he learns from this document, he will see fit to make it unnecessary for me to press that motion, when he makes his Budget speech.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How much land is there in connection with the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Very little; there is really no farm there.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is there any stock kept there?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, some stock.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Is the stock brought in by express? I see an item here showing two pigs cost \$32, and the express \$19.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. That is undoubtedly so stated in the report, but I am sure that is not expressage on the pigs.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. Minister said there was not much land under cultivation, but I see 313 lbs. of twine were required, or sufficient to bind 150 acres of crops.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That was used to bind the convicts.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. All the ordinary supplies are obtained by contract.

British Columbia Penitentiary. \$45,982.72

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What is the meaning of the first note respecting the deputy warden's salary, that this is to be granted to him notwithstanding anything in the Act to the contrary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The object is to put the deputy warden at his maximum, notwithstanding that he would not yet have arrived at it under the Penitentiary Act. I think that is the object, but, if not, it is to give him the \$50 increase. He is an exceptionally good officer and an old officer trained in Kingston. He is chief keeper, deputy warden and farmer, and is altogether a superior man.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is this simply giving him a statutory increase?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; I am inclined to think it is giving him more than that.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many convicts are there in this penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think about 60.

Mr. LANDERKIN. How many pounds of tobacco does each one get a year?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Not many.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Because I see here that 458 lbs. of tobacco are charged for at 45 cents a lb.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I see that the number of convicts in that penitentiary on the 30th June, 1890, was 76.

Mr. LANDERKIN. And they all smoke?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Possibly the Minister of Inland Revenue might explain how this is, because 458 lbs. of tobacco for 76 convicts is rather a handsome allowance.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have no experience in regard to that, and I do not know that the Minister of Inland Revenue has any experience either.

Mr. McMULLEN. I also see that 30 lbs. of snuff are charged for in Kingston penitentiary.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Looking back, my hon. friend will see that others were more liberally dealt with, for in Manitoba they received 683 lbs. of tobacco at 65 cents a lb. It strikes me

Mr. LANDERKIN.

that they deal liberally with the convicts in the article of tobacco.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I find that in Manitoba 418 lbs were obtained and 265 lbs. used.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But 418 lbs. were purchased.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No doubt some is kept in stock.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does not the Minister think it is unnecessary to buy an amount of tobacco sufficient for two years?

Mr. McMULLEN. I want to ask something in regard to the furnishing of the British Columbia penitentiary. I find here tapestry carpet, 514 yards, \$411.20; Brussels carpet, 290½ yards at \$1.05, \$305.29; Brussels carpet, 229½ yards at 90 cents, \$206.33, or over 1,000 yards of carpets. Surely they did not carpet the whole place!

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. A house was provided for the warden last year for the first time. It was considered absolutely necessary to do that or to build a wing in addition to the present building, as we had no place for a hospital, and by providing a house for the warden we were able to give the deputy warden the warden's apartments, and to use the deputy warden's quarters for a hospital. In accordance with the practice we have supplied the regular furnishings, such as window blinds and carpets.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to ask the Minister of Justice if he considers it proper to use tobacco in the penitentiaries?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Yes, I do. A year or two ago I brought down a file of papers on that subject. Tobacco is given to sick men who are accustomed to the smoking habit, and it is also given as a slight reward to those who have been accustomed to use it, and have deserved the reward by extra labour, or by exposure, or by anything that requires recognition, and we have found it a very useful ration, and we have also found that the deprivation of it is a great hardship to those who have been accustomed to use it. It is not served out as a ration in the ordinary way, but is given for extra good conduct or hard work or exposure.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to be a pretty regular ration, judging from the amount consumed.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In British Columbia the Indians are very often in hospital, and they are so accustomed to the use of tobacco that it has to be given to them regularly.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I should like to know if the Minister of Finance is of the same opinion as the Minister of Justice on this subject?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not considered it.

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

After Recess.

House again resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before disposing of this item on the British Columbia penitentiary, which we reached before six o'clock, I want to draw again the Minister's attention to a point with regard to the new residence for the superintendent of the penitentiary of British Columbia. He said they had built a new house for him. Now, I have looked

into the matter, and if the Minister of Justice will carefully calculate the amount that is charged for carpeting, he will see that it must have been an enormously large house, if all this carpet was put in there, or else there must have been some carpeting used in the penitentiary in fitting up some of the rooms. It surely cannot all have been charged to the new residence, because there is carpet enough charged to cover 900 yards square. That will supply five houses 24 by 36, two stories high, with ten rooms each, and cover the stairs to boot. He will find that it will cover 30 rooms 15 by 18. Now, it surely cannot be possible that all that carpeting has gone into the new house. I simply wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice to it. I do not, for a moment, mean to insinuate that he is cognizant of any wrong being done, but I simply call this fact to his attention. It has cost altogether, for carpets alone for that new residence, if it all went in there, including cocoa-matting, \$1,418.74, and it would cover the space I have mentioned. This appears to be an enormous amount to go into a residence of that kind. There are other little items to which I wish to draw attention. There is a coffee mill, \$12; there are half a dozen coffee pots, costing \$27; 12 razors, \$1.50 each, \$18; 18 rat and mouss traps, \$12. There are many other items which I consider very exorbitant. Now, I think it is due to the Committee, when items of this kind come before us, to discuss them and criticize them. We have a duty to perform, and we desire to perform it. Our sole desire is to see that the country's interests and rights are protected. We have no desire to keep the Committee beyond the time that we can extract from the Government intelligent explanations of the items to which we call attention. This is the duty of every Opposition, and we do not propose to shrink from it, however small the item may appear to some hon. members. I say it is absurd to ask us to consent to the passage of this item of 1,100 yards of carpeting to put into the residence of the manager or superintendent of the British Columbia penitentiary. We have a right to some explanations. The Minister has said there was a new house built and carpeted. We admit that. It may have been necessary, although I challenge the propriety of giving these people such lordly mansions to live in, and I think that something less costly than Brussels carpet would do for them.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think, perhaps, the hon. member did not catch all that I said on that subject. I said that the warden's house had to be furnished with carpeting and window hangings, the deputy warden had been moved into the warden's apartments, and we furnished his house likewise to some extent. When I assumed charge of the department I found that not only the practice, but the regulations provided that we should furnish these houses. I thought that was unsatisfactory for several reasons that I need not enter upon now. But it was evidently necessary, when we provided a new house for the warden as for the deputy warden, that we should at least cover the floors and provide window hangings, or it was impossible for them to do it out of their salary. The house in British Columbia is not a lordly mansion; it is a good-sized house, but it is plainer and cheaper than the houses that have been given to the wardens anywhere else, unless, perhaps, at Dorchester, where the house is a very

modest one. All I can say is that I agreed to furnish the carpeting and the window hangings for these two, and I was assured that the measurement that we provided for was the actual measurements for the two establishments, and I am assured that the sum to which the hon. gentleman refers in the Estimates as having been paid, is not enough to cover the actual cost of providing what I promised to provide, and in the Supplementary Estimates I have to ask for a further allowance for the same purpose. Of course I have no personal knowledge of the subject; all I can say is that I believe all these furnishings have gone into the new house and into the deputy warden's house, and that the quantities supplied there have not been enough to cover the floors.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). There are two or three items in the account upon which I would like some information. I notice that 211 tons of coal were purchased at \$8.50 a ton. Now, I have understood that British Columbia was a coal-producing country, where coal could be obtained much cheaper than the price here mentioned. Doubtless the Minister can give me a satisfactory explanation. I find that British Columbia last year exported 499,000 tons, at an average price of \$3.95 a ton, whereas the Government has paid \$8.50 a ton to provide for the penitentiary, and I think this item requires some explanation. There is another item which the Minister may explain when he gets on his feet—that in regard to coal oil. There were only 20 gallons provided, but the expenditure was something extraordinary unless they sell coal oil there at a very much higher price than it brings here. We find that coal oil there cost 40 cents a gallon, whereas on importations from the United States by British Columbia only 28 cents a gallon were paid. Then again there is another item which appears to require some explanation. There are 14 hour's labour entered under the name of G. W. Cooley, for \$7. Is he a professional man or an ordinary labourer, for he is paid at the rate of \$5 a day? There is an item for Cumberland coal, which is charged at the rate of \$30 per ton. There are 92 lbs. of rope, for which \$27.32 were paid. Perhaps the Minister will explain these items.

Mr. PRIOR. In regard to the price of coal charged for British Columbia penitentiary, I may say that it is the usual retail price paid in Victoria, Vancouver and New Westminster, which retail price is \$8 per ton as a rule. During the last 12 or 18 months we paid \$10 for every ton we used. Although the mines are within 70 miles of each of these towns, there is to all intents and purposes a monopoly, only three companies getting out coal, the regular retail prices ranging from \$8 to \$10 per ton. The export price at the wharves for coal shipped to San Francisco and to South America is, I think, about \$4.50 per ton; but there is no place we can get coal except from the Nanaimo mines, and every one has to pay the price I have named, not only householders, but manufacturers who have to use it for manufacturing purposes. In regard to the Cumberland coal for which \$30 per ton is charged, that comes round the Horn from the east, and it is the usual price paid. I know the wholesale price is \$25, the retail \$30. In regard to rope, the usual price charged for small quantities by dealers, such small quantities as are mentioned, is from 16 to 20 cents per pound. No

doubt these will appear large prices to many hon. gentlemen, but every article sold on the Pacific coast is sold, as hon. members from British Columbia have frequently stated, at a price far in excess of that demanded east.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Both the coal and the coal oil are supplied by contract. We adopted the best means to obtain tenders for coal from all quarters, and even enlarged the usual number of advertisements in order to get the contract well advertized. I do not know exactly what claim Mr. Cooley has; but he is a mechanic, and was employed in connection with renovating a basement where the flooring had rotted away. He was the only mechanic employed, and convicts were under him.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). The explanation of the hon. Minister in regard to the coal price is not satisfactory, because the Trade and Navigation Returns give the price as \$3.95 per ton. It is most extraordinary that people of that province, which exported 4,495 tons to the United States last year, at an average price of \$3.95 per ton, should be willing to pay \$8, \$8.50, and even \$10 per ton. I cannot understand how coal is kept up to people of that province when it is sold at such a low rate to people of other countries. No doubt the British Columbians will see the necessity of free trade so far as that province is concerned.

