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,

if any, to the requirements and capacity of our wooden ships. Those interested in the wooden ships of this country became exceedingly alarmed at the contemplated legislation, more particularly as the surveyors contemplated by the Imperial Bill, under the Board of Trade, upon whom devolved the duty of fixing that load line, were Lloyds' surveyors; and as the vessels of this country were chiefly classed Bureau Veritas, it was also feared great injustice would be done by these surveyors in dealing with ships classed entirely under different forms and rules from those of Lloyds. The Canadian Government, acting at the desire of the ship-owners of this country, immediately proceeded to represent to the Imperial Government the grave injustice and the great injury which would be done to the Canadian wooden ships, and the Bill in England was, after consideration, considerably amended, and passed with the following section added, to meet, if possible, the objections raised by the ship-owners of this country :—

"An Act to amend the Merchant Shipping Acts relating to load lines, Chap. 9, 53 Vic., Imperial Act, Sec. 3, provides: Where the legislature of any British possession, by any enactment provides for the fixing, marking and certifying of load lines on ships registered in that possession, and it appears to Her Majesty the Queen that the provisions of that enactment are based on the same principles as the provisions of this Act, and are equally effective for ascertaining and determining the maximum load lines to which such ships can be safely loaded in salt water and for giving notice of the load line to persons interested, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by Order in Council, to declare that any load line fixed and marked and any certificate given in pursuance of that enactment shall, with respect to ships so registered, have the same effect as if it had been fixed, marked or given in pursuance of this Act."

In consequence of that clause, this Bill has become necessary. I may say that in the petitions, large numbers of which have come to this House, with many signatures from those owning ships in the Maritime Provinces, the difficulties are pointed out that are to be encountered in the English Bill, notwithstanding that in another clause of it, which I did not read, the surveyors charged with the ascertaining where this load line is to be marked may be either Lloyds or Bureau Veritas; and the petitioners have pointed out that the rules upon which these surveyors are bound to act, under the Imperial Act, are inapplicable to the style of ships built in this country, no reference having been made, —the subject, perhaps, not having been understood in England—regarding the breadth of beam and the extraordinary buoyancy of the wooden ships of this country, and they point out that if it is impossible to get rid of the restrictions under the Imperial Act, if the load line is to be marked, it be marked by surveyors both here and in the United Kingdom appointed by the Dominion Government, who have special knowledge of wooden ships and their great carrying capacity. The proposition on the part of the ship-owners of this country seems to me not at all unreasonable, nor do they appear to be actuated by any selfish interest or desire to escape the imposition of necessary restrictions; and in support of this, I would refer to the very elaborate report I have included in the last annual report of the Department of Marine, of the Marine Conference held in Washington in 1889, where all the shipping countries in the world were represented, and where the very able English representatives endeavoured most earnestly to obtain the passage of a resolution in favour of a universal load line mark. After careful investigation and able presentation of the British case, the report of that conference was to the effect that it was impossible to lay down a general rule, or adopt a broad rule for the shipping of the various countries in the world. I would like to read to the House one extract in connection with this, as it supports, to my mind, the position taken by the shipping interests in Canada in favour of the load line being controlled by the authorities in the country to which the ships directly belong. The members of the conference, referring to the English rules, say :

"The above mentioned rules have proved to be a good standard upon which to determine the proper loading of British vessels, which are classed in Lloyds' register, or for other vessels, the particulars of whose strength and fitness to carry any particular cargo can easily be ascertained by the surveyors of the Board of Trade. As regards foreign ships, however, which are loading in the United Kingdom, and which are either not classed in Lloyds' register or the particulars of which cannot be ascertained without a minute examination, the difficulty is, that the law which intends to guard against dangers arising from overloading cannot be enforced without serious disadvantages to the owners of ships and cargoes consequent upon the difficulty of ascertaining whether the ships are fit to carry the cargo in question."

And they concluded that this very important subject of underloading or overloading ships should be left to the Governments concerned, and while they made many recommendations in regard to shipping, which they thought of universal application, and in the interest of the world's shipping generally, they took special pains to point out that, in a delicate matter such as this, it was impossible to make any hard and fast general rule which would apply to the different ships of different countries, since they are all built on different models and for different purposes. In the Bill which I ask leave to introduce, I have endeavoured to meet as far as possible the principle which is at stake, that is, to fix the maximum load line, but in fixing that line, I have endeavoured to secure the interests of our own shipping, and to prevent their being handicapped in a competition for the world's carrying trade, or for the trade which they now get in English ports. In the Imperial Act of 1890, the owner has no voice, whereas he has all the voice in the Bill of 1876, as to the fixing of the load line. I propose that, as we have no mathematical rule in this country, and no machinery to fix this even if we had the rule, so as to make it applicable to our shipping, we shall include the owner in the settling of the load line and associate with him a surveyor from the British Lloyds' Register, or from the French Bureau Veritas, or any authorized surveyor appointed; and, if they do not agree as to where the line shall be fixed, then the department shall take the responsibility, as it does in other matters which are represented in England by the Board of Trade. There are many other provisions suggested in regard to the safety of ships, and all the owners are agreed upon that point. The safety of their ships is important to them. Many safeguards have been thrown around them, and the only danger is that we might go too far and injure them. I know that the provisions of the Bill will be carefully scrutinized by the representatives of the shipping interests in this House, but, the House being aware that we are without any scientific calculations which have been applied in the rules adopted by the Board of Trade, I propose that, on the second reading of

this Bill, it shall be referred to a select committee, composed chiefly of the representatives in this House of the shipping interests which are concerned, and, with the aid of that committee, I hope we will be able to meet the difficulty which now presents itself. It must be remembered that, on or after the 1st October, the rules of the British Board of Trade will apply, and without complying with those rules no vessel will be allowed to enter or clear from any British port. Those rules of the English Board of Trade are very stringent, and, to comply with them, the vessel must go into dock and suffer great detention and consequently great embarrassment.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CATTLE TRADE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Marine to the fact that, in regard to the Bill respecting the Shipping of Live Stock which he proposes to allow to stand, the persons engaged in the cattle trade are very anxious to see some legislation passed. I have a telegram on the subject which I will send to him.

Mr. TUPPER. I intended to introduce this Bill to-day, but I find that there is a necessity to pass a resolution first, as it has to do with trade and commerce. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for promising to send me the telegram. I am also in receipt of a telegram stating that certain vessels have left our ports in such a condition in regard to the accommodation for cattle that should not have existed. But the Minister of Agriculture has, it seems to me, power to deal with the chief question at point—that is, the space allowed for the animals—under the Order in Council which is passed under the Act relating to Contagious Diseases of Animals, and I think the objection will be satisfactorily met, notwithstanding that this Bill is not now introduced.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. I have to-day received a message from Montreal from some shippers there, who say there is an order sent there by which a space of only 2 ft. 6 in. is allowed on deck, and the shippers say their cattle are too large at this season of the year, especially distillery cattle, which have to go on deck, and are not able to go into any space less than 2 ft. 8 in.

Mr. TUPPER. I think that information is incorrect. The Minister of Agriculture told me instructions had been sent to insist upon 2 ft. 8 in. space on deck and below deck. That is the space which has been adopted by the American Board of Trade.

Mr. FEATHERSTON. This is the telegram :

"Dr. McEachran says: Has orders fixing space for cattle at 2 ft. 8 in. on main deck, and 2 ft. 6 in. on upper decks. This compromise not satisfactory. Impress on Minister the fact that all the exporters in Canada have signed requisition to have space on all decks fixed at 2 ft. 8 in. They own the cattle and should know what is necessary. It is their property that is being injured. Salesmen on other side report cattle arriving in bruised condition owing to overcrowding, and boats have sailed within past few days which no Montreal insurance inspector would pass, one losing eighteen head before reaching Quebec."

Which shows that they were right in their judgment.

Mr. SPROULE. I have also received a telegram——

Mr. SPEAKER. I must call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there is nothing before the House at present. All these messages may be sent to the Minister or spoken of when the Bill is introduced, but the Bill has not been introduced.

Mr. LAURIER. This is a very important matter, and at present we do not know exactly where we stand, whether the space is 2 ft. 6 in. or 2 ft. 8 in. I think that hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of bringing this important question before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I did not know whether it would be appropriate to mention this matter here now, but, seeing that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Featherston) did so, I thought it would be proper for me to read the telegram I received from Mr. Dunn, who went to Montreal with about 2,000 head of cattle to ship. I telegraphed him yesterday, after seeing the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Marine, who stated that they had telegraphed to the inspector there to see that the space allowed was 2 ft. 8 in. for each head of cattle. This is the reply I received from Mr. Dunn :

"Government inspector here says he has orders fixing space for cattle at 2 ft. 8 in. on main deck only, and 2 ft. 6 in. on upper deck. This compromise not satisfactory. Please impress upon Minister the fact that all the exporters in Canada have signed requisition to have space on all decks fixed at two feet eight inches. They own the cattle and should know what is necessary. It is their property that is being injured. Salesmen in England report cattle arriving in bruised condition, owing to the overcrowding, and boats have sailed within the past few days which no Montreal insurance inspector would pass, one steamer losing eighteen head before reaching Quebec."

Mr. TUPPER. I thought the House understood, if the hon. member did not, that this is immediately under the charge of the Minister of Agriculture in consequence of the provisions of the Act to which I referred, and I understood him distinctly to say that they had conversation with reference to the matter on several occasions, and that instructions had gone to insist upon a space of 2 ft. 8 in., whether above or below, and whether on the upper deck or not ; and I was surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen make a statement as to the instructions that were actually sent. I shall see the Minister and have the matter cleared up at once.

Mr. DENISON. Do I understand the Minister of Marine to say that those instructions were telegraphed yesterday or to-day ?

Mr. TUPPER. I understood that those instructions went yesterday. With reference to that I may be mistaken. I know the Minister told me, when I spoke to him about the matter to-day, that 2 ft. 8 in. was the space.

Mr. DENISON. I have a telegram also, and they say they can take only 2 ft. 6 in. on the upper deck, and that the inspector was acting on these instructions.

Mr. TUPPER. There has apparently been some confusion.