Mr. PRIOR. If the hon. gentleman were living in British Columbia he would find a good many things he could not understand. Coal is sold in large quantities, such as by the ship load, at \$3.95, \$4, and \$4.40 per ton; but as regards the price in Vancouver, Victoria, and New Westminster, I never knew it to be less than \$7.50 during my residence there, covering a period of 18 years. This price is due simply to the fact that there is a monopoly. Only three companies sell it retail. It is shipped from the mines to coal dealers for retailing, and they keep up the price. If coal was brought from the east, it would cost more than we now pay, and the people of our province believe in patronizing home industries.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It may be as well to remind the House of a circumstance which may be fresh in the memory of a good many of the older members and to which this state of things bears close relation, namely, that the late Government, when in charge of public affairs, gave the most available and valuable coal territory in British Columbia to a certain corporation, on which occasion members of the Opposition told the Government they were trifling with the resources of the country and doing a very great injury to the future of British Columbia. No doubt the fact which we have now heard, that coal is exported at \$4 per ton, for the use of American citizens, from British Columbia, but that the inhabitants of British Columbia have to pay from \$8 to \$10 per ton, forms a most striking commentary on the action against which we protested some years ago on the part of the Government, in depriving ourselves of the control of valuable coal areas and handing that control over to monopolists.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) calls attention to the fact that great areas of coal measures at Vancouver were given away to a company, and therefore
Mr. PRIOR.

increased prices have to be paid by reason of the monopoly thus caused. Before the company obtained these lands, and especially before any portion of the Island railway was built, the people were perfectly willing to give away all the coal lands that were given away. Although different opinions may be entertained now, still at the time the lands were given away everyone was satisfied, and the majority of the people are satisfied now.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That does not in the slightest degree alter the fact or undo the mischief that appears to have been done in regard to the future of our province on the Pacific coast. The whole future of manufactures in British Columbia will continue to be most seriously affected, if the state of things to which my hon. friend alludes continues, as apparently it is likely to continue; and it is a most ample justification of the protest which was made from this side of the House against that most improvident and foolish grant.

Mr. PRIOR. I draw attention to the fact that coal has been no dearer since the land has been given away than before. It has been the means, however, of raising hundreds of thousands of tons of coal and giving employment to thousands of men.

Mr. BOWELL. The mines from which Victoria is now supplied were owned by the Dunsmuir family long before the land was given to build the railway, and it is only now that the mines in the Comox district are being opened, and the products of those mines are being shipped to San Francisco and are being brought to these markets; so there is no telling what the effect of opening these mines may be on prices hitherto prevailing. The remarks of the hon. member for Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) have no force, nor are they at all pertinent, owing to the fact that the lands were owned by the Dunsmuir family before that railway was built and before the lands were given in aid of the construction of the road.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But my remarks have a great deal of pertinence from the fact that if the most available and valuable mines were placed in the hands of monopolists by the deliberate action of the late Government, the Government by that action deprived the people of British Columbia of the chance of getting cheaper coal. That is what they did.

Mr. PRIOR. The hon. gentleman does not see that the mines are in the hands of three companies and not one company, and if three companies can combine to keep up the price, fifty companies can do so. Every day in the United States, England, and even in Canada "corners" are arranged in grain, coal and almost everything.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman will find out that when these matters are placed in the hands of three companies it is three times as easy for the companies to arrange a "corner" as it is when they are in the hands of ten companies.

Mr. McMULLEN. It is earnestly to be hoped that the hon. member for British Columbia will support the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), in his Bill to prevent combines. Can the Minister of Justice give us any information as to the size of the residence for wardens?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I cannot give any idea as to what the size is. I will lay the plan on

the Table in a day or so. The deputy warden's quarters consist of half a dozen rooms.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Perhaps the Minister will give the information on concurrence, for the statements made by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) disclose a startling condition of affairs, which should not exist.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The subject will come up under a different head, and I will then submit the information.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Government should adopt a system under which the buildings of these officials would be of certain specified dimensions. When you build a post office in a town you are guided by the importance of the place as to the size of the building, and I think that, in such cases as this also, the size of the building should be minutely described so as to leave no room for extravagance. If the amount stated here is correct, I think the Minister of Justice will find that there is a screw loose somewhere, and that they have intruded on his generosity to practice extravagance.

Mr. CORBOULD. In reference to the statements made with regard to the price of coal, I may say that my personal experience in New Westminster is that I have never paid less than \$8 per ton exclusive of delivery, and I have paid as high as \$10 a ton exclusive of delivery. The hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright) has stated that all coal lands in that region have been given away. I must differ from him there. There are plenty of coal lands found on the Island of Vancouver outside the railway belt, and so soon as the requirements warrant it these lands will be opened up and developed. I may also remind the hon. gentleman that on the mainland, and outside of that belt, we are paying \$12 a ton for anthracite coal from Banff. If I am not mistaken I think that the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) was sent out there by the Mackenzie Government and made exactly the same offer as the present Government made with reference to the land in that railway belt.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Some years ago there was a vigorous protest in this House against the Government giving away the extensive coal fields they had in British Columbia. It is not to be wondered at that the settlement of British Columbia is very slow when, under the system of government we have, the great natural resources of the province are given away, and that the country has become so expensive for settlers that it is impossible for people to live there. If you do not provide that people can live cheaper, the immigration of settlers into that country will be very slow indeed. It is a singular thing that while coal can be exported from that country for less than \$4 dollars per ton, the people living there have to pay from \$8 to \$10. The attention of the members from British Columbia having been called to this state of affairs, it should be their earnest endeavour to remove a system which is producing such prejudicial effects in British Columbia, and which is retarding the settlement of that province. It is well known, as mentioned by the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright), that a strong protest was made against the policy of the Government, in giving away these lands. It was

foretold at that time that it would lead to a monopoly, and the statements now made by the hon. members from British Columbia show that a monopoly does exist in British Columbia, which is prejudicial to settlement and which interferes with the development of the province. We hope that the Government will now take some steps to prevent this monopoly, and to give the people who settle in that province an opportunity of living there cheaper than they do under the present system. I remember that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Gordon), I think, struggled with all his might against this monopoly which the Government then gave, and he was supported by members on this side of the House. The people of British Columbia now see that if they are paying these high monopoly prices for the necessaries of life they have to blame the Government who gave these coal fields away to monopolists; and, I believe, Yankee monopolists at that.

Mr. ROSS. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin), when he says that British Columbia is slow in growth, has made a statement not warranted by facts. I think I know a great deal more about British Columbia than the hon. gentleman does, and I can state that during the last ten years that province has grown remarkably, not only in population, but in the development of the various enterprises in that country. The census recently taken will prove that my statement in this respect is absolutely correct. The people of British Columbia have every reason to be proud of the manner in which their province has grown during the last ten years.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, allow me to call your attention to the fact that we are drifting from the item under consideration and undertaking a discussion over a very wide range as to the prosperity of British Columbia and the prices of articles there. Both sides of the House have now had their fling, and I would ask you to draw the attention of the Committee back to the item.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I must remind the Minister of Finance that it is pertinent to the question under discussion, which is the high price of coal, to point out that the Government have caused this high price by their former action. I am not going to prolong the discussion as the hon. gentleman has requested that we should not discuss it further, and very likely he has good reasons for that. A statement was made as to an offer said to be given by my hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), which, to the best of my recollection, was wholly incorrect. I do not think he was ever authorized to make any offer respecting the coal lands of British Columbia. However, the hon. gentleman is here and he can speak for himself.

Mr. FOSTER. Order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. the Minister of Finance will recollect that this statement was made by one of his own supporters, and I have a right to require that it be proved or disproved.

Mr. EDGAR. With reference to the statement made by my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Corbould), as to my having been a party to offering these lands in British Columbia, I know that I offered the people of that province a great many things when I went over there, and I know that

most of them are very sorry that they did not accept the offer when they had the chance. I admit that I was responsible for recommending to the Government the construction of the Nanaimo Railway, but it never got so far as to consider the question of a land grant or a money grant. The railway itself was all that was proposed at these initial stages, and I had not the good luck to be in Parliament when the Nanaimo Railway Bill was introduced the first time, or when it was introduced and carried through the second time. So far as that goes, my hon. friend (Mr. Corbould), who was not in British Columbia at that time, cannot have read the ancient history of his province or he would never have made that mistake.

Mr. MULOCK. I wish to call attention to the high price of sugar, which, at page B—115 of the Auditor General's Report, is stated to be 8½ cents per pound. Now, we find that the present tariff enhances the price of sugar, not only to the Government who buy it for these institutions, but to the people generally, about 75 per cent. I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if we can hope for any relief in this direction. In the United States to-day sugar can be purchased for two or three cents a pound less than in Canada, and that is an uncalled-for condition of affairs. This operates against the interests of Canada, and I think the time has arrived when the Government should come to the relief of our people. If the necessaries of life are purchasable on the other side 30 or 40 per cent. cheaper than they are in Canada, that is an inducement to people to leave a dear country and go to the cheap one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the hon. gentleman is not speaking to the question at all.

Mr. MULOCK. I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman. I only ask the hon. Minister of Finance if he intends to devise a scheme for supplying these public establishments with sugar at a cheaper rate?

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). Everything appears to be very dear in British Columbia. I see that some newspapers have been subscribed for, one at \$12 and another at \$10 a year, while the *Empire*, the weekly edition, goes for \$1 a year. While on my feet, I would like to ask if any portion of this 1,095 yards of carpeting was used for some of the wards of the penitentiary?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. None.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron). I also find a charge of \$141.47 for 145½ yards of cocoa-matting. I cannot conceive how so much carpeting can be needed for a private house which is stated by the Minister to be not a very large one.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Carried.

Some hon. MEMBERS. The question was not answered.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I think the answer was given half-a-dozen times.