Mr. DENISON. If the Minister will say that he had been instructed to make it the same on the upper deck as on the lower, that would probably cover the whole thing.

Mr. TUPPER. I understand the Minister has already said that. I shall see him with reference to the instructions.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BOWELL moved for leave to introduce a Bill No. (105) respecting the Intercolonial Railway. He said: The Government railways on the mainland now comprise the Intercolonial Railway, the Eastern Extension, the Cape Breton and the Windsor Branch Railways. A separate set of books for capital account on each of these railways has been kept in the past up to this year, which entails a considerable amount of extra work and expense. The object of the Bill is to make the three railways last named a part of the Intercolonial Railway, by which means the branches, ferries and all connected with the mainland will simply be designated the Intercolonial Railway, which will do away with the necessity for keeping a number of books, and the employment of a number of clerks for that purpose.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

POLICY OF THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. LAURIER. Before you proceed with the next order, I would call the attention of the leader of the House to the fact that in the statement which he gave to the House yesterday with regard to the formation of a new Cabinet, he made no statement whatever as to what would be the policy of the new Administration. I shall expect that to-morrow, or on any other day which would be convenient for him, he will give information to the House in that respect.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will probably be able to make some statement to-morrow, but I do not promise the hon. gentleman.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is a convenient time to enquire of the hon. Minister of Finance when he intends to deliver the Budget speech, whether on Friday or on Tuesday next?

Mr. FOSTER. As a sop to my hon. friend, I will present him with the ten days' statement down to the 10th June, and say that the Budget speech will be delivered on Tuesday next.

SEALING IN BEHRING SEA.

Mr. GORDON asked, Whether this Government had been advised by the Imperial Government that it is the intention of Her Majesty to issue, immediately after the passage of the Behring Sea Bill, now before the Imperial Parliament, an Order in Council as provided for in said Bill, prohibiting persons belonging to British ships from killing, taking, hunting, or attempting to kill, take or hunt, any seal in Behring Sea during the remainder of the present sealing season? If so, has Her Majesty been advised by this Government, that up to the 24th of May last, no less than forty-nine British or Canadian registered vessels, with a tonnage of 3,042 tons valued at $458,000, have been fitted out, and have cleared from Canadian ports for the purpose of sealing in Behring Sea during the present sealing season? If this Government have not so advised Her Majesty, will they do so at once by cable? so that no misapprehension may exist in the mind of Her Majesty as to the magnitude of the interests involved, and of the compensation that should be provided for to indemnify the vessel owners and crews for the losses they will necessarily sustain, if driven out of Behring's Sea before the end of the season.

Mr. TUPPER. In reply to the hon. gentleman, I may say that while this Government has not been advised by the Imperial Government that it is the intention of Her Majesty to issue, immediately after the passage of the Behring Sea Bill now before the Imperial Parliament, an Order in Council as provided for in said Bill, prohibiting ships and those interested in taking seals, a convention has been entered into between the United States and the Government of Great Britain, which contemplates the passage of an order of that character, under the provisions of that Bill which has now become law. I may say that Her Majesty was advised by this Government of the great magnitude of the interests involved in Canada, so that no misapprehension exists as to that point, and as to the compensation that should be provided to indemnify the vessel owners and crews for the losses they would have necessarily to sustain.

QUARANTINE REGULATIONS.

Mr. MACDONALD (Huron) asked, Has the attention of the Government been drawn to the following order issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, dated 19th May, 1891, quarantining for fifteen days lambs and swine imported from Canada:—

"Whereas, under the Act of Congress approved August 30, 1890, it has been provided by the Department of Agriculture, in order to protect the sheep and swine of the United States from contagious diseases now existing in foreign countries, that all sheep and swine imported from Great Britain and the Continent of Europe must be held in quarantine for a period of not less than fifteen days; and,

"Whereas the Dominion of Canada makes no requirement of quarantine for sheep and swine imported into that country from Great Britain and the Continent of Europe: and,

"Whereas to permit importations of these animals from Canada into the United States without quarantine would be dangerous to the stock interests of the United States, owing to the failure on the part of the Canadian authorities to enforce this measure of protection, and would enable importers to evade the quarantine of the United States ports: therefore, it is

"Ordered, That all sheep or swine to be imported from Canada into the United States are hereby made subject to the regulations of the Department of Agriculture of date October 13, 1890, and the exception contained in the third and sixth regulations of said date, as applicable to Canadian sheep and swine, is hereby rescinded, and all animals named in said regulations, except cattle imported from Canada, are subject to the same conditions and requirements as if they were imported into the United States from Great Britain or the Continent of Europe.

(Sd.) "J. M. RUSK,
"*Secretary.*"

If so, has the Government taken any steps with the view of having the order withdrawn, and what are they? If no action has yet been taken by the Government, does it intend at the earliest possible moment to take action to have, if possible, the quarantine removed? If so, will the Government remove the cause assigned by the United States Department for the issue of the said order, namely, the absence of quarantine by the Government of Canada against the importation of sheep and swine from Great Britain, by establishing a quarantine

against such importations? If not, what line of action does it propose to adopt?

Mr. HAGGART. The attention of the Government having been drawn to the United States order relating to the quarantining of sheep and swine referred to, an Order in Council was passed on 6th instant amending the Canadian regulations, so as to place a quarantine of fifteen days on each sheep and swine entering Canada at the seaports of Canada (which is a similar quarantine arrangement to that which the United States itself possesses), instead of a simple inspection. This order has been published in the *Canada Gazette*, and officially communicated to the United States Government.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government has any intention of moving the adoption, during the present session, of a measure prohibiting the sale by wholesale of intoxicating liquors, within the compass of any municipality in which the municipal authorities have passed a regulation to the same effect?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. In the opinion of the Government, this is a matter which should not be pressed on the municipal authorities.

Mr. AMYOT. That is not the question.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman will see that it is, for the hon. gentleman enquires whether the Government will pass a law contingent on the acts of the municipal authorities.

INDIAN AGENT AT SUTTON WEST.

Mr. MULOCK asked, Out of what moneys did they pay the sum of $181.65, being expenses incurred by the Government in connection with an investigation held into the conduct of the Indian Agent at Sutton West in 1885?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The sum of $141.65 was paid out of contingencies, and $40 out of the Indian land management fund, making a total of $181.65.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38.

Mr. ALLISON asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make a grant of land to each of the survivors of the volunteers who assisted in suppressing the rebellion in Canada in 1837-38?

Sir ADOLPHE CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to make a grant of land to each of the survivors of the volunteers who assisted in suppressing the rebellion in Canada in 1837-38, as we have always considered, and this House has always considered, this is a matter affecting the old Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada previous to Confederation.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, When was the Electoral Franchise Act passed? How many times has it been amended since? How many times have the lists been revised? How many times suspended? Have the revisions and suspensions occurred alternately? Were revisions promised which did not take place? If so, why? Will the lists be revised this year? What has been the cost of each revision? What the total cost? Was anything paid for the lists in seasons when suspended? If so, how much?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The Electoral Franchise Act was passed in 1885. It has been amended three times. The lists have been revised three times. The operation of the Act has been twice suspended. The revisions and suspensions have not occurred alternately. Revisions were not promised that did not take place. The lists will in all probability be revised this year. The cost of each revision has been already stated fully to Parliament. A small sum was paid, the amount of which I am not in a position to state this afternoon, for lists during one year when the revision was suspended, this amount being necessary for preliminary expenses which had been incurred before the introduction of the Bill to suspend the operation of the Act

Mr. LANDERKIN. The hon. gentleman has not given the amount paid when the revisions were suspended.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I said I was not able to state this afternoon the amount so paid; but I will give it subsequently.

BREAKWATER AT CENTREVILLE, N.S.

Mr. BOWERS asked, Has the Government received any report from their engineer as to the amount required to repair the breakwater at Centreville, Digby County, N.S.? If so, is it their intention to allow the breakwater to remain as it is, risking the total destruction of the same by the next winter's gale? Or will there be placed in the Supplementary Estimates an appropriation sufficient to save it from destruction?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I sent to my department for information in this matter, and received the following answer: No report has been received as to the amount required to repair the breakwater at Centreville, nor has any information been received by the department relating to the state of that work.

POST OFFICE BOX AT KINGSTON.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Who was, on or about the 28th May, 1889, the lessee of box No. 524, in the post office at Kingston, Ont.; and what was the name of the person who appeared on the books of the post office as having paid the annual rental of that box?

Mr. HAGGART. The department has no knowledge as to who was the lessee of that box at Kingston post office.

WALKERTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. TRUAX asked, Has the contract for fitting up the interior of the Walkerton post office been awarded? If not, will it be let by public tender, and when? Will notice be given in the local papers as to the time for receiving tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. A contract has not been given. It is usual to give such work to the party who has the contract for the erection of the building, when his work is satisfactory, and the work is given at architect's estimates. Of course,

the notices referred to will not appear in the local papers.

DRILL SHED AT TORONTO.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, 1. Have any contracts been awarded in connection with the erection of the drill shed in the city of Toronto? If so, for what parts of the work and who are the contractors? 2. If any contracts have been awarded, when is the work to proceed? 3. Have tenders been asked for the other parts of the work yet? If not, when will the Government advertize for tenders?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. To the first portion of the question, the answer is, yes. To the second portion, the answer is, that a contract has been let for the excavations to Davis & Son. To the third portion of the question, the answer is, that the work will be proceeded with on 1st August. To the last question the answer is: Tenders have not been asked for the other parts of the work yet, but they will be called for within the next eight or ten days.

NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING.

Mr. BEAUSOLEIL asked, In what newspapers is the table showing the hours of the arrival and departure of the mails for the Ottawa post office published? What amount is paid to each of the said newspapers yearly for publishing the said table? Is the table inserted in any French newspaper? If not, why not; and if so published, what is the name of the newspaper and the yearly sum paid for the service?

Mr. HAGGART. The time table showing the hours of arrival and departure of the mails for the Ottawa post office is published in the following newspapers:—*Citizen*, $100 per annum; *Journal*, $100 per annum; *United Canada*, $50 per annum. The time table was also published in *Le Canada* until the 30th April, 1891, at $50 per annum.

WELLAND CANAL—SURPLUS WATER.

Mr. GIBSON moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters and communications from the city of St. Catharines, and other municipalities on the Welland Canal, or from any persons or corporations, for the privilege of using surplus water from said canal for manufacturing or other purposes; and of the reports of Engineers of Canals thereon, and the replies of the Government to all such applications.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving for this return I desire to say a few words regarding the vast quantity of waste water that is continually passing through the waste weirs of the new Welland Canal, that might with profit to the country be used for manufacturing purposes. In fact, sufficient water could easily be spared to run several factories according to their requirements at each one of the twenty-four regulating basins, without, in my opinion, affecting the efficiency of the canal. If encouragement were given by the Government for the free use of water for a few years, or at a nominal rental, until industries were securely established, there is every reason to believe that the Welland Canal would be the means of making that section of the province a veritable hive of industry. Within a very few miles of the Welland Canal, on the American side of the Niagara River, an aqueduct or tunnel is in course of construction for manufacturing purposes, which, I understand, will cost about $3,000,000. Now, Sir, we have a much better supply of water running to waste, and connections with the regulating basins of the new Welland Canal could be made by the Government, and the cost would be gladly paid for by parties requiring the use of water. I understand that investigations have already been made by the engineers of the department, as to the practicability of supplying water to mills and manufactories along the canal without affecting navigation, and I think it is time that the matter should be brought to a practical issue and the public fully informed thereon. It may be said that several sites on the old canal are at present unoccupied, but it must be borne in mind that the large vessels now passing up and down on the lakes cannot pass through the old canal, so that for all practical purposes the old canal is simply fit for a mill-race. I was pleased to hear the late right hon. Minister of Railways and Canals state that my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) was mistaken as to the reasons for the water being let off the new canal. But I am afraid, Sir, that the right hon. the late First Minister was not furnished with the exact reasons, or, I am sure, he would never have given his consent to expose the embankments of the canal and basins, and the lock and weir masonry, to the winter frost, even to secure a political victory. A public work that cost the country millions of dollars, a work of so much value and importance, should not have been exposed just because an election was taking place. This work stands to-day a credit to the memory of the late Mr. Page and his able assistants, Messrs. Monro and Thompson; a work which Mr. Page often said to me would be his monument after he had passed away. I am sure, Sir, that if Mr. Page were then living he would not have given his consent to run the water off the canal during the winter months. It never was done before, and even on the old canal the work of repairs is not commenced until spring, immediately before the opening of navigation, for the reasons I have just given. If this care is exercised upon the old canal, how much greater care should be taken with the works of the new one. There was no excuse for letting the water off, as far as repairs were required; because four years ago during the work of the enlargement every part of the canal was thoroughly overhauled and renewed, and so perfect were the specifications and schedules covering the works made by the late Mr. Page, that the Government did not require to arbitrate on a single case from sections A to J. Being one of the contractors I know whereof I speak, and I have to add that it was the talk of the Counties of Lincoln and Welland, that letting off the water was a wilful waste of public money. The only repairs that was really done when the water was let off was to fix up the banks damaged by their exposure to the frosts of winter during the time the water was let out of the canal, and the only qualification required to secure work was a promise to vote for the Government candidate.

Motion agreed to.

MINING MACHINERY—FREE ENTRY INTO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. MARA moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Customs and the Collector of Customs at Kootenay Lake, and between the Minister of Customs and any other person, relating to the admission of mining machinery into the Kootenay Lake district free of duty. Also copies of the instructions of the Minister of Customs to the Collector of Customs at Kootenay River, referring to the free admission of mining machinery.

He said: My object in asking for this correspondence is to ascertain where the difficulty lies in respect to the admission of mining machinery into the Kootenay Lake district free of duty. At the close of last session, before leaving here, I received assurances from the hon. Minister of Customs that every facility would be given to the mine owners on Kootenay Lake to bring in mining machinery free of duty, and that the most liberal construction would be placed on the law. I am informed that instead of that being done, so many obstacles have been placed in the way of the mine owners that they have ceased to take advantage of the liberal Act passed last session. I am also informed that in one case, six months after the machinery was entered, and after it had changed hands, the collector of Customs, in the most arbitrary manner, wrote to the mine owners stating that unless the duty was paid immediately the machinery would be seized; and to prevent the machinery being seized and the mine being closed down, the duties were paid under protest. There is an impression in the Kootenay Lake district that the department is responsible for these obstacles being placed in the way of the free importation of mining machinery. The correspondence I ask for will, no doubt, show where the difficulty lies.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to bringing down all the correspondence that has taken place between the department and those who are interested in the introduction of mining machinery into Canada, either in the Kootenay district or in any other portion of the Dominion; nor is there any objection to bringing down the instructions. On the contrary, I shall be very much pleased to do so, when not only the House but the country generally will know what has been done by the department in this respect. I think it will be found that the difficulties and delays which have arisen in the passage of what is termed mining machinery are due to the difficulty of establishing whether such machinery is manufactured in Canada or not. With the view of preventing similar difficulties in future, I had an Order in Council passed requiring importers to make an affidavit that the machinery imported is for the purposes of mining, and that it is not made in Canada; and upon an affidavit of that kind being produced, no delay that I am aware of has taken place in the admission of the machinery into the country. On the contrary, the machinery has been admitted, the duty has been exacted, and afterwards when the necessary affidavit has been made a refund of the duty has been made; and if there are any such cases in the Kootenay district, it will be the duty of the Government to see that the amount is returned to the parties making the importation. The intention, not only of the Government, but of the House, in making that change in the tariff was to encourage, as far as practicable, mining operations in this country, while at the same time guarding against the introduction of such machinery interfering with Canadian enterprise.

Motion agreed to.

NEW CARLISLE WHARF.

Mr. FAUVEL moved for:

Return of all payments and cost of construction of the New Carlisle wharf, including amount paid to the Crown Lands Department and owners of timber limits in the County of Bonaventure, for timber used on the said works.

He said: The wharf referred to in this motion has been in course of construction for the last ten years, and I must say it has been most miserably built. In the County of Bonaventure we have three public wharves on which during the last two years the Government have exacted wharfage dues, whereas I find, on asking my friends in the House, that there are several counties in the province where the Government do not exact similar wharfage dues. I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Public Works what is the reason he subjects the County of Bonaventure to these tolls?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know the correctness of the statement for which I suppose the hon. gentleman has authority, but if there are some wharves on which wharfage dues are not charged, I have no doubt that upon my colleague's attention being called to the matter, he will see that in future we shall have the advantage of similar tolls being collected there.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I must protest against the Government's policy of charging wharfage on farmers' goods deposited on the St. Lawrence River wharves. The Government, while boasting the prosperity they claim to have created in the country, is acting in this in antagonism with commerce and free navigation, in the course of which it puts obstacles by means of such dues. The Government levies taxes right and left by means of which it exercises political persecution. It is not those who support it or who are in favour of its policy, it is not the blind partisans of the Administration who suffer from them, but its political opponents. The farmers' goods are allowed to be put on board the boats, and then advantage is taken of that for batches of actions to be taken against our friends. It is not public revenue that is cared for—this barely brings a few paltry dollars: but the object is to encourage a few lawyers who advocate its policy, as well as to persecute the friends of the Opposition. I say that this conduct of the Government is not worthy of the reputation they pretend to have in this country; and if the Government build wharves here and there with the object of using them as means of persecution and as fetters for trade, it certainly does not deserve the support of the population. For my part, I denounce it. I say that when these wharves were built it was understood that the farmers would have the free use of them; and now the practice of charging them three or four cents per head of cattle or box of goods, is not calculated to encourage agriculture, and is contrary to the principles of the protective policy of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER. I believe, although I did not gather it from the notice of this motion, that I have some connection with the subject to which

the hon. gentleman has alluded. While my department does not construct these wharves or look after their repair, it devolves on my department to do that horrible work which the hon. gentleman has been so vehemently denouncing—to collect the tolls from the vessels using those wharves. I have not heard before in Parliament any denunciation of the policy of the Government in collecting a small toll in order to pay some man to look after each wharf, and this toll, I may say, is fixed in the same manner for all the different wharves, under regulation by Order in Council. There is not a very handsome revenue from those wharves, as will be seen by the annual return published in the Marine Report. In most cases, the wharfinger is allowed twenty-five per cent. of the toll, so as to enable us to secure the services of some man to look after the wharf. The neglect to which the hon. gentleman has alluded in connection with the imposition of these tolls, is due chiefly to the fact that, in the Province of Quebec, I have found it exceedingly difficult, owing to various causes, to get men to undertake the work of wharfinger for the very small remuneration allowed them, there being no remuneration at all when there are no receipts.

Mr. LISTER. There are no wharves of that kind in the country.

Mr. TUPPER. There are some, and a case was brought up the other day from Prince Edward Island, in which it was stated ships used the wharves and paid no fees; but, so far as the department is concerned, I can assure the House that no attempt, direct or indirect, is made to favour any person or class of persons who use these wharves, the one great difficulty being to get people to act as wharfingers for the small pittance they receive in most cases. In many places, of course, the wharves are a great necessity, and the people along the coast have been most anxious to have them; and in some places the Federal Government took charge of the wharves built by the old provinces; but after the wharves are built, the demand naturally arises that they should be maintained free of charge to shipping. That demand, however, has never been seriously advocated. In some cases it would work great injustice to the owners of private wharves, and the system now administered is one that has prevailed from the beginning.