Mr. MULOCK. I would recommend you, Mr. Chairman, to be a little more gentle in guiding the course of the discussion. I think we want to facilitate the progress of these Estimates, but I doubt very much if that will be obtained if any member thinks, even unjustly, that he is prevented from obtaining information by arbitrary conduct on the part of the Chair. I am not suggesting that that

Mr. EDGAR.

is the case in this instance: but when an hon. member asks a question, an opportunity should be given for an answer before the Chairman decides whether the item is carried or not. I doubt very much whether it is the duty of the Chairman at all to suggest whether the discussion is ended or not.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I may take this opportunity of saying that I have noticed on many occasions that questions had been put by hon. members after the Minister in charge of the particular item under discussion has already answered the same question three or four times. Sometimes hon. members who are not in the House when a question is first put and answered, and afterwards come in, look over the Auditor General's Report, and ask the same question again. I am here to stay as long as the House sits, but I think it would be in the interest of all if hon. members would keep their seats so that each question could be put and answered once, instead of being repeated by different members one after another.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. As regards the action of the Chair, the Chairman had no alternative but to declare the item passed, if no one rises to speak. I did not dream of answering the hon. gentleman's question, because I had already answered it, and I supposed him to be not asking for information, but just restating his objection and indicating that he was not satisfied. The hon. gentleman must have heard me state that the whole of this carpet was bought for the two dwellings, and I promised at a future date to bring the plans of those dwellings down and lay them before the House.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The question asked by my hon. friend from East Huron was not regarding the carpet. He wanted to know why the Government were paying \$40 or \$12 a year for newspapers in British Columbia, and then he went on to give his opinion about the quantity of carpets.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. He was answered at the time, by British Columbia members, that that was the usual price.

Mr. CORBOULD. That is the usual subscription price for daily newspapers in British Columbia. The *Colonist* and *Columbian* are each \$10 a year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I sympathize with the hon. Minister of Justice, because I recollect when I sat on the opposite side of the House having, on a great many occasions, to answer the same question from the same gentleman eight or nine times over. I thought it very hard, and so I sympathize entirely with the remarks made by yourself, Sir, on this point. But I would just observe this: there is always a little murmur through the House, and it is not always easy by any means for hon. members a few seats back to hear what is said on the front benches. Of course we cannot expect the Ministers to speak at the full pitch of their voices in committee, but in justice to my hon. friends I think what is said is not always heard or is very imperfectly heard, and that is the reason questions are sometimes repeated two or three times.

Regina Gaol. \$13,520

Mr. McMULLEN. I think this requires explanation. I see the vote last year was only \$900.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Last year when the estimate was taken, the gaol was not quite finished, and I only took a vote for the salaries of the permanent officers—the warden, and, I think, one guard; but the gaol is now completed and receiving prisoners, and this vote is not only for salaries, but is to include the maintenance of prisoners.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. What was done with the prisoners before you had the gaol?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They were confined in the police barracks at various places, and the police authorities were paid by the Department of Justice out of the vote for Miscellaneous Justice.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate..... \$60,488

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it is time we should cut down a great many of the contingent expenses of both Houses. I find that in the Senate, last year, we paid for: 339 inkstands, \$258; 416 knives, \$373.80; 3,048 pencils, \$323.84; 54,124 pens, \$201.78; 228 pairs of scissors, \$136.06; 144 scrap books, \$93.20; 680 balls of twine, \$84.26; 15,600 b.s. visiting cards, \$30. What can eighty-six or ninety Senators want with 339 inkstands and the other articles? It is absurd to ask the committee to grant a sum of money to the Senate to repeat the extravagance which evidently exists in that body. I do not know whether those hon. gentlemen are under the control of this House or not. It appears we are asked to pass this item, and if so we have certainly the right to criticize the expenditure. I believe there are a great many very honourable, high-minded gentlemen in that chamber; men not at all responsible and not desirous to be responsible for the items here enumerated. I challenge anyone to go carefully over the different items and accounts and not find that these articles have been scattered right and left from that particular chamber. It is time some change should take place in the items connected with contingencies of the Senate. We really ought to ask those hon. gentlemen to meet with a committee of this House and let us investigate together this expenditure and see if we cannot ascertain where all this stuff goes to. I have only mentioned a few of the most extravagant items. As I have said, I do not believe many of these old gentlemen are aware of the facts. They quietly take their seats, and their knives, and their scissors; and knowing a great many of them as I do, I cannot believe they are winking at the extravagance that is going on in that chamber. We are entitled to some explanation from the Government.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What are the champagne knives?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Mr. MULOCK. There is something to be said in favour of the expenditure, because I wish to say a word on the other side, and give the Senators credit for an economy, though perhaps it may be an unwise one. I find that these seventy-eight gentlemen have only charged the country with three flesh brushes and one foot bath.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I notice each one of them has a thermometer.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. There is a charge here for sixty bottles of glue. Is that to fasten them to their seats?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This involves a large amount of the tax-payers' money and I think it is the duty of some Ministers to give some explanation of this most extraordinary expenditure. If any Minister will take the trouble of going over the items in detail, he cannot help coming to the conclusion that there must be something radically wrong. Here are charges for cooking knives and saucepans. Why should the tax-payers be called on to pay for these? Here are other items for feather pillows and nail brushes and methylated spirits. I dare say there may be other spirits as well; surely we are entitled to some explanation of this extraordinary expenditure.

Mr. WELSH. It is easy to find fault, but the trouble is to find a remedy. Every session this question of extravagant expenditure at Rideau Hall and the Senate comes round, and the Government always acknowledge that the matter requires looking into. It is high time it should be looked into and some remedy devised; and as this is our first meeting, the Government should propose some plan for a reasonable supervision of the expenditure of both Houses. In other countries there is a committee of both Houses to settle what the expenditure shall be, and I think the Government pledged itself last session to see that some arrangement would be entered into with the different departments to supervise the expenditure of public money.

Mr. FOSTER. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke thought that this was not a laughing matter, and rather chided us on this side for making light of it. I want to assure my hon. friend that the laughing commenced on that side, and we caught the contagion and laughed in unison. It is all very well to speak of the supervision of this expenditure, and it may be that some hon. gentlemen really think that the Government are responsible for it. We must take into account the fact that, both in the House of Commons and in the Senate, those expenditures are supervised and ordered by the Houses themselves. Hon. gentlemen have had a great deal to say about the Senate and their extravagance. I hope, when we come to the items of expenditure for the House of Commons, the hon. gentlemen will be just as free in criticism of themselves, because I think they are just as much open to criticism in regard to the contingencies of the House of Commons as the Senate are in regard to their contingencies. Now, as to the saucepans and matters of that kind, perhaps my hon. friend never strays far away from his own habitat, but if he should happen to wander into the Senate restaurant he would find that there is a place there in which he can be served with meals, and that requires cooking ranges, cooking materials and everything necessary for that purpose. My hon. friend must not run away with the idea that the Senators cabbage these saucepans, put them in their tail pockets and carry them home. These matters are arranged just the same as they are in the House of Commons. And so it is with regard to brushes, combs and so on. This does not only refer to what the Senators use, but there are rooms all around the corridors and offices, and these rooms are supplied with brushes, combs and everything necessary for cleanliness. These are not for the Senators to take away, but the amount is

simply for the contingencies for the Senate in its corporate capacity, and includes the rooms of all the Senate clerks and the Speaker's apartments. A proportion of that amount goes into the trunks which members of the House of Commons, as well as the members of the Senate are accustomed to get. I have never heard in this House any vigorous denunciation of that practice which has existed from old times, and I think it is not altogether disagreeable to hon. members to get their boxes of stationery. That is not done by the Government, at all events. It is done by a Printing Committee which is formed of members of both Houses, and I think it is a sub-committee of that Printing Committee that arranges for these boxes and for what is to go into them. A number of these fittings are quite familiar to members on both sides, as they come to them in the box they receive every year, and I have no doubt that they carefully treasure and sparingly use what they get. There is no doubt that more of these articles are got than are actually necessary. Hon. members who have been long in Parliament, know, however, how difficult it is to supervise expenditures of that kind. Two years ago a committee of members from both Houses was appointed, and they met day after day and hour after hour, and endeavoured to secure greater economy in this matter. I think not much eventuated from the meetings of that committee. At all events, a report was made to this House, but I do not think it was ever adopted. If that be so, it was the fault of this House itself. I think that report had good features, and would have been productive of economy, but it is not the fault of the Government that it was not adopted, but the fault of the House. Not being a member of the Senate, I am not acquainted with the inner workings of that House, but, I suppose, they are something like those of the House of Commons. However, if members of both Houses desire to be economical and to save a part of this expenditure, they can easily do it, and it would be, I think, a good thing to do, but the initiative rests with the House in each case.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. This expenditure as to trunks I do not think is attended to by the Printing Committee, but is left to the Senators themselves. It is notorious that their trunks are furnished with better stationery and better articles of every kind than those which are furnished to the members of the House of Commons, and I do not know why that should be so. I think there should be a change in the method of purchasing these articles. Some years ago I proposed that this whole system of supplying boxes of stationery should be done away with, but, so long as this provision is made, I think the Senate and the House of Commons should be on the same footing. I cannot see why the members of the Senate should have better articles than those which are furnished to the members of the House of Commons. For my part, I do not see why these articles should be furnished to either. I think it would be preferable that it should not be done, but, as long as this money is expended, there is no reason why the members of the Senate should be preferred above the members of the House of Commons, as they invariably have been since I have been a member of this House. I think it should be left either to the Printing Committee or to some other joint committee of both Houses to make a selection of those articles

Mr. FOSTER.

which are required, and that there should be no discrimination between the two Houses. I cannot see why the Senators deserve more consideration than members of the House of Commons in this regard, but they have always maintained their superiority and have always had something better than has been given to the members of the House of Commons. It was mentioned that, even in the matter of trunks, they have better trunks than are given to the members of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope they are not larger.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. They are larger. If there is no way of controlling the exorbitant expenditure of the Senate, I think this House should have something to say about it. I see that the amount for these contingencies last year amounted to \$60,247.96.