Mr. CHOQUETTE. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I also must protest against the action of the Government in the matter of wharf dues. There are two wharves in my county. Until after the election not much was said about the levying of dues. The wharfingers had been chosen among the Conservative chiefs, and in election time they made it understood to their friends, on the hustings or otherwise, that no tolls would be collected on the wharves. But as soon as the elections were over, the first thing done was to appoint a lawyer for the collection of the dues and the prosecution of the people who had used the wharves, especially the Liberals. The hon. Minister of Marine says that no protests have been made before the House about the collection of these dues. It is quite possible; but it is perfectly certain that the system was denounced to the department. Two years ago, and last year again, I myself wrote several letters on the matter, and I caused to be sent by the municipal councils of the parishes of Berthier and Crane Island, petitions praying for the removal of these wharfages. In the parish of Berthier, what do we find to have been done? A wharf was built, and the municipality was caused to build a road of at least ten arpents to reach this wharf, with the promise that nothing should be paid for the use of the wharf. The municipality had to spend considerable sums of money to build this road, and then the Conservative chief who was appointed wharfinger, takes the people by the throat and makes them pay three or four cents to put an animal, a tub of butter or a bag of grain on the wharf. This should not be, all the less, since the Minister of Marine gives no good reason for the continuance of such a system. He says the receipts are so small that he can find no one to keep the wharf for its tolls. Well, if the revenue is so petty, the system should certainly be discontinued: these dues should not be kept as an arm over the heads of the farmers, and the arm then handed for political purposes to the Conservative chiefs in the parishes where such wharves are in existence, who will say to the farmers: "If you vote for the Government, I, the wharfinger, will make efforts to save you from that tax." There are no reasons for the maintenance of that tax, which is rather an encumbrance than an advantage—for when people reach the wharf they have enough to do to see to their horses and their cattle without having to seek the wharfinger to pay him two cents, ten cents or a shilling, for the privilege of putting their goods on the wharf. Therefore there is no reason for the continuance of these wharfage dues and the Government ought to abolish them. As to the parish of Berthier, I specially protest against the existing state of things: for, when the Government built the wharf, it obtained from the municipality that a road should be built to reach it, by promising the people of the parish that they would never have to pay a cent for the use of the wharf. But now that the people have built this road at a great expense, and that they have put it in a fine condition for the benefit of the wharf, they are made to pay the wharfage. Under such circumstances, I believe that the Government should change its policy, and abolish this system of taxes altogether.

Mr. PERRY. The other day I asked the Minister of Marine if the wharfinger at Tignish had made a return. The hon. gentleman said no, but that he would write for it, and I am not aware that it has come yet. What is the reason? I suppose it is that if the wharfinger were to send a correct return, the name of every unfortunate Grit who has had to use that wharf would be down as having paid his fees, while not a single Tory would find a place in it. Is it honest that such a state of things should be allowed to exist? I know that the Liberals have been made to pay their taxes for the use of that wharf, and that the Tories have gone scot free. Is that the policy of the department? Does the hon. gentleman intend to allow this year to pass, as he has allowed last year, without having any return from that harbour master? I think it is high time that gentleman should be dismissed; for if he intends following up the course he has hitherto pursued much longer, there will be a small rebellion down there. The breakwater there is more for the benefit and advantage of the fishermen of New Brunswick, who

are well represented here—well, I do not know that they are much represented here this session. I went there one day last winter during a storm, and saw the harbour filled up so that you could not pass your hand between the crafts. There were ninety-five boats there, and ten outside, and twenty-five had to go to Alberton, and our boats were inside and could not get out, and so they lost their morning's fishing. Is there any use in having a harbour master there when such a thing as that takes place? I wrote to the member representing the constituency of Gloucester—I think his name is Burns—asking him to use his influence with the Government to get them to do something, either to dredge the harbour or do something so as to allow the smaller boats to get out in the morning. He promised me that he would do everything in his power, and said he was all-powerful with the Government. I have not seen him this session, and I am afraid to approach the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) It would be no use anyway.

Mr. PERRY. Yes, it would be no use; he is so cross; but I hope, if I get this report, I will be able to show this House how the people of Tignish are affected in regard to politics. I know all these vessels, and who owns them, and the side of politics they belong to, and I think I will be able to convince the Minister of Marine that his friends are made political gods of, and that the Liberals there are sacrificed in order to gratify the spite which the Tories have against Liberals. It is not just. When a poor man sends his sheep, cows or produce across the line in order to purchase in return flour or lumber, he is heavily taxed, and what he brings back is heavily taxed. I would not wonder so much if all were treated alike, but a poor man cannot get a blanket from across the line without having to pay a heavy tax upon it. This is the way in which we are treated in Tignish, but the Minister of Marine will sit there quietly and will not try to show that he has swollen the treasury of the Dominion of Canada by this means, because he will give us no information whatever. We have no information except what the Minister is inclined to give us. Is this the kind of Government we have? I am not prepared to submit to this much longer, nor are my people inclined to submit to it. I should not wonder one day or another, on a dry day, to see them give him a little wetting to cool him off. I hope the Minister will at once see that this return is laid before the House, that there will be no more humbugging about it. That report ought to have been here in the month of January or February, but it is not here yet. At all events I have not seen it. There was also a return which I moved for more than a month ago in reference to the *Stanley*, and that is not here yet. How can members discharge their duties properly when they are kept in the dark, when Ministers of the Crown will not give information they are legally bound to give? I say that we, representing the Opposition, have a duty to perform, and we are willing to perform it, but the fact is that the Government are afraid of the Opposition. I hope the Minister will at once cause this report to be laid before the House.

Mr. LISTER. I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make a statement that the compensation paid to those who are in charge of docks and wharves is 25 per cent. of the annual receipts.

Mr. TUPPER. As a general rule.

Mr. LISTER. Then there are exceptions?

Mr. TUPPER. Where the receipts are so small that it would not induce anyone to act, the amount is sometimes 50 per cent.

Mr. LISTER. Since I have been a member of this House, I have heard complaints constantly, session after session, from the Maritime Provinces as to their treatment in regard to public works constructed by the Government and in the hands of the Government. It seems that on the inland lakes of this country they have adopted the same principle, that is, of constructing works at certain ports on the upper lakes according to circumstances of a political character. The statement made by the Minister of Marine justifies to the fullest extent the charges which have been made against the Government from time to time, that these public works have been constructed in order to influence the electors. We know that the policy of the Government in the past, in order to secure support from different parts of the country, has been to erect custom houses and post offices where they were not required and where the revenue did not entitle those places to have them, while in other places that kind of work has been neglected, if not refused, simply because those constituencies have not returned members to support the Government. The Minister of Public Works knows that that is the case. So far as docks are concerned on the Sault Ste. Marie river and on Lake Superior, the Government have erected docks particularly at Sault Ste. Marie. There was a gentleman who ran in support of the Government, and the Government purchased his dock at an enormous cost, erected another dock in its place at a cost of from $5,000 to $10,000 and placed that gentleman in charge of the dock, as I am told by residents of that place, at a fixed salary. Not only that, but they appointed that gentleman's brother as Custom-house officer at that place, and the result is that anyone who desires to land goods at Sault Ste. Marie must go to the public dock. There are other docks there built by private enterprise, but they are of no value to the owners because, in consequence of the policy of the Government, it is an inconvenience for any shipping to go there. The consequence is that what was, in effect, public property is to-day, for all practical purposes, the property of this individual, although it has been built by the Government, with the money of the people of this country. At St. Joseph Island the same state of affairs exists. There the Government, whose object and motive are perfectly manifest, built a very expensive dock, which should have been built by private enterprise. To-day the gentleman who is the practical owner of that dock, collects the fees and attends to it, and I am told he is paid a salary; in other words, the Government has, with the money of the people of this country, built what he was not enterprising enough, apparently, to build for himself, they constructed a dock with a very large sum of money; and to-day this individual owns what the country has paid for. I point out these things because there has been, and there is, a strong feeling in certain sections of the country that private enterprise should not be anni-

hilated and destroyed by the Government stepping in and doing what private enterprise ought to do, doing what, in effect, there is no necessity for, inasmuch as other wharves exist in several places that offer all needed facilities, and their value is reduced very much, if not entirely destroyed, by the action of the Government. Sir, these things should not be encouraged. People should not resort to the Government for aid in every enterprise which private individuals should undertake. Private enterprise must, to a certain extent, meet these cases, and the effect of the Government policy is prejudicial and injurious to a large section of the country. So far as I can see there can be no possible justification or excuse for the Government except the desire to expend public money in order to influence the electorate of a certain section.

Mr. BOWELL. I have no information upon any of the points to which the hon. gentleman has alluded. I desire to say, however, that he has been misinformed with reference to the necessity of vessels, or any persons, being compelled to go to the public dock when they bring goods into the country. There are at present three or four officers appointed for the express purpose of attending the different docks, receiving entries and examining dutiable goods when they are brought in from the United States. If the hon. gentleman's information, with reference to other matters, be no more correct than that which refers to the Customs, he has been sadly misled as to the facts in connection with the construction of these docks, as well as to facts in connection with their management. As I have already stated, I do not desire to refer to the other points alluded to by the hon. gentleman, because I have no official or personal knowledge of them; but I desire to assure him that he is in error, he has been misinformed, with reference to the management of the Customs Department at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. LISTER. I am making no charge against the Customs Department, but I only ask, why, if there are other docks at Sault Ste. Marie, should there be a Government dock there at all? The public have opportunities of landing their goods already, and why, in the name of common sense, should the Government go to work and build a Government dock at all? This dock was owned by the gentleman I speak of. He was the owner of it before the Government took it over, and they went to work and built a new wharf.

Mr. MULOCK. The Minister of Customs does not answer one part of my hon. friend's statement. I understood the member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) to say that the Custom-house officer at Sault Ste. Marie is a brother of the present owner or lessee of the dock, or is a partner of the lessee or owner of the dock. Is that the case?

Mr. BOWELL. I did not hear the hon. gentleman say that. In the first place, the hon. member for Lambton asked no question whatever. I merely got up to make an explanation, so far as his reference to the Customs Department was concerned. He did say, however, that the Collector of Customs was a brother of the owner of the dock.

Mr. MULOCK. A partner.

Mr. BOWELL. No, I did not understand the hon. gentleman to say that. I did not understand him to say that he was the partner of the owner of the dock.

Mr. LISTER. What I did say was that the *de facto* owner of the dock is the brother of the Custom-house officer.

Mr. BOWELL. Can you give me the name of the owner of the dock?

Mr. MULOCK. Mr. Plummer.

Mr. BOWELL. A Mr. Plummer—I do not know his Christian name—is the Collector of Customs at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. LISTER. Mr. Plummer is the owner of this dock.

Mr. MULOCK. I have some information on the subject which I will bring up at a later period; and when I do bring it up, in order that the Minister may be able to deal with it, I will tell him now that the papers which I have here show, if I have caught the point correctly, that the two gentlemen, the Messrs. Plummer, are in partnership in Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. BOWELL. In mercantile business?

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know; at all events, they are in business that involves the importation of articles at that point. I am informed by these documents that one of these gentlemen is the Custom-house officer, and the other imports through this Government dock. It is further suggested that the one who imports receives favours through the Custom-house officer, and it is further stated in these papers that underneath the dock which the Government has placed in the custody of the Custom-house officer, the one who imports has facilities for bringing in small crews who are able to proceed under the shelter of this dock, and when they are under the dock they are practically beyond the reach of the Custom-house officers.

Mr. BOWELL. I will only say to the hon. gentleman that if the statements which he has made are true, the collector will be subject to dismissal. In the first place, his alleged conduct is directly opposed to the provisions of the Audit Act, which prevents a man receiving a certain salary, from entering into any other business. In all cases where an officer receives a salary beyond a certain amount, he is strictly precluded by law from being connected with, or interested in, importations. I may add, for the information of the House, that Mr. Plummer, brother of the collector is a merchant of long standing at the Sault. I have no knowledge, nor has the department, that his brother is a partner with him, or has any connection whatever with the business. I can only repeat that if the allegations made by the hon. gentleman are substantiated, the collector will be subject to dismissal.

Mr. MULOCK. I am not making the allegations on my own authority.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I wish to take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the pier at Wood Islands, which is an important public work in Prince Edward Island. I had the honour, I think last year and the year before, of calling his attention to the condition of that work. I pointed out to him that for the last ten or twelve years the Government had been making the repairs by day work, spending

only one or two thousand dollars upon it. I pointed out to him the fact, which I know from personal observation last year, that the Wood Islands breakwater at that time was in a very dilapidated condition, although the Government were charging wharfage for everything landed at that wharf. As a matter of fact a horse and cart could not be taken within half a mile of that part of the breakwater where vessels land their goods. When any article was landed from a schooner it had to be carried on the backs of men over the breakwater till it reached the upper portion, where it was placed in a cart. This was most cruel and intolerable. I was promised by the department that steps would be taken to place this most important work in an efficient condition. I am glad to know that an engineer of the department proceeded there last year, Mr. Brown, I think was his name, and he no doubt made a report to the department as to the condition of the breakwater. The hon. Minister will no doubt find, although I have not seen a report or Mr. Brown since, that the condition of affairs was very much as I stated it from my place last year. I cannot allow the session to pass without bringing the condition of this breakwater in a very formal way before the attention of the House, unless some assurance is given, as I hope it will be, that the Government intend to place that wharf or breakwater in efficient repair. The people in the immediate vicinity of that work have to endure more than any people I know of in the Island as regards shipping. They have no harbour and no breakwater within miles of them, except this one, and it has been allowed to gradually get out of repair until to-day it is hardly any use whatever. I hope, therefore, the suggestion which I and my colleague made last year in regard to the repairing of this breakwater, backed up, as no doubt it is by the report of the engineer sent by the department, will have the effect of inducing the Minister of Public Works, not to expend a thousand dollars on repairs to be done by day work, because the money might as well be thrown into the sea, but to expend such sum as the engineer reports to be necessary to place it in a fairly efficient condition. If the Minister will do that, he will confer a great boon on the people in that vicinity, and do a simple act of justice to a long-suffering people.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I remember the hon. gentleman made a remark to that effect last year, and he is perfectly right in stating that an officer of my department, I think Mr. Brown, was sent to report on the matter. As I was unable during three or four months to attend to my official work, being very unwell, I cannot say what the report was. I cannot say whether the work has not been repaired to a certain extent; but I know that after the remarks last year by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies) and the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Welsh), I gave orders that such small repairs should be done as, I understand, the Local Government would have done, tenders being called and the contract being given to the lowest bidder. I think that was done last season. At all events, those were my instructions. I shall take a special note of it.

Mr. WELSH. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick. For four years I have brought up this question every session. Hon. members may talk about the Minister's promise; he has given me his promise verbally and in writing, and he has broken his word; and if there ever was a dead-meat business brought before this House it is this, and it is the most false act ever perpetrated against Prince Edward Island.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. WELSH. I will rise and say what I think. If I were to express my feelings in regard to the way the Minister has treated the Island in the matter of this breakwater, my remarks would not be very complimentary to him or to the Government.

Mr. BOWERS. While the subject of breakwaters is before the House, I desire to call attention to several breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., which are suffering for lack of repairs. At Centreville there is a wharf which cost several thousand dollars. A sum of $500 or $600 is required to place it in repair. If this is not expended, $5,000 or $6,000 will be required at some future time to place a new wharf there. At Comeauville, in Digby, there is a wharf which requires an expenditure of $1,000 or $1,500 to place it in a proper condition of repair. At Salmon River the inhabitants have asked several years for an addition to their breakwater, and which has been promised them several times. For lack of the necessary accommodation trade suffers, as the vessels cannot load their cargoes for the American or other markets. I also call his attention to the condition of the wharf at Meteghan, for which $3,000 will be required to place it in repair. This is a very important work. A large sum of money has been expended in erecting a breakwater outside the wharf, but certain portions of the wharf inside of the breakwater have become out of repair. The inhabitants do not object to pay wharfage, provided the Government place the wharves in such a state of repair that they can be used. I hope that as the Government's attention has now been called to those works they will do something towards the wharves in Digby County, which county has a seaboard of 125 miles and requires a large number of these public works.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. LANGELIER moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence, papers, reports and documents in relation to the returning of the debentures of the North Shore Railway Company.

He said: During the session of 1885, it will be remembered, a discussion took place regarding the Short Line Railway. It will be in the recollection of hon. members that two principal lines were proposed for a short line railway from Montreal to the sea. One was through the city of Quebec, involving the construction of a bridge over the St. Lawrence River. The other, and it was the one adopted by the Government for reasons which are very well known, was through Sherbrooke. When the question was under discussion, the Minister of Public Works, speaking for the Government, pretended that he deeply regretted that the Government could not adopt the route by the city of Quebec, but he said they had adopted the shortest route, and that was through Sherbrooke. It appears now that the shortest line was not through Sherbrooke, and, in fact, that the line through Sherbrooke was

neither the shortest nor the best. It was the worst and not the shortest. But we will pass that by. On that occasion there was a very strong feeling expressed in favour of the route by way of the city of Quebec by members from that part of the country supporting the Government. Two members especially were very active in their opposition to the line through Sherbrooke and in support of the line through Quebec: they were the then hon. member for Montmagny and the then hon. member for Dorchester. In order to give them some consolation the Government stated that they had taken steps to secure to the city of Quebec the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and, in order to effect that purpose, the Government proposed to the House a grant of $1,500,000. I must say at once that $1,000,000 of that amount was only a revote, it having been voted at a previous session. The Minister of Public Works, explaining the policy of the Government, stated the manner in which the money was to be used. He said that it was proposed with that money to secure the control of the North Shore Railway, that is to say the portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. Martin's Junction and Quebec, which was then the property of the Grand Trunk. Everyone knows the history of the construction of that line, and it is not a history very much to the credit of the then Government of Quebec. Before the construction of that line, we had only the Grand Trunk Railway between Quebec and Montreal, and it was stated over and over again, when the North Shore Railway was about to be built, and as a reason for the construction of that line, that it would be a Government railway, that it would be a competitor to the Grand Trunk Railway and consequently advantageous to the city of Quebec. However, the line was scarcely finished when in 1882, under the Administration of the present Secretary of State at Quebec, a law was passed confirming a sale made by the Government of the Province of Quebec to a company authorized by the same statute, which was called the North Shore Railway Company. By the Act creating the company in question, it was authorized to issue second mortgages on the railway, because the first mortgage was in order to secure the purchase money which was to remain due to the Government of the Province of Quebec. I repeat again, that the Minister of Public Works on that occasion, in 1885, solemnly promised that the $1,500,000, which he was then proposing the House should vote, was to secure the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the city of Quebec. I forgot to mention that this line which had been publicly proclaimed as a competing line to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, was afterwards sold to the Grand Trunk Railway Company by the North Shore Railway Company. That very same company which had obtained control of the railway a few months afterwards, sold it to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and Quebec was in a worse position than ever it had been before so far as communication with Montreal was concerned. Such was the state of facts when the Act of 1885 was passed. The Minister of Public Works explained to the House then, that with the $1,500,000 which he asked Parliament to vote, the Government would try to secure control of the North Shore Railway from the Grand Trunk Railway, which then owned and ran the North Shore Railway, and he added that if the Government could not secure control of the North Shore Railway they would use the $1,500,000 to subsidize another line which would be built between Quebec and Montreal. That would, of course, compel the Grand Trunk Railway to sell the railway in favour of the Government; and after the session of Parliament the Government succeeded in getting control of the North Shore Railway. They paid $500,000 to the Grand Trunk Railway Company; $250,000 to recoup the Grand Trunk Railway of what it had paid to the North Shore Railway Company, or rather, I should say, to Senator Senecal, because he was nearly the whole company himself, and $250,000, the profit of the Grand Trunk Railway, on the transaction which they had made with the North Shore Railway Company. I am giving these sums in round numbers. There then remained a sum of $1,000,000 of the money voted in 1885, and what did the Government do with this money? It had never been contemplated by this House that the money voted would be used to pay Senator Senecal's debts to the Bank of Montreal or to any other bank or individual, but the Government found that Mr. Senecal's company had issued debentures for a certain amount and nearly $1,100,000 had been pledged as collateral to the Bank of Montreal for a loan to Mr. Senecal. The Government acquitted the debt of Mr. Senecal to the Bank of Montreal, and with this money which was to be used in the interest of the city of Quebec, they bought these debentures in order to release the debt of Mr. Senecal to the Bank of Montreal. The result of this is, that up to the present moment the Government are holding these debentures, for which, I think, they paid $970,000, so that there remains nothing of the $1,000,000 which was to be used for the city of Quebec and to secure for that city the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What has been the consequence of all this? Every one can see that it would be in the interest of the city of Quebec that the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway line should be developed, but by the arrangement which was entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, coupled with the fact I have just mentioned in reference to that debenture indebtedness of nearly $1,000,000, the city of Quebec is suffering. It is now in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company not to develop the traffic on that portion of their line, but rather to prevent its development, and why: for this reason, that under the arrangement entered into the Canadian Pacific Railway Company must take from the gross receipts of the railway, first, whatever is necessary to pay the running expenses of the line; then, whatever sum is necessary to pay the interest that is due to the Government of the Province of Quebec on the balance of the purchase money, which, I think, is some $3,500,000; and if any surplus remains it must be used to pay 5 per cent. interest to the Government on these debentures which they got by releasing Mr. Senecal's indebtedness to the Bank of Montreal. The result is that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company see very well that if they develop the traffic on the North Shore line it will not be to their advantage at all, for it would be simply to enhance the price of these debentures. Of course the Canadian