Mr. FOSTER. That takes in \$32,933 for salaries, \$1,059 for pages, \$2,070 for messengers, and amounts for charwomen, postage, newspapers, \$2,073; Debates, \$9,000, unforeseen expenses, \$2,000, and so on.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is all in connection with the running of the Senate, and we ought to do something to equalize this matter. I think the Government should devise some means by which the expenditure in both Houses should be controlled either by the Government or by a special joint committee or by the Committee on Printing, so that the two Houses may be dealt with alike, and I ask the Finance Minister if some arrangement of this kind could not be made?

Mr. BERGIN. I think the hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. The Senate does not get better stationery than the Commons. The stationery for the Commons and everything that is furnished to the Commons in that small trunk, is furnished, as a rule, by the stationery department of the House of Commons under the direction, I may say, of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), the whip on the other side, and by myself as chairman of the committee; and we have endeavoured to provide just as good stationery for the House of Commons as for the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. What committee do you mean?

Mr. BERGIN. The Joint Committee on Printing. We have given no advantage to the Senate over our own House. There has been the most perfect understanding between the hon. gentleman who acts as chairman for the Senate, when he happens to be chairman for the Senate alone, and the other members of the Printing Committee. If we have not as good stationery as the Senate, it is not because of any favouritism, but because the hon. member for Perth and myself have not had sufficient knowledge of what was necessary in ordering stationery for the House of Commons.

Mr. SPROULE. I must say that I partially agree with what the hon. gentleman opposite has said with regard to the difference in what was furnished to the Senate and what was furnished for the Commons, and I refer particularly to the trunks that have been given out this year. I do not think that the trunks that have been given to the members of the House of Commons reflect very great credit upon the parties who ordered them or the parties who made them. I think that anyone who understands the value would say that the trunks given out for the Senate are much more valuable than those for the Commons. Those given to the Commons are very inferior in many

respects. In my own trunk, when I lifted off the lid inside, I found it was only pasted on with mucilage, and the handles came right off. They were merely stuck on inside with mucilage, instead of being fastened on in a substantial way. There are no heads to the nails to protect the sides of the trunk, whereas the trunks given to the Senate have large brass-headed nails that protect the trunk to a large extent, and the trunk will wear very much longer. In looking through other parts of the trunk, I found it very much inferior to the Senate trunk, so I think there is a great difference in favour of the Senate. If they cost the same, there is something inexplicable that I cannot understand, because I think any one who has examined the two carefully will say that the Senate trunks are much more valuable. But I wish to speak more particularly with reference to the stationery provided in the trunks. It always seemed to me that it was useless. We have very nice letter pads that we get upstairs, and they are valuable for our purposes, but they are only supplied to us during the session. Why not have a supply of this in the trunks of stationery? We have note paper, but it is so small in size that it is practically useless, with small sized envelopes that we cannot use to advantage. If you would give us the kind of envelopes that would suit any ordinary size of note paper, they would be much more valuable. Now, I believe you might put in these trunks a much better class of stationery than we now receive, and give us letter pads so that we can use them, either ruled or unruled.

Mr. MULLOCK. Did you say liver pads?

Mr. SPROULE. Liver pads might be needed on that side of the House, but we do not need them here. I say, put in letter pads the same as we can get upstairs, of the ordinary letter size, and put in a number of them, and not so many of the small pads. Then do away with package after package of small note paper, that is comparatively useless for any one who wants to do much writing.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Notwithstanding the statements made by the hon. gentleman opposite, I maintain that I am right with regard to the difference in the stationery. Ever since I have been a member of this House, the statement has been made that the Senate have the best stationery, and the Senate themselves claim that they have superior articles. I did not know until to-night how the selection was made. I have been a member of the Printing Committee for nine sessions, and during the whole of the time of my connection with the Printing Committee—and I have been at nearly every meeting—I never remember any sub-committee being appointed to select stationery. I doubt very much, if the minutes of the Printing Committee were examined for any one year during the last nine years, that a motion would be found appointing a sub-committee to select the stationery for the Commons and the Senate. It is possible there may be one, there may be an understanding that these gentlemen should do it, but there has been no regular appointment that I was aware of, and I do not think that there have been any meetings of that committee at which I was not present. However, I maintain that I am correct in saying that the Senate have had indulgence in this regard, whether by the committee or by the management of their own affairs, I do not know; but they claim it them-

selves, and no doubt it is a fact. Now, there is one item here which seems rather singular, as it can only be used during one year. During the last year in the Senate, which is composed of about 80 members, they had no less than 313 almanacs and 12 card calendars. Now, what do they do with 313 almanacs? They must have had them in every room. They must carry them around in their pockets, and have them pinned upon their backs, and use them in every sort of way. I think we ought to have some explanation of this item. If the member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) is responsible for this stationery, I want him to tell me now why he authorized the purchase of 313 almanacs in one year for 80 members. They cannot keep them for another year's use, and if the member for Stormont is going to defend his position, I want him to answer that question.

Mr. BERGIN. I repeat that the articles of stationery have been selected ever since I have been a member of the Printing Committee, by the Chairman and by the member for Perth.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who authorized that selection?

Mr. BERGIN. The Printing Committee authorized it. It was understood that the hon. member for Perth should act for the Opposition, and the Chairman of the Printing Committee for the Government, and we have always acted harmoniously together. I do not know that we went together during the last two or three years, because we thought that we had provided all that was right and all that was necessary. There are some hon. gentlemen who want nearly all their stationery in the form of letter pads, others want it in the shape of foolscap; others, who have ladies with them, want very small envelopes, which they think are more convenient for the dear creatures; but others, who are business men and write voluminous letters, want very large note, for they do not write *billets doux*. We know by experience that we cannot please every one. Officers of this House are furnished with almanacs.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. These 313 almanacs are for the Senate. What has the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) to do with the Senate?

Mr. BERGIN. We select the Commons' stationery, and I deny that it is inferior to that obtained by the Senate. I suggest that we place on the Table at our next Committee meeting a box of the Senate stationery, and I will show that our box is better and costs no more.

Mr. CHARLTON. We must have the test made.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) now takes a different position from that which he occupied at first. He then claimed that he selected the stationery for the Commons and the Senate.

Mr. BERGIN. No, no.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. The hon. gentleman said the stationery was uniform because he selected it. He now says he does not select the stationery for the Senate. Who does select it? We should like to know.

Mr. BERGIN. We must enquire from the Senate.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is evident that the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Bergin) does not know anything about the stationery business. He admits he does not know anything about the stationery supplied to the Senate: all he knows is in regard to the Commons' stationery, and, therefore, I do not consider he is an authority on the matter. I should like to ask the Government who selects the stationery for the Senate?

Mr. BERGIN. I told you that the Chairman of the Senate Committee, when not Chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, selected the stationery for the Senate as we did for this House.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Who joins him in the work? The Chairman of the Printing Committee has the assistance of the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), and there is uniformity in their selection: but the chairman of the Senate Committee appears to act alone. If the Chairman of the Printing Committee of the Senate and the Chairman of the Commons Committee, with the assistance of the hon. member for South Perth, act together, I will be satisfied. The Government should make some other arrangement in regard to this stationery business. Although I have been a member of the Committee for nine years and have attended, I believe, every meeting, I have never heard a motion made to appoint anyone to select the stationery, either a member of the Senate or the Commons. There may have been an established practice before I became a member, but the practice has never been authorized by the Committee in an official way, to my knowledge. Will the Minister of Finance state if the Government will take any action on the matter?

Mr. FOSTER. This is a matter entirely in the hands of each House. I spoke merely from memory when I stated that the Printing Committee generally did this business. I remember once, when a member of that Committee, helping to select the stationery for the Commons. The members of the Commons on that Committee did not select the stationery for the Senate, and the Senate did not have anything to do with selecting the stationery for the Commons; but it was understood, whether by resolution of the Committee or not, that the heads of that Committee were to select the stationery. I quite agree that there should be no distinction between the class of stationery used by the two Houses. It should be equally good in each case, and one should not have any advantage over the other. I suggest to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), who is an influential member of the Committee, that when the Committee meets again, now that he knows the *modus operandi*, the matter should be discussed in order to ascertain whether the Senate and Commons cannot come to a satisfactory conclusion for a proper and uniform selection of the stationery for both Houses. The hon. member must not refer to the Senate too harshly. He spoke of 313 almanacs being required for 78 or 80 persons connected with the Senate, but he must remember that 215 persons connected with the Commons require 430 almanacs. So, both Houses are at fault if there is extravagance.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Do I understand that the Joint Printing Committee have full control of this matter? If not, it would be useless to attempt to arrive at an amicable arrangement, because the

Mr. BERGIN.

Senate members would act in their own way and the Commons in their way. Unless this House and the other House delegate the power to their representatives on the Committee, we might talk until doomsday and not arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Do I understand that the Committee has absolute control over the matter?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that the Committee has done the work. This House finds the money, and if the House refuses to vote the money the stationery could not be bought. I made the suggestion as a feasible way of coming to an arrangement. If the hon. gentleman does not think it can be done, he may, perhaps, be able to devise some other means.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Committee control of this matter?

Mr. FOSTER. The Committee having done the business for years is quite capable of making a recommendation to the House in regard to stationery.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). It is well understood that the power of each House is just the same as is the power of each House in the United Kingdom, and the House of Commons has no control whatever over appropriations made for the purposes of the other Chamber. Each House is in that respect complete master of its own business. It is true that if the Government pass a Bill to take this matter out of the hands of the two Houses and vest it elsewhere, a different system might be adopted; but there is nothing to prevent the House of Commons, if it chooses, obtaining the best quality of paper on the market, and there is nothing to prevent the Senate from adopting the same course. If this matter is to go to the committee the other House must consent. It cannot be done unless the other House chooses voluntarily to surrender part of the power it possesses. If the system is to be one of uniformity, legislation is required and a joint committee will not accomplish the purpose. It will require legislation, as we required legislation with respect to the Library in order to secure joint action there.