Pacific Railway must be anxious to get hold of the debentures in question to discharge the mortgage which they bear on the railway, and they see very well that if they give themselves any trouble to develop the traffic and increase the receipts of the railway between Quebec and Montreal, they would be enhancing the debentures which they want to get hold of. The result has been practically ruinous to Quebec, for instead of having that great railway company working to develop the trade and commerce of the localities with which it is connected, it is doing its best not to extend the traffic between Quebec and Montreal. Another very serious consequence is, that under that arrangement the Government seem to be so very anxious to secure the 5 per cent. interest on their debentures, that they do not want the Canadian Pacific Railway to be at liberty to spend too much money for the maintenance of the road, and the company is not even allowed to build a new bridge or to purchase new rolling stock. At one time we were threatened with a complete stoppage of traffic on the North Shore road, because the bridge engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway reported to that company, as was stated to this House last session, that two bridges were dangerous and that the Pont Rouge bridge, 24 miles from Quebec, was so dangerous that the engineer suggested to the Canadian Pacific Railway to completely stop the running of trains on that line. Eventually the company obtained permission from the Government to rebuild that bridge at an expense of some $17,000. I have learned from some of the highest officers of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they have had the greatest difficulty in getting the repayment of that money out of the $1,000,000 which remains, and which should have been used for that purpose. Another bridge which became dangerous was the Portneuf bridge, and although there were two years of negotiations on the subject the Government failed to repair it. These facts, with many others, will give an idea of the way in which the city of Quebec has been treated. I need not tell the House that the release of the $1,000,000 of debentures has been a burning question with the citizens of Quebec. They are a dead load, not only on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but on the trade and commerce of the city; and the city council, the board of trade, and almost all the important commercial men of the city have been urging the Government during the last three or four years to release them. Promises were made to every delegation that came to Ottawa on the subject, but nothing was done. The elections of this year came on. It had been stated that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company could obtain the release of that indebtedness they were prepared to use the money in improving the road, building elevators on the Louise embankment, repairing the bridges and increasing and improving the rolling stock of the railway; and I am told on good authority that such is the present intention of the company if this indebtedness is released. They do not want to keep the money for themselves, but will use it in improving the road. I need not say that in the last election this was a very prominent question before the electors of Quebec, and especially before the electors of Quebec Centre. A meeting took place for he purpose of selecting a candidate to oppose me. That meeting was attended by no less personages than the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia. At that meeting a very respectable gentleman, a vice-president of the Board of Trade, Mr. Chateauvert, was selected as the candidate, and I will take the trouble to read to the House the speech he made on that occasion in the presence of those two hon. Ministers. I translate the report:

"I can say without boasting that I have succeeded with Col. Forsyth"——

A great friend of the hon. Minister of Militia——

——"to induce the Government to release the $1,000,000 of debentures on condition that the Canadian Pacific Railway do the improvements necessary on the Louise embankment by building elevators and executing other works which shall help to make of Quebec a centre of distribution like Montreal and Toronto, and one of the finest harbours in the world."

There can be no mistake as to the correctness of the report of that speech, because Mr. Chateauvert himself took the trouble to distribute it among the electors of Quebec Centre along with a circular which he did me the honour to send me, and in which he says:

"You will see by the enclosed report of a speech which I delivered on Saturday night what my views are, and for what purpose I solicit the suffrages of my fellow-citizens."

That was not enough. Mr. Chateauvert was so sure of the promises he had obtained from the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia that he went further and published in *Le Courrier du Canada*, the special organ of the hon. Minister of Public Works, his promissory note, as it was called by the paper, and he was so sure that these promises would carry the division that he called himself already the member. Here is the promissory note:

"QUEBEC, 21st February, 1891.

"As member for Quebec Centre and in return for the confidence of my electors, I promise to give them the settlement of the $1,000,000 of debentures of the Canadian Pacific Railway and assistance for the bridge."

This promissory note, so called, was published in every issue of that paper for a considerable time during the election contest, at the top of its editorial page, with the following commentary added:——

"Here is a promissory note signed by a business man in full knowledge. It has not been signed in blank; the date, the consideration, the amount, everything is mentioned therein."

That is perfectly true. Well, Mr. Chateauvert is a very respectable gentleman, who, I believe, would not tell a lie even privately, and still less publicly, in a statement of that kind; and when I saw it I could not have any doubt, nor could the citizens of Quebec, that he had received from the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Militia the promise which he stated he had obtained from them. In connection with the same matter, the city of Quebec had the honour, among other cities during the elections, of a visit from the High Commissioner, and of course, he made a speech, in which he, of course, made promises. I do not think he could make a speech in election times without making promises of money. I take the report of his speech in the *Morning Chronicle*. I am sure the hon. Minister of Public Works will not dispute the fidelity of that paper to the Government and to himself personally. The meeting took place in a hall in the centre division called Tara Hall. Here is what the paper says:

"Sir Charles then addressed the audience for about two hours, speaking most eloquently and being loudly applauded. Sir Charles stated that, not being a member of the Government, he had telegraphed Sir John to-day—(meaning Sir John A. Macdonald)—what he could say on the question of the Quebec bridge and the North Shore railway bonds. The answer received had been as follows, and he published that answer before the meeting :—

"'KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"'Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions imposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "'JOHN A. MACDONALD.'

"(Loud applause.)"

Of course the applause must have been very loud, but it would not have been so loud if the same audience had read the answer given by the Minister of Public Works some time ago to a question which was put for me by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island. Here is the question :

"1. Whether it is within the knowledge of the Government, that, at a meeting held in Tara Hall, at Quebec, on the 26th of February last, Sir Charles Tupper, the High Commissioner for Canada to London, declared, that having telegraphed to the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, First Minister of Canada, in order to know from him what he ought to say on the question of a bridge at Quebec, and on that of the North Shore Railway debentures, he had received the following telegram :—

"'KINGSTON, 26th February, 1891.

"'Parliament will be asked to transfer bonds to Canadian Pacific Railway, on conditions proposed by the city of Quebec.

(Signed) "'JOHN A. MACDONALD.'"

"2. Whether the said telegram was sent by the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald, to the said Sir Charles Tupper? 3. What are the conditions imposed by the city of Quebec, referred to in the said telegram? 4. Whether the Government intends to keep the promise thus made in its name by Sir Charles Tupper? 5. When does the Government intend to introduce the measure promised by the said telegram? 6. Whether the Government is aware, that, at the said meeting, Sir Charles Tupper declared that the citizens of Quebec might regard the building of the said bridge as an accomplished fact? 7. Whether the Government authorized the said Sir Charles Tupper to give the said promise? 8. Whether the Government intends to carry out this promise? 9. When does it propose to introduce a measure to give it effect?"

I will now read the answer given by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. I am quite sure there would have been very little applause if such an answer had been given in Quebec. The hon. Minister said :

"The telegram mentioned in this question is not complete : it is only a portion of the telegram, and that is the only answer I can give to that part of the question. There will be a measure brought down during the present session in reference to the bonds of the North Shore Railway."

It is not said in what respect the telegram was incomplete. If it was garbled, it was not garbled by myself, for I took it as it was published in the *Morning Chronicle*, nor was it garbled by that newspaper which took it from Sir Charles Tupper himself. Therefore, if there was any garbling of the telegram, it was done by Sir Charles Tupper. I would like to know what does the rest of the telegram contain? I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works should have stated whether the portion of the telegram which was not read contained a promise of help for the bridge, for that was the respect in which the telegram was deficient. The Tories of Quebec were very exultant the next morning. Every one of them said : "Now we have the bridge; we heard Tupper yesterday, and we will have the million dollars of debentures released, and we will have the bridge. He said so, and of course he always tells the truth. He never made a vain promise." So they all thought they would get the bridge. I read the telegram again and again, and could not find in it any promise about the bridge. Most probably that is the portion of the telegram which has been left out, and I expected the Minister of Public Works would have read that portion, which must have contained the offer of assistance for the bridge. What we want to know is the exact truth with reference to the question concerning the million dollars debentures of the North Shore Railway. Every one must see that the answer of the hon. Minister is most incomplete. There may have been some excuse for the incompleteness of the answer when he gave it, for then nobody was in charge of the Railway Department, but now we have reorganized the Government, and there must be somebody in charge of that department and in a position to give us the information we want. The House will see this is a subject involving a million dollars, and it is entitled to correct and complete information. I put another question on the same occasion. I asked :

"Whether the Government are aware that during the period of the last election Victor Chateauvert, Esq., ministerial candidate in Quebec Centre, published in *Le Courrier du Canada* the following notice :—

"'QUEBEC, 21st February, 1891.

"'As member for Quebec Centre, in return for the confidence of my electors, I promise to give them a settlement of the Pacific million, and help for the bridge.' And that in a speech made by the said Victor Chateauvert, Esq., about the same date, to the electors of Quebec Centre, he made the following statement :—

"'I can say, without boasting, that I have succeeded, with Colonel Forsyth, in inducing the Government to give up the million dollars of debentures (the million dollars of debentures which the Government retains on the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Quebec and Montreal) on condition that the Canadian Pacific Company shall make the necessary improvements on the Louise Embankment, construct elevators, and carry out the other works which will serve to make Quebec a distributing centre like Montreal and Toronto, and one of the finest ports in the world.