Mr. CHARLTON. There is a point in connection with the reading rooms of the two Houses that is worthy of consideration. The Senate and the House of Commons get along with the use of the same library, and I fail to understand why they cannot get along with the use of a common reading room. The Senate spent last year for newspaper subscriptions \$2,073, while for the same purpose the Commons spent \$1,967. It is absurd to maintain two separate reading rooms. The two Houses could get along very well with one, and the members of the Houses would become better acquainted with one another, and there would be no jostling or crowding caused by using a common room. By spending a thousand dollars or so less on one common reading room than the sum now spent on both, a reading room could be established which would be greatly superior to the two existing rooms. I am well aware that the Senate are very tenacious of their rights. The Committee which made various recommendations with a view to economizing the expenditure, and which might have been adopted with great advantage, found that feeling to prevail. The members who sat on that Committee could not have failed to have

noticed that the Senate were very tenacious of their rights, but it strikes me that if the matter were placed in a proper manner before them an arrangement could be come to whereby some thousands of dollars could be saved by having a general reading room.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see that the chief Opposition whip (Mr. Trow) has just come into the House. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) made some reference to the fact that he and the whip on this side of the House ordered these trunks for the Senate and the House of Commons, and I must say that it appears to be a general skirmish with regard to matters of incidental expenditure. I am not often able to agree with the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), but I am glad to be able to endorse what he has said about these trunks. They are no credit to the three gentlemen who had the ordering of them, as the trunks furnished to the House of Commons are very inferior articles, although I understand that the same price was paid for them as for the Senate trunks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. McMULLEN. If that is not the case, then I would like to know how it comes that this inferior and trashy article is furnished to the members of the House of Commons, while members of the Senate get a superior and a more expensive trunk. I would like to know from the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin) whether or not he has got the same trunk as the Senators. I have been credibly informed that he secured for himself a Senate trunk, and I do not know whether my friend the whip on this side of the House did the same. If the same price was paid for the trunks furnished to the Senate and to the House of Commons, the price paid for the House of Commons trunks was altogether too high, or the price paid for the Senate trunks was too low. I believe the Senate trunks were made in Ottawa and the House of Commons trunks in Montreal, and I would like to ask the hon. member for Cornwall if he has secured a Senate trunk?

Mr. BERGIN. I may inform the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that I did not state the member for Perth (Mr. Trow) had anything to do with purchasing the trunks. After prorogation, and when it was proposed to make a contract for trunks in obedience to the orders of the House, I wrote to the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Trow), and whether he was at home or not I do not know, but I did not receive an answer to my letter, and I did not see the hon. gentleman until we met again this session. I went to the different trunk makers in Montreal and the Chairman of the Senate Committee said he would do the same in Toronto. I found that I could buy no trunks for anything like the money it had been suggested in the House such articles should cost. I spoke to a friend of mine who is a commission merchant and a dealer in leather, and he said he would get samples of the trunks from different manufacturers and let us know when the samples would be brought together. I referred the matter to the Speaker and we saw the different samples of trunks at Montreal and selected the one which he thought was the better one. With all due deference to what has been said by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in my opinion one of the trunks supplied to the House of Commons will out-

last two or three of the trunks supplied to the Senate. They have not the appearance of the Senate trunks, I admit, but I think they are more solid and better constructed. They are made of solid leather on iron frames and I am informed they are equal to the sample. As far as the trunk which I have received is concerned, I may say that it is the same as that which other gentlemen have, and I have not a Senate trunk, nor would I exchange my trunk for the Senate trunk.

Mr. TROW. I will take some responsibility for these trunks, notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin). Some two years ago I urged upon the special committee of the Printing Committee to purchase trunks of the description we have received which would be of some service and of some value to us, instead of having our houses encumbered with shoddy trunks received every session which were totally useless, and the cost of five during the parliamentary term would cost nearly the price of the leather trunk. Now you have something that is useful for yourselves and families through time. I do not know what kind of trunk my inquisitive friend from Wellington received, but I fancy it was similar to the one I got. It was made in Montreal and cost \$25, while the Senate trunks made in Ottawa cost \$32. The latter trunks perhaps are somewhat better and a little more durable. Our trunks are in my opinion cheap, and good, and serviceable, and every member ought to be thankful that he has something to point to, to show that he has been a member of Parliament during his life.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). It seems that, while the Minister of Finance is quite correct that the expenditure of money is under the supervision of the joint committee, yet, after all, the responsibility rests in the first place with the Government and in the next place with the House. If the members of the House are satisfied that things are wrong, it seems to me they ought to remedy them, and now is the time to do so, because it will not do to lay the blame on the committee or anyone else. We have the power in our own hands to stop this matter, and, if the Government think that there has been extravagance in this line, either in the Senate or in the House of Commons, they should not assume the responsibility of asking for so large a vote. I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance, in a large measure, that a comparison of the Commons with the Senate will not show that the Commons deserve a very great deal of credit for economy in this matter either. The question is, are we prepared now—and now is the time to do it—to control the committee by simply refusing to vote the money? If so, the Ministry ought to have the courage to reduce the item, and in doing so they ought to be supported by the House. But you cannot greatly blame the committee, when you vote this year as much for contingencies as was voted in previous years. You find the members of the House of Commons charged with 888 knives, nearly four for each member. If you place as much money at the disposal of the committee this year as they had last year, they will consider that they have authority to expend it. The control is really in the House, and now is the time to deal with the question by simply reducing this vote, or, if you like, by wiping out the whole amount for contingencies: or, if you still think you should in

the public interest have stationery, then vote the amount you think necessary.

Mr. BERGIN. There is no doubt a great deal of waste in stationery, and there can be no doubt that the House is charged with using a large number of different articles which are not used by the members of the House. Some hon. gentlemen forget that in addition to the members of the House, stationery is furnished to the *Hansard* reporters, to the press, to the clerks, and to all the officers of the House. Almost every clerk gets a knife. There can be no denying that there is a great deal of waste of stationery inside of the House, and that members are not as careful as they ought to be in the use of stationery. We endeavoured to introduce a check on this wasteful consumption of stationery three or four years ago by asking Mr. Romaine to insist upon an order being sent by each member of the House for the stationery he requires, so that I think the amount of stationery used by each individual member is on record every day in the Stationery Department, and it can be seen at a glance who are the members so wasteful and extravagant. It is not only in paper, but in other articles of stationery that there is waste. You can understand that if a member goes to Mr. Romaine and tells him that he must have this or that, that one has carried off his knife or another his paper-cutter, Mr. Romaine cannot very well refuse him.

Mr. DENISON. I gather from the remarks of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) that hon. members opposite each get two knives. I have only been able to get one. I think the paper they get is also very much better than what we get on this side.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I do not wish to belittle the efforts of the Printing Committee, but I think both Houses would be better served by having the selection of paper made by men who are thoroughly capable of making a proper selection.

Mr. BERGIN. Like the member for North Brant, I suppose.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. No. I am not like the hon. member for Stormont. I do not think all the common sense is contained in my own head; I give others credit for having a little as well as myself, and I am going to suggest that the power to select this stationery be delegated to Mr. Romaine and the corresponding officer in the Senate. That would be the way to have a uniform selection made for both Houses, and they would probably be better served than they are at present. I do not think the Printing Committee have authority to delegate this power. I think the Government ought to take the matter up and instruct these two officers to make a uniform selection every year, so that there would be no disparity in the quality of the stationery supplied to the two Houses.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). It is not, I think, the quality of the article that we have reason to complain of. I think the stationery all round is perfectly good stationery for anybody, and if the Senators get a few articles of a little better quality than we do, I do not complain of that. I complain of the quantity, not of the quality. I see there were 888 knives bought for members of the House of Commons last year. I got only one knife; who got six? Where are the men who have appropriated these articles? I suppose Mr. Romaine who distributed these articles makes an entry of the name of every man to whom he gives a knife. In more than one case, three extra knives have been given, but, of course, not to any members of this House. Let a member of the Government ask Mr. Romaine to send down a return of what has become of those knives and then we will know where the leak is. Why buy 888 knives for 215 members? If a member loses his knife, let him buy another, and not ask the taxpayers to pay three or four times over in the same session for knives costing from \$1.25 to \$2. The difficulty is not so much in the quality as in the quantity, and the condition of things appears to be really worse here than in the Senate, with respect to knives at all events. I do not know how the scissors stand, but I know that in my trunk there is only one small pair. If there is a knife wanted for the reporters, buy that and no more; and when a man loses a knife let him get another at his own expense.

Mr. FOSTER. The House will remember that two years ago we had a joint committee of both Houses which came to certain conclusions, that it was found impracticable, in some way or other, to carry out, and they made a report which was never adopted. The leader of the Senate has informed me that last year they appointed a sub-committee on contingencies, which went through the whole matter thoroughly and devised a means of cutting down this expenditure to the actual wants of the Senate, so that these extra knives, &c., will not hereafter be bought. They also sent us a report, which is on the Journals of the House of last year, so the leader of the Senate informs me. Now if the House of Commons will reform itself in the same way, we will get rid of these annual discussions and of a great deal of the blame which attaches to the Government throughout the country for these things which cannot be properly explained. I do not despair that before the session is over we shall be able to devise a means whereby this expenditure shall be cut down.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The best way would be to reduce the vote at once. So long as we leave it at the same amount, those who have the spending of it will purchase to the full amount at their disposal. If there is this economy to be effected in the Senate contingencies, they will not require so much money. The hon. Minister may say that they will not spend it; but if they do not need the whole of it, we would be strengthening their hands if we did not vote the full amount. I do not hold the Government responsible for this thing, because it is in the hands of the House as well, and if we are honest we ought to be prepared to reduce the amount and thus accomplish the reform the Minister recommends.

Mr. FOSTER. No one can be prepared to say now, what, under the new regulations to be adopted, will be the exact sum required. We had better pass this item now, and if we can come to an arrangement before concurrence it will not be difficult when we find the basis on which we can proceed, to drop a certain amount before the item is concurred in.

Mr. TROW. I wish to say one word with reference to this streak of economy which has seized hon. members apropos of this small item of extras. We must take into consideration the fact

that it is not merely 215 members who receive these knives. The reporters all receive them—about fifty reporters; and there are other civil service men who receive knives. The *Hansard* staff and translators receive knives, the pages and the messengers of the House. Why, the very time occupied in this discussion is more costly to the country than all these extras hon. gentlemen have been speaking about. Very likely some of the hon. gentlemen whose ire is roused with reference to a few knives and reams of paper have been sinners themselves. I do not know any set of men in this country who could make a better selection of stationery than is contained in the stationery trunks. I am surprised that hon. gentlemen should be so ready to make complaints against the committee which has done its duty in every respect. I can say this conscientiously that I have received one knife each session and no more, and do not want any more. At the same time, I would not raise my voice over a few extra knives.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I wish to disabuse the mind of the hon. member for South Perth that I found fault with the selection of stationery. I have not done so, but what I contended for, and what every hon. gentleman in this House ought to contend for, is that there should be uniformity in the selection, and that the Senate should not receive better stationery than the House of Commons.

Mr. BAIN. Perhaps the most reasonable remedy for the complaint is that made by the hon. member for Huron. The leak is not so much in the selection, but in the fact that parties apply at the department when they have lost their knives, for others. They go to Mr. Romaine and insist on getting these extra things. If a man loses his knife he should buy another. For myself I may say—and I have had a good many years' experience in this House—I never on any occasion received more than one knife in any one session, which I got in my sessional trunk along with my stationery. I never asked Mr. Romaine for another knife. If I lost my knife, I thought I was to blame, but I think the leak occurs in a way for which we are ourselves responsible, and the sooner we realize that it is not creditable to the Commons the sooner we will have this leak stopped.

House of Commons—Salaries, per
Clerk's estimates..... \$73,350

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There is an increase of \$1,300 here.

Mr. SPEAKER. There are twenty-nine statutory increases of \$50 each, making \$1,450, and there is a reduction in the estimate for the assistant law clerk of \$150. Mr. McCord, who was receiving \$1,950, has been promoted to be the law clerk, and the estimates for the assistant is at the minimum of \$1,800.

House of Commons—Contingencies.... \$23,100

Mr. McMULLEN. I notice here an item for a silk gown, \$60, and also for 17½ yards of silk, \$30.13. There is also an item for swords for Serjeant-at-Arms, \$47.12, and many other items of expenditure that I think ought to be fairly explained. There is a payment to Mrs. F. Wilson of \$1,500 for example. I would ask how many silk gowns are required?

Mr. OUIMET. I am informed that the silk gown was bought for the use of the Clerk of the

House. It has been the custom for many, many years, long before I was here myself, to buy these gowns at the public expense, and I have seen no reason and no resolution from the House varying that practice. I suppose it was done in the same way as before.

Mr. McMULLEN. What about the 17½ yards of silk?

Mr. OUIMET. I know that some silk was bought for the ornament of the Speaker's chamber, and this may be the item, but I cannot say. I can state that no silk was bought for the private use of the Speaker or any of the employes of the House.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Speaker is allowed \$300 for a private secretary during the time the House is in session. I understand that last year the Speaker used a clerk of the House as his secretary, and that the \$300 allowed for that purpose was made payable to that clerk in his own office. I should like to know if that is correct?

Mr. OUIMET. That is not correct. The money was paid to the private secretary.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Has the Deputy Speaker a clerk?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. No.

Mr. MULLOCK. Apparently there is no increase in this item, but I think there is an increase in fact. Last year the expenditure for contingencies of the House of Commons was \$23,100, but it included \$2,000, the salary of the Deputy Speaker, which appears this year under a separate item.

Mr. FOSTER. The Deputy Speaker's salary was a separate item last year.

Mr. MULLOCK. I was quoting from the Auditor General's Report, but I see that I am in error. There is an item of \$47.12 for swords for the Serjeant-at-Arms. Is this an annual expenditure?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the old swords have worn out. They have probably been used since Confederation.

Mr. McMULLEN. I see here items for cab-hire for the Speaker, \$137, for his clerk \$79, and for sundries \$14.25, making about \$230 last year. I think we should have some explanation in regard to those items.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suppose the \$79 is not for the Speaker's clerk, but for the Clerk of the House, and my own experience is that the item of \$137 for the Speaker is not very much.

Mr. MULLOCK. This account should be better classified in the Auditor General's Report. It would be proper, under Commons' details, to have one account showing the expenses in connection with the Speaker's department and the Speaker's household, and so on, and a separate account in regard to the House of Commons itself. At present it is impossible to distinguish in regard to these items, whether they are for the House of Commons, or some officers of the House of Commons.

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt the Auditor General will read the suggestion; he is very apt to take suggestions.

Publishing Debates..... \$40,000

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does that cover the expenditure? I doubt it very much. What was the sum last year?

Mr. FOSTER. \$63,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman see any advantage in voting what we know will not be sufficient? I am afraid that \$40,000 will not cover the expenditure, from my recollection of the experience of former years. I should be very glad if it would.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is anything gained in making an estimate smaller than it is known will be needed; but it is rather a difficult matter for a Finance Minister to make an estimate larger than the proper officer who sends in the amount thinks is necessary. I do not feel myself at liberty to make it greater.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Where is the expenditure for the last year?

Mr. FOSTER. In B—164.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I see the Debates last year cost \$63,006.

Mr. FOSTER. It depends on the length of the session. It is impossible to estimate for it accurately.

Salaries and Contingencies—Serjeant-at-Arms' estimates.....\$33,932.50

Mr. McMULLEN. On page 165—B, I see "Mrs. F. Wilson, two months, per Order in Council; \$533.33; special vote, \$1,000." What is that for?

Mr. SPEAKER. That was for the late law clerk, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. McMULLEN. What is the salary of the law clerk?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it is \$3,200. It will be remembered that Mr. Wilson died rather suddenly, and there was an Order in Council to give his widow two months' salary.

Mr. McMULLEN. On page 165—B, I find an item for 20 yards of silk in one place, and 17½ yards in another place. What is that for?

Mr. SPEAKER. I imagine that is for furnishing the Speaker's rooms. These accounts, as the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has stated, are all dispersed throughout the Auditor General's Report. They are arranged alphabetically instead of being arranged under the different services for which the amounts were paid.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have tried to keep some trace of the items connected with the Speaker's department in this chamber for the last seven or eight years. I notice that an enormous quantity of stuff goes in there. I do not know whether it is there now; but, I fancy, if the hon. Speaker now in possession found all the stuff there, he would not be able to get into the place at all. Year after year a large amount of stuff is bought and put in there, and when another Speaker comes in there appears to be room enough for any quantity of stuff more. I think there is room for saving a good deal of money in connection with that department, as well as in connection with the restaurant. I find a large amount of stuff is bought for the purpose of refurnishing the restaurant every year when Parliament assembles. I do think that all the expenditure connected with these two departments should be put under the strict supervision of some person who would be held responsible, and that when one man goes out the contents of the

Mr. FOSTER.

Speaker's department should be carefully listed and the list should be handed over to the new Speaker, and at the end of his term he should hand over to his successor everything that he receives, except those things that may be broken or destroyed. It appears to me there is an enormous quantity of stuff that is bought and charged to the Speaker's department and the restaurant downstairs, and I do not really know what becomes of it. If all that has been bought and paid for during these eight or nine years, were to be found either downstairs or upstairs, there would not be room for a rat to get through it. I would like to know what becomes of all this stuff that is bought and paid for every year. I was much pleased to hear the remarks that dropped from the Finance Minister. I think when the Senate go to work and cut down their expenditure after careful investigation, they set a wise example for us, and there is room to carefully criticize the expenditures in connection with the two departments I have mentioned. I have endeavoured to criticize these things from year to year, but it does not appear to do any good. We find afterwards the same quantity of stuff is bought, and the same expenditure is made. You would fancy, from the charges that appear in the Auditor General's Report, that at the end of every session the place is cleaned out and the stuff is carried off, and we have got to refit, refurnish, recarpet, and rearrange the whole place for the purpose of meeting the convenience of the Speaker who is going to occupy it. I think that there is something wrong, and some effort should be made to find out where the leak is.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the restaurant, an inventory of the goods was made at the time the keeper took charge of it at the beginning of this Parliament, and an agreement was made with him that he would return these articles to the charge of the Serjeant-at-Arms at the end of the session, and would make good any deficiencies there might be. With regard to the Speaker's rooms, I suppose my hon. friend will hardly expect that no renewals would be needed. He, perhaps, has kept house himself, and he knows that articles wear out and have to be replaced, and he would hardly expect the Speaker, no matter who he might be, to exercise police supervision over the rooms during the recess between one session of Parliament and another. I take it that the servants are perfectly honest, and that nothing is taken away from the Speaker's chambers during the recess. But I think my hon. friend will understand that those goods, after they are used for a certain length of time, become worn out, and perhaps the Speaker's wives think they are rather unfashionable, and would like to change some articles. But I would say for my own part, that very few additions have been made to the furnishing of the rooms since I have had the honour of occupying the position of Speaker.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. I will suggest the adoption of some plan similar to that adopted by the Public Accounts Committee in regard to Rideau Hall. When a Governor leaves, or at the end of every year, an inventory is taken of all the goods in the Hall; and, I think, a similar plan should be adopted with regard to the Speaker's apartments.

Salaries of Officers of the Library. . . . \$16,895

Mr. MULOCK. Will the Minister of Finance explain the increase?

Mr. FOSTER. There are the statutory increases, and, in addition, \$200 to the salary of each of the librarians. It was thought that their present salaries were not sufficient, and an increase of \$200 each is to place them at the same salaries as deputy heads.

Grant to Parliamentary Library. \$17,500

Mr. MULOCK. I notice \$148 for newspaper subscriptions. If these subscriptions are to purchase papers for the accommodation of the staff of the library, they are unnecessary, because the reading room is quite accessible. An item of \$288, travelling expenses of the librarians, needs explanation. I find that of the gross expenditure of \$12,000 or \$13,000, mainly for books, not more than \$100 is expended in Toronto, a considerable sum being expended in Montreal and a large sum in Ottawa. I do not know whether special rates are obtained by dealing with particular firms. If not, the expenditure should not be made in this fashion.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenditures are made under the supervision of the Library Committee.

Mr. SCRIVER. As a member of the Library Committee I may say that these purchases are all made by the librarians. They are made subject to the supervision of the Library Committee, and the accounts are all accurately audited by a sub-committee of that committee during each session. The bulk of the purchases are made abroad, either in the United States, England, or foreign countries, but some are made in Ottawa. I do not know how it happens that the city in which my hon. friend for North York (Mr. Mulock) takes so much interest appears so infrequently. I suppose it is because, perhaps, they do not bind books as well, or publish as many books as many cities. At all events, the selection is made by the librarians themselves.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend's explanation hardly covers the point. I do not suppose our book purchases are made direct from English or other publishers, but through Canadian dealers.