"'After having secured from the Ottawa Government, through the influence of our Ministers, Sir Hector and Sir Adolphe, the return of the million of debentures, and a promise of aid for the bridge between Quebec and Lévis, I should consider myself a bad citizen if I did not consent to come forward under circumstances so favourable for the city.'

"2. Whether it is true, as so stated by Mr. Chateauvert, that he had secured from the Government the remission of the said million of debentures and a promise of aid for the said bridge? 3. What is the nature of the aid so promised? 4. When do the Government intend to introduce measures to carry out the remission of the said million of debentures, and to assist in the construction of the said bridge?"

Here is the answer which the hon. the Minister of Public Works gave to my question :

"The Government are not aware that the article in question was published in that paper, but they do know that Mr. Chateauvert exerted himself very much about this remission of the million dollars, and also about the bridge in question. The Government will introduce a measure about the million dollars debentures. The remainder of the question I cannot answer now."

Certainly the Minister of Public Works should have been in a position to say whether or not Mr. Chateauvert told the truth when he publicly stated, in a speech to the electors of Quebec, that he had obtained from the Minister of Public Works and also from the Minister of Militia a promise for the release of the North Shore Railway debentures. Either Mr. Chateauvert was publicly telling a lie to all the citizens of Quebec and should be branded for having told a lie, or it was true that the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Public Works had promised the release of that million of

debentures. We want to know whether Mr. Chateauvert, whom we have always known to be a Tory, but whom we have also known to be a good and respectable citizen of Quebec, is to be branded publicly as a liar or whether the Ministers referred to made the promise, and, if so, whether they are prepared to redeem it. Let them say whether they are or not; let them say whether the promise was made or not, and, if it was not made, we shall know how to deal with Mr. Chateauvert in Quebec. We do not want to be fooled any more. We want to know whether the citizens of Quebec have been shamefully deceived by Mr. Chateauvert or whether Mr. Chateauvert has been shamefully deceived by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I would say a few words in answer to some of the observations which the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Langelier) has made, because some of the matters he has touched upon happened to come under my notice in a departmental way. I presume that the speech he has made this afternoon is not intended to elicit the policy of the Government upon this question of the million dollars of bonds, because the hon. gentleman and the House have been promised at an early part of the session that a measure on this subject will be brought down during the session, and it will be more convenient for him, as well as for us, to discuss that question when the papers and the correspondence and the documents are accessible to members on both sides of the House. The hon. gentleman is quite misinformed, or else he has unintentionally misstated the question as to the betterments required from time to time to be made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The hon. gentleman stated, for instance, that we did not wish betterments to take place in connection with the North Shore Railway. He also stated that a great deal of difficulty occurred in the negotiations between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government in relation to repairs which were actually necessary for the safety of the travelling public, and he intimated that, at one time, there was a serious danger of the road being closed because there were bridges which were not safe for the travelling public. I beg to say that there is not the slightest foundation for the supposition that we did not wish betterments to take place on the road, or that there was ever any delay on the part of the Government of Canada in regard to the necessary repairs taking place on the bridges on that road. The single question that arose in regard to betterments was as to whether we were bound by the terms of our contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to allow them to increase the capital expenditure on that road at our expense. They were entitled by the terms of the contract with us, according to our interpretation of it, to make renewals from time to time, but if they were to substitute, for instance, steel bridges for wooden bridges, we had no objection to their doing so and they did not require our consent, but they did require our consent to charging against the capital sum the additional cost of steel as compared with wood. In that respect we felt we would not be warranted, without coming to Parliament in regard to the matter, in assenting. We felt that our position under that contract and under that lien might be changed, but in regard to necessary repairs or betterments, the Canadian Pacific Railway were always free to make any betterments, to substitute steel for wood wherever they pleased, to make repairs where they were necessary, or to substitute wood for wood. In these matters they were at perfect liberty, because they would involve no extra capital charge whatever. As to the question which was put to us across the House the other day by the hon. gentleman, and in regard to which he has made some complaint in reference to the answer he received, I think the answer was pretty full, considering that there was a definite promise that a measure would be brought down in regard to the million dollars of railway bonds. The hon. gentleman finds fault with us, and indicates that we could not have paid very close attention to the progress of the election contest in Quebec or we would have discovered that the Quebec *Chronicle* did contain the article which he has read from *Hansard*. I might with equal justice say that the hon. gentleman did not pay much attention to his own election contest or he would not have had to come to the House of Commons to ask if that article had appeared in a paper published in his own constituency. The Government had no official knowledge of the publication. He had the same knowledge as the Government had on that subject, and his question was not a fair one. As to whether Mr. Chateauvert has deceived the electors of Quebec or Ministers of the Crown have deceived him, the hon. member will find, when the measure comes to be laid on the Table of the House, a full answer to that question, and he will find that, in any indication that Mr. Chateauvert has given of any pledge on the part of the Government of Canada, there will be no difficulty in carrying that pledge into effect. The measure will be brought down in the course of a few days, and the hon. gentleman will be able to see from its details whether it corresponds with the promise Mr. Chateauvert gave to his constituents or not. What may have transpired between the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Millitia and Mr. Chateauvert I do not know, but the Government of Canada will keep faith and will ask the House to ratify whatever promise was made by the Government of Canada, upon which no doubt the statement of Mr. Chateauvert was based. I will not go further, because I presume the hon. gentleman desires to have the returns and it is close to six o'clock.

Mr. LAURIER. It is, perhaps, to be regretted that, in the discussion of a matter of this moment, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia are not present to defend their own course, and to explain the promise which they gave.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. They will be here when the matter is before the House.

Mr. LAURIER. But they are not here now.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 87) to revive and amend the charter of the Quebec Bridge Company.—(Mr. Desjardins, L'Islet.)

Bill (No. 91) to amend the Act to enable the City of Winnipeg to utilize the Assiniboine River Water Power.—(Mr. Macdonald, Winnipeg.)

Bill (No. 92) to incorporate the Anglo-Canadian Electric Storage and Supply Company.—(Mr. Mackintosh.)

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

PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.—CONTRACTS—MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Before the next Order is called, I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which was supposed to have been called, beyond all manner of doubt, for to-morrow, has not been called, and that rumours have been circulated to the effect that that Committee is not to be called to-morrow, but is to be called on Friday instead. I cannot but think that this is to be regretted for many considerations. We cannot ignore the fact that one of the leading members of this House is on trial before that Committee, and the dignity of the House demands that under circumstances of that kind, at least reasonable speed should be adopted by the Committee in its proceedings. Now, we know very well that for the convenience of members of that Committee, or a portion of that Committee, the Committee does not meet upon Saturday and it does not meet upon Monday; but it was clearly understood, and the understanding was expressed when the Committee had met once or twice, that we should meet *de die in diem*. It was afterwards suggested that, as many members would be away in Montreal and Toronto on Saturdays and Mondays, that understanding should not be carried out to the extent of meeting upon those two days, and while I myself yielded, and yielded very reluctantly to that conclusion, I think the understanding of the Committee was that on those two days we should not be called together, but outside of those two days it was clearly understood by all members of the Committee that the Committee should meet on every other day and proceed diligently with the important charge which this House entrusted to them. Sir, we have a large number of witnesses in attendance by virtue of the subpœnas we have served upon them in the Committee. The expense, no doubt, is comparatively trifling, hardly to be spoken of at all, but when one considers the magnitude, the gravity of the charges, and the position of the hon. gentleman against whom those charges are made, the serious character of these charges, and the inevitable conclusion that if they are proved they will result in the most serious consequences, one stands aghast in surprise at the fact that this Committee is not called to meet from day to day, but that its meetings are, it seems to me, to be postponed so far as it is possible to postpone them. I cannot, for one, assent or consent to this delay. I protest in the strongest language against this procedure. I think if the Government are responsible, they are to be blamed; I think if the Chairman of the Committee is responsible, he owes an explanation now to this House and to the Committee. I think the agreement which was come to has been broken. I think the hon. gentleman himself who stands charged before that Committee owes it to his own dignity to insist that that Committee should meet at once and determine whether he is guilty or not. If he is innocent, why, Sir, it is the interest of the whole country, it is in the interest of this House, it is in the interest of its representatives, I won't say anything of his own interest—that his innocence should be proclaimed, and if evidence is given to justify any other conclusion, it is in the interest of the whole country that we should have that evidence given before us, and that this matter should be brought to a close. Sir, I cannot but think that, looking at the matter from a general standpoint, and looking at it from an outside standpoint, the Parliament of Canada does not occupy a dignified position. Its leader stands to-day impeached before one of its principal Committees, and that Committee ought to put all other considerations to one side, and proceed at once to determine the innocence or guilt of the hon. gentleman charged before it, instead of allowing his reputation to lie under a cloud. I will say no more upon that point, but I do say that the Committee has a right to insist that the understanding which was come to shall be carried out, and this House has a right to insist and to know why it is that that Committee does not proceed with the investigation of these serious charges.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman, in framing his protest, has used language which was utterly undeserved and inappropriate to the occasion. The hon. gentleman said that it was the fault of the Government, and he intimated——

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I did not.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said so in exact words.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.). I did not. I said if it were the fault of the Government, they should be held responsible, and if it were the fault of the Chairman of the Committee, I should expect him to rise in his place and explain his conduct to the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman said that it was the fault of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no. Order.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. It will be entirely in vain for hon. gentlemen to say "No," and "Order." I am perfectly in order. I say that the hon. gentleman did impute fault to the Government in the matter——

Mr. LAURIER. I rise to order. My hon. friend beside me has stated distinctly that he made no such imputation. He said: "If it is the fault of the Government," and in face of such an explanation the hon. gentleman is entirely out of order in persisting to attribute to my hon. friend words which he declares he did not utter.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman—