Mr. SCRIVER. The orders are sent direct to the publishers abroad by the librarians, but not always.

Mr. MULOCK. Do the librarians make the purchases themselves and afterwards account to the committee for the expenditure, or has the committee anything to say as to the channels through which the purchases shall be made? If not, I submit there should be a fair distribution of favours.

Mr. SCRIVER. The members of the committee are requested to make suggestions as to the character of the works to be purchased. I do not know that they are expected to make suggestions to the librarians as to the places where or the persons from whom the purchases are to be made.

Mr. MULOCK. Then I ask that the librarians be asked to furnish a statement as to the principle on which they purchase books, having reference to the sources through which they purchase them.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the Library submitted to the House at the opening of the Session may contain the information. If not any other

information necessary may be obtained through the Chairman of the Library Committee; who is Mr. Speaker.

Printing, printing paper and binding....\$70,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Much printing is done that is altogether unnecessary, and elaborate and expensive reports are scattered through the country and little use made of them. A considerable saving might be effected on this item without loss even to the country or to the individual.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It would be satisfactory, not only to members of this House but to the public, if some Government officer was instructed to prepare a comparative statement as to the cost of printing done at the Printing Bureau as compared with the cost of printing done under the old contract system. It would indicate to the country whether we had made an advance by establishing a Printing Bureau. In connection with this item, I desire to ask whether any further information can be given with respect to Barber & Co.'s suit against the Government for damages?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no further information to offer, and the Secretary of State is not in his seat. I am informed there has not been any decision in the case.

Revision of Electoral Lists under Franchise Act.....\$ 150,000

Mr. LANDERKIN. Have instructions been given to the revising officers to go on with the revision of the lists, or do they go on without instructions? Because last year when they were going on with the revision they were told to stop.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There was some public intimation given that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce any Bill to suspend the operation of the Act and they are going on.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When you suspend, do you give them notice or do you let the Statute take its course?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). Would the hon. gentleman say if this \$150,000 is adequate to pay all expenses in connection with the preparation of the voters' lists?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am afraid not.

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). What is the total estimate?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. About \$240,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understand that the revising officers do not advertize when the preliminary revision is to take place. I believe this is one of the economies the Government has introduced into the system.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The revising officer prepares a list of additions and erasures, and he publishes this at a certain number of places and states that he will sit to hear objections, but he does not give notice when he begins his work.

Mr. DEVLIN. What is the consequence when the revising officer sends out notice that he will go and sit at a certain place and does not go and sit?

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell). I would like to know how this estimated amount is expended: how much does the Minister estimate as necessary to pay the salaries of the revising officers, whether it is proposed to pay clerks as well, and how much

will be required to pay the cost of printing the lists ?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Speaking roughly, the amount required for the salaries and disbursements of the revising officers would be about \$150,000. It is not intended to pay the clerks separately, but to follow the system which was adopted last year of paying the revising officer a sum sufficient for his services and his disbursements, and he provides his own clerks and his own bailiffs and pays them out of that sum.

Mr. FLINT. I would like to call the attention of the Government to a matter which was brought to my notice by a member of this House, namely, that at least in one electoral division of the Dominion one of the revising officers appointed by the Government is the law partner in business of one of the members in this House who is very likely to become a candidate in an election. I would like to ask the Government if any representations have been made to them in this matter, and if so what they propose to do in regard to it ? I need hardly say that it is considered very improper, and that it is looked upon as a violation of the spirit if not of the letter of the Franchise Act, that a person so near in relation to a member of this House, and to a probable candidate in a county in which the elections have always been very close, should occupy that important office. As this matter has been brought to my attention, and as it appears to be very pertinent to the subject under discussion, I would like to hear the views of the Ministry upon the matter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The case the hon. gentleman refers to is not quite as he understands it to be : however, I will not challenge the statement of fact which he has made. I may point out that the law makes no provision whatever for removing a revising officer, except the provision that he is to hold office in the same way as a judge does, and be removed by a vote of both Houses. We have, therefore, no power to remove a revising officer. There is no provision for his disqualification because of the fact that his law partner is elected to the House, but the subject is well worthy of consideration and will be considered.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I believe I am the person to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Flint) refers, and I may say to him that he is quite astray altogether in his ideas on this point.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I say that the revising officer is not my partner at all.

Mr. McMULLEN. Was he your partner ?

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). I am quite ready to give you a very full explanation.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Well, do so.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). He has never been my partner.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Then he does not refer to you.

Mr. WHITE (Shelburne). Yes, he does; and the reason I know it is that he has put a question on the order paper, and therefore I am quite satisfied the hon. gentleman refers to me. He never has been my partner. He was appointed revising officer before I had any idea whatever of running in an election. I may also say that the voters' list, as made in the County of Shelburne, gives

Mr. MILLS (Bothwell).

satisfaction to both sides of politics, and I venture to say that it would be impossible for the hon. gentleman to find anybody in the county who objects to the list as it now stands, or to the acts of the revising officer.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Last year a Minister of the Crown intimated that there would be a revision of the lists and I went to the trouble of getting blanks printed and having them sent out. It cost me a considerable amount of money, and after I had made that outlay, the revision did not go on. In the year 1888 a similar thing was done. If you are going to have a revision it should be stated publicly that you are going on with it, so as to save trouble and expense to the members. This Act has been suspended on several occasions, the first revision was in 1886, it was suspended in 1887, it was again suspended in 1888, it was revised in 1889 and was again suspended in 1890, and we want to know whether it is going to die or not this year. I want to have more than the words of the Secretary of State for this before I go to the expense, because we had his assurance that there would be a revision in 1890 and no revision took place. We would like to have the assurance of the leader of the Government now, as the Minister of Justice rather evades the issue.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am not evading the issue at all. I would advise the hon. gentleman to send out his blanks and I can comfort him with the assurance that they will not be wasted, as the same blanks will do. I am extremely sorry that we had not a revision, for I know the hon. gentleman likes it, but he will not be disappointed a second time.

Mr. BARRON. This item in itself may not be large but we all know that the cost of revising the lists is something enormous. A reduction might be made by reducing the number of revising officers. In Victoria you have two revising officers, one the county judge, and another a gentleman practicing law. The population of the County of Victoria is less than that of the County of Peterborough; yet in the latter county there is only one revising officer, who is a County Court judge. If he can do all the business for a larger population, why would not one revising officer be sufficient for the County of Victoria? This system of unnecessarily duplicating officers goes on all over the country. By doing the work with a fewer number of officers you could save a large amount of expenditure.

Mr. DEVLIN. I agree with what has been said to a certain extent, but I believe that in the Province of British Columbia there are six revising barristers, whereas in the County of Ottawa, which has a larger population than that province, we have but one. I can understand how it is that some portions of the county have not been visited by the revising barrister at all. When a revision of the list took place, there were three townships, Hartwell, Ripon and Suffolk, which received notices that they would be visited by the revising barrister; but strange to say that gentleman did not see proper to go into those townships, with the result that although the provincial lists showed nearly 300 names in Suffolk, and over 300 in Hartwell, the Dominion list showed only 60 names in the one township and 62 in the other. So carefully was the list made, moreover, that even a public square was put on it, and that square voted, and I believe

voted against me. Therefore, if in the Province of British Columbia six revising barristers are necessary, it seems to me that in the County of Ottawa, which has 70,000 population, even a larger number are needed.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is the printing included in this vote?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Only in part.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. Is it the intention to do away with getting printing done by outside parties?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be all done away with outside except the printing of the supplemental lists in the first instance. That is to say, the list which the revising officer posts up indicating what names are to be added and what to be struck off will be printed in the locality, but the regular lists will be done here.

Mr. FRASER. Might I ask if the Government could not have uniform blanks furnished? At present different forms are used in different counties. Could not the Government prepare official blanks and sell them to both parties, instead of leaving the parties to prepare them themselves? That would give us uniformity.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I do not think that could be done under the law as it stands, but the question could be considered when the law comes to be amended, as to whether forms of application should not be embodied in the Act.

Mr. FRASER. It is hard to get amendments made here. I have no doubt that if the plans were prepared in the office of the hon. Minister of Justice, they would be accepted by all the officials.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I think it would be an improvement if the revising barrister were paid in some other way than according to the number of names. Many names appear in duplicate, and sometimes I have seen the same name three times on the list, so that there is a direct inducement to the revising barristers to get as many names on the list as possible. Then they are also induced to keep on names which have been struck off. In the town of Chatham there were no less than 150 names struck off which we objected to, but strange to say when the list came to be finally revised these names appeared again. I do not know whose fault it was; but I think if the revising barrister were paid a definite sum for the work instead of by the number of names, we should have a purer and better list.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice to the large size and inconvenient form of the present lists. Could he not direct the revising officers to prepare them in more compact and convenient form, which would be more easily handled and carried about?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think there is no doubt that a smaller sized list would be much more convenient, and I will ask the hon. Secretary of State who has charge of the subject, if the change can be made without adding largely to the expense. I fancy that some mechanical difficulty may be in the way, owing to the forms having been permanently made up.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Would the hon. Minister of Justice state what is the argument in favour of paying revising officers according to the number of names?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am sure that no case can have arisen of names having been left on the list by the revising officer in order that he might get a few cents for such extra names: but mistakes will necessarily sometimes occur. If any names were improperly left on the list after the final revision, it must have been through some oversight of the parties watching the revision. The object of establishing the mode of payment was to arrive at some system by which we could adjust the cost of revision to the labour in the revision. If you leave it at large, it will be impossible to get any standard by which the payment can be made. In rural constituencies the number of names is less, but the work is probably greater than in urban constituencies, as there is more travelling from home and greater inconvenience to the revising officer. We equalize the conditions to some extent by providing that there shall be a stated salary of \$300 to each revising officer, no matter whether his constituency is rural or urban. Then up to a certain number of names we allow five cents a name, and above that number three cents. In that way we provide by a permanent vote of three hundred dollars a fair allowance to the revising officer in the rural districts where he has to travel more and has fewer names, and we provide compensation to the urban revising officer who has a larger number of names involving more clerical work. It is an attempt to get at equalization, and we have found it to work well in this sense, that there are very few complaints that the distribution of remuneration is not even. There are of course exceptional cases, enormous constituencies like the Counties of Ottawa, and Chicoutimi and Algoma, which always have to be treated exceptionally, but otherwise the present plan of payment has been found fairly to adjust the remuneration to the labour.

Mr. MULOCK. Did I understand the Minister to say this item would have to be increased by \$90,000?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No; about \$240,000 altogether.

Mr. MULOCK. That would mean the vote is short by ninety thousand dollars of the amount necessary to pay the cost of revision. I am surprised and disappointed at that statement. Some time ago we were informed that the cost of revising the lists, on the only two occasions they have been revised, was \$680,078; and on the 20th May last the Secretary of State said: "The old lists being in type will by so much reduce the cost of the next revision." Well, looking at the figures furnished by the Secretary of State on that occasion, it appears that the revision of the lists in 1889-90 cost \$236,800, and I inferred from what he said that the revision for the current year would be much less. But now we are told it is much more; in fact it is nearly a quarter of a million dollars. In other words, for the sake of putting this Act into force, on the three separate occasions, the country has to pay \$922,000. That is an unwarrantable waste of public money, for which there is not a shadow of excuse. The Act has been condemned by the Administration by their refusing year after year to enforce it. It is discredited by every person in the country. There is not one who has got to do with the enforcing of it, with the exception of those who receive their portion of the million dollars, who

does not condemn it. I have conversed with many members on both sides, and am perfectly in order when I say that I have not yet been able to find a member on the other side who approves of the Act.

Mr. DENISON. I approve of it.

Mr. MULOCK. I commend the hon. gentleman for his courage; but it does not follow that, because he approves of it, it is a good measure. One swallow will not make a summer. His opinion no more than mine will decide the question. I speak from observation and experience, and, whilst the hon. member for West Toronto approves of it, no one else on either side does so. If the new Government are prepared to strike out a new path and are not to be hampered by the policy of their predecessors, they could not inaugurate their Administration better than by reforming this obnoxious and cumbersome election law.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). As a young member, I take this opportunity of stating that I am of the same opinion as the hon. member for West Toronto. Having some experience in the matter, I must say that the Act is the best ever enforced in the District of Algoma, for this reason, that under the provincial Act a very large number of voters in that district are disfranchised. A very large number of young men engaged in fishing, mining and railroading, who have not the means to place themselves on the provincial lists, have a vote under the Dominion Franchise Act. For that reason I think the Act the best ever enforced in that end of the Dominion.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Explain how it is?

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). If you take the Act of the Ontario Legislature passed in 1888—I think it is on page 11 of the Statutes of that year—you will find that it stipulates that only householders and property owners in the unorganized districts of East and West Algoma, Hastings and Essex, and one other county, are allowed to vote. There are no lists provided. There is no machinery to provide lists in that unorganized portion of the Dominion I have the honour to represent. Thousands who are not householders or property owners have thus no means of getting on the provincial lists, and consequently have no votes in that district. If I am wrong, I am liable to be corrected.

Mr. BARRON. The hon. gentleman who has spoken knows very well that the Ontario lists are prepared, in the first place, by an assessor, and if there is an unorganized district, there is no assessor; and, as my hon. friend behind me says, every one votes. I want to point out to the Minister of Justice that he has not yet answered the point I made, whereby I think the extraordinary expense of the Act can be very materially reduced. Representations have been made to the hon. Minister on the advisability of reducing the number of revising officers. There is, for instance, the County of Peterborough, which has a larger population and area than Victoria, and yet has but one revising officer to two in Victoria. I do not mean to say an unkind word regarding the revising officer for North Victoria. On the contrary, I find him most accurate, and am perfectly satisfied with his fairness and justice. I delight in taking this opportunity to so speak of him, but it seems to me that, when we can have one revising officer in the County of Peterborough, surely one is sufficient in the County of Victoria.

Mr. MULOCK (Brant).

and I think representations have been made to the Minister of Justice to that effect. I see the hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Stevenson) in his place, and no doubt he can tell us that the revising officer in his county had plenty of time to do his work and did it well. I, therefore, think that in the County of Victoria, with less area and less work to do, one revising officer would be sufficient and would have plenty of time, so that would be one way of reducing the expense of this unfortunate Act.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I agree with the hon. member that it is very desirable to decrease the expense by having not more than one revising officer in an electoral district, where that is possible, but that cannot be done in regard to the existing revising officers whose tenure of office is such that they cannot be removed. However, it will be remembered in future appointments.

Mr. McMULLEN. I should like to know if any instructions have been issued this season to revising officers in regard to the revision of the lists, and, if any instructions have been issued, what they are?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. No instructions have been issued at all to them beyond the announcement that the revision would proceed according to law this year, and as to the scale of remuneration which would be adopted.

Mr. WATSON. In the election of 1882, when a portion of the western territory was added to Manitoba, every resident householder had a vote, as I understand he has now in the district of Algoma, in the Province of Ontario. Consequently, the franchise is more liberal for the Local House of Ontario than it is for the Dominion, where a man has to have a house and has to be registered.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). The state of affairs in Algoma is entirely different from the way which it was represented by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson). The Ontario Act provides that householders and property owners only shall vote in the unorganized district. The Dominion Act provides that everyone 21 years of age and a British subject, and not otherwise disqualified, is entitled to a vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MACDONELL (Algoma). Well, provided he complies with the conditions of the Act. It is not necessary for him to be a householder or a property holder, but if he has \$300 a year he can vote. We have a very large element there composed of railroad men, lumbering men, fishermen and miners. They generally board. The Act contemplates that every man shall have a vote. It is practically manhood franchise. The Ontario Act is manhood franchise in a measure, but in these unorganized districts it is not, because they are neither property holders nor householders.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member is perfectly right, but I think what is complained of is that, in this unorganized district, there are a great many of these railroad navvies and men engaged in the mines who have votes in other counties, men who go into these lumbering districts for the winter and possibly into the mines in the summer. They work in Algoma and have a vote there, and they have votes elsewhere at the same time.

Mr. SOMERVILLE. It is worthy of putting on record that, of all the members who sit on the other side of the House, only two have had the courage of their convictions, and have risen to declare that they think the Franchise Act is a good one. Evidently there are two men there at all events who believe in that Act.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would make another appeal to the Minister of Justice. This season has been very unfavourable. I am told the prospects are that we are not likely to have a third of a crop. If ever there was a time to reduce expenditures which are unnecessary and uncalled for, that time is now, and this quarter of a million might be saved to the people by repealing this Act and might be expended in furnishing the people with seed grain, which it may be necessary to do if the weather remains as dry as it has been. I, therefore, appeal to the Government to lop off this quarter of a million in the interests of the country, though not perhaps in the interest of the Tory party, and expend it, if they are bound to expend it, in some work which will be useful to the people.

Patent Record.....\$15,000

Mr. FOSTER. That may be made \$12,000.

Mr. LANDERKIN. That might be dropped altogether this year in view of the hard times.

Mr. FOSTER. It is out of that that a large revenue comes to the country.

Committee rose and reported the resolutions.

ADJOURNMENT—THE BUDGET.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance if he proposes to make his Budget statement on Friday?

Mr. FOSTER. I am diffident about making another announcement. I have made so many that I am afraid the House will consider I am fickle in this matter. I think, unless extraordinary events occur, the Budget will be delivered on Tuesday next.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I think it is important that the Budget should be brought down immediately. It should have been brought down long ago. The Minister must know that the sugar trade of the country, which is an immense trade, is, I may say, almost paralysed. It is in such a state that extra provision had to be made for handling it meanwhile, and the large season of consumption is upon us. It is expected, whether rightly or wrongly, that the Government may deal with it in some way. It seems to me that the public interest demands, if any tariff changes are made, that they should be announced at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Finance does know all that the hon. gentleman has stated. It is not his fault that the Budget was not delivered a fortnight ago, but events over which we had no control kept it back. It may be possible to deliver it on Friday, and if so, I shall certainly do so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is well, for many reasons, that the date should be definitely fixed. If the hon. gentleman says Friday, all right.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be able to say to-morrow.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 17th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that, in obedience to the Order of the House of yesterday, Mr. Michael Connolly had delivered to the Clerk of the House the books of accounts, &c., required for examination by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, in connection with the enquiry relative to the Quebec Harbour Works, &c.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 104.) to amend the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890 (from the Senate).—Sir John Thompson.

DECK AND LOAD LINES.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 106) to provide for the marking of deck and load lines. He said: It will be recollected that last year the owners of ships built chiefly in the Maritime Provinces, were exceedingly alarmed to find that it was proposed by the Parliament of Great Britain to adopt extraordinarily severe regulations in reference to the loading of ships. By the provisions of the Imperial Bill then under consideration, all colonial ships, as well as ships built at home, were compelled to conform to these rules, regarding the extent to which they could be loaded and the amount of free-board to be given any vessel loading and clearing outwards at a British port. The history of that sort of legislation began in 1876, when the Imperial Parliament adopted what was known as a load line or a maximum mark under which a ship could be loaded on departing from a port in the United Kingdom. The fixing of the load line was left, however, entirely to the owner, a penalty being imposed only when no load line whatever was fixed; and the criticism on that measure was that the load line could practically be put upon the mast, and therefore the Bill fell entirely short of its object. Very exhaustive enquiries were promoted after 1876 by Parliamentary Committees, and elaborate calculations gone into in order to settle, mathematically as well as nautically, the exact measurement which should be adopted and the exact capacity of each ship for carrying certain cargoes, and after these elaborate enquiries had been made, chiefly with reference to iron and steel vessels, built as vessels in England and Scotland are, the Bill to which I have just referred was brought forward in the British Parliament. But instead of being confined to the vessels which had been chiefly considered with reference to the framing of rules for the free-board, it embraced the wooden ships of this country, although apparently the rules and calculations had very little reference,