Mr. LAURIER. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have a right to speak to the question of order; I am going to speak to the question of order. I was interrupted by the hon. member, and I am speaking now to the question of order, and the hon. gentleman would not have pretended I was out of order if he had allowed me to finish my sentence. My statement was this, and I am speaking now to the point of order, and the hon. gentleman will see I am entirely in order: The hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), who spoke, imputed

blame to the Government in this matter, and as the hon. gentleman has stated he did not do so, I am bound to assume he did not intend to do so, although at the same time the hon. gentleman's words certainly bore that construction. I wish to say a few words with respect to the proceedings of the Committee. I desire to say, first, that it is very much to be regretted, indeed, that a matter of this kind should assume a party aspect. We have conducted the proceedings of the Committee so far almost without any difference of opinion. We have all realized, I think, on both sides of the House that the investigation was a most disagreeable and painful one, and we must all have regretted that charges like these had to be investigated. We all, however, realized that these charges having been made, the investigation had to be proceeded with by regular methods, no matter where they led us. The Committee arrived at a determination, subject, of course, to be changed as circumstances made absolutely necessary to sit *de die in diem*. The hon. gentleman, I again admit, I may not have properly heard him, said, or I understood him to say, that everything had been done to put off the investigation. We have sat *de die in diem*, except when it was the unanimous wish of the Committee that we should adjourn over a day. I am quite willing that the Committee should sit on Monday. I explained to the Committee at the last meeting that we could not sit on Saturdays, because it is absolutely necessary for the business of the House that the members of the Government should be in Council all day, and inasmuch as the charges are so important and involve one of our colleagues, it is very unsatisfactory to be absent when witnesses are giving their testimony, and trust to reading the evidence afterwards. Subject to that reservation, I am quite willing that the Committee should sit on Monday and *de die in diem*, without any exception, except when the business of this House makes it imperatively necessary that the sitting of the Committee should be suspended. This is what occurred: We continued to sit *de die in diem* except when the Committee unanimously agreed that it was inadvisable to meet, as they did on one day, when we gave way to the Committee on Railways and Telegraph Lines. On the last day the House sat before the adjournment, in consequence of the death of the late Premier, I attended at the Committee room at half-past ten o'clock. The Committee were to have met that day. I found, not at all to my surprise, there was no quorum present, and one could hardly have been expected, because everyone understood that the House would adjourn, and in the minds of members there was no disposition to go on with ordinary business. That, therefore, made an adjournment *sine die*. If there had been a quorum there might have been a different result. I do not think there were half a dozen members present. I know that when I arrived, not more than five minutes after the hour, there was no member present, and I was told by the clerk that two or three members had been present but they realized there was no possibility of a meeting being held. The Committee thus stood adjourned *sine die*. We could not meet yesterday or to-day because the Committee of Railways and Telegraph Lines required to meet, and that Committee has forty Bills before it. The business of the House in that regard was standing still, and we gave up the room to that Committee. To-morrow it will be absolutely impossible to meet in consequence of other engagements that have been made, or to get a quorum even if the Committee did meet. Friday is the only day we can give. I am very sorry. I would be quite willing to give next Saturday, if I supposed a sufficient number of members would remain in town to constitute a quorum. We are not only willing, but as anxious as any members of the Committee can be, that this Committee shall go forward next week and sit *de die in diem*, without interruption, except such as is inevitable on account of the business of the House. I say to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Davies), as I understand him to say the Government is to blame, that we have no wish except to get at the end of this investigation. It is no more agreeable to us than to him, and nothing will stand in the way of speeding it to a conclusion except the transaction of the business necessary in connection with this House. Considering we are meeting after that last adjournment under very peculiar circumstances, considering that the Cabinet had to be reorganized, and that this had to be done in the middle of the session, with very important questions of policy to be considered, it is not unreasonable that we should ask the House for one day to deliberate before important questions touching the Budget and other matters which are now on the Order paper should come up for determination. That is the necessity which makes us ask that to-morrow should not be given to the business of the Committee. I must say as regards my colleague against whom these charges are brought, that he has not only never expressed an opinion, but has never been consulted as to the propriety of the Committee adjourning on any occasion. It is only on account of what we consider imperative necessity that we ask to have the Committee not to meet to-morrow. I have already explained why no meeting was held yesterday, and why to-day had to be given up; but it was not in accordance with our wish that there should be a suspension of one day.

Mr. TARTE. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the very long delay that is taking place in the production of papers that I feel necessary for my enquiry. I made the statement on which this investigation proceeded on May 11th. On May 15th the first meeting of the Committee took place. An order was then given for the production of all papers connected with the charges. Since that time they have been delayed from day to day. Of course I do not want to assume anything I am not in a position to prove, but there is one thing perfectly sure, and it is this: I have found in private letters that fell into my hands, traces of official letters and other papers that were not produced before the Committee. Some of these were only produced after we put in the hands of one of the officers called before the Committee a book containing evidence that such a paper existed and had not been produced. I might say more than that. There are to-day letters and telegrams, which were exchanged between Mr. Trutch and Mr. Perley, under the control of the Minister of Public Works, and which have not been produced before the Committee, and I state here that those letters are an essential part of the evidence that I desire to present to the Committee. As I said, I do not want to make any imputations. When I made the very

grave charges that I thought it was my duty to make, I fully realized all the difficulties I would have to meet: but when objection was taken in this House in regard to the Minister of Public Works keeping control of the papers, I did not take part in sustaining it. I hope that the Minister of Public Works, who is the official leader of my race in this Parliament, will not place me under the painful obligation of believing that those who at the time made that objection were right. I hope that they were wrong, but, Sir, I hope at the same time that he will realize that it is his immediate duty to order that all the papers should be brought down, and brought down without any more delay. Look at what we have witnessed, Mr. Speaker. We have seen people who have for the last eight years controlled, as a matter of fact, a great many things in a great public department, hiding their books from day to day.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Will the hon. gentleman not confine himself to the mere statement which he wishes to make on the Orders of the Day being called? He is now entering upon matters which give rise to a debate.

Mr. EDGAR. In order that this matter may not be slurred over, I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. There is no occasion to slur it over at all. I simply reminded the hon. gentleman of the Rule of the House, which I thought perhaps he had not in mind. There is no objection to his making a full statement of what he desires, and it will be answered.

Mr. TARTE. What I say, Sir, is that we have before this Parliament in the official report of the Committee, the clear evidence, I might say more than that, the clear admission that the books were not forthcoming and that the book-keeper was dismissed.

Mr. SPEAKER. Let me draw the attention of the hon. member to the fact that he is now speaking as to the delay in producing papers by the Department of Public Works. What connection has that with the holding back of the books or with Connolly's clerk, I do not see.

Mr. TARTE. If you allow me, I believe that I can show you that I am perfectly in order, and, more than that, that there is a perfect relation between that delay and the other delays that we have suffered before the Committee. It should not be forgotten, I think, that the persons named in the charge I have brought are Larkin, Connolly & Co., and also, unfortunately, the Minister of Public Works. My charge is, that improper dealings have taken place between the parties named. I yet hope that the hon. Minister will prove that my charges are false: but still the charges are there, and they are now being investigated. Well, Sir, I was saying that we could not obtain until to-day important correspondence, letters and telegrams that are under the control of the hon. Minister. I state this from my seat in the House, and I will prove it in due time. At the same time we see that the other parties accused of having corruptly dominated the department have themselves hidden their books and sent away their man who was in a position to explain the entries in these books. This cannot be denied, because one of them has clearly admitted that he has dismissed the bookkeeper. I made these charges with a certain hope that they were going to be investigated in an honourable manner. I have expected justice, and I still expect justice, from this Parliament. Well, Sir, if we cannot get these papers, if we are delayed from day to day, I will certainly not be able to make all my evidence, although persons who may have been parties to destroying papers may be deceived in the long run. But still let us take the facts as they are before us. As a matter of fact we have been delayed, but I fully admit that the Government, I believe, is not responsible for that delay. I am quite prepared to say that I have received justice from the hon. Minister of Justice, who has directed all our proceedings in the Committee, but one thing that all the members of the House will be obliged to admit also is, that we have not acted with the energy that was to have been expected from us. We have been delayed from day to day: papers we have had a right to have are not produced yet, and I again call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the fact that he has got under his control in his department a great many letters extending between the years 1885, 1886 and 1887 that he had an order to bring before us, and that have not been brought down yet. I do not wish to say any more now, but, Sir, I believe that the House will agree with me that, in the interest of all parties, we should not prorogue until this enquiry is over. I believe that I may appeal to both sides of the House. If I have been deceived in the accusations I have brought I am quite prepared to bear the full responsibility and penalty of it, but, Sir, if my accusations are true, as I have every reason to believe they are, then the guilty parties ought to be punished.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I will not follow the hon. gentleman in his argument nor in his speech, because I believe the House does not expect that from me. The only thing I can say to the House is this: That every paper, every letter, every document, every plan and every thing that is in my department connected with this case, I have given orders from the beginning that they should all be produced before the Committee. I repeat again, that if the hon. gentleman will lay before the Committee when it meets to-morrow or the next day, a list of what he wants and which he does not find in the numerous papers and documents that have been laid before the Committee already, if any of those documents are to be found in my department every one of them will be brought down as soon as possible. I know perfectly well that my position as a member of Parliament and a Minister of the Crown is this: That as the head of that department, and the House having ordered through its Committee that all these documents and papers should be produced, they must be produced, and an order has been given to the deputy head of the department to do so. He has full liberty to do so, his duty is to do so, his orders are to do so, and I have no doubt that if any document is missing it is because he did not find it. If the hon. gentleman will give a list of one, or two, or three, or twenty documents which he wants, Mr. Gobeil, the Deputy Minister of my department, is bound to find them if they are in the department.

Mr. GIROUARD. With regard to these missing papers, I may be allowed to make one or two remarks. First, the papers coming from the De-

partment of Public Works are contained in several large boxes. Evidently this investigation requires the production of a large number of papers, and it would not be surprising if some of them, on the first inspection, should be found to be missing. The hon. gentleman mentioned the other day, at the sitting of the Committee, that he had found out that some papers were missing. Surely there could not have been any intention of deceiving the hon. gentleman, or preventing his going on with his investigation. He found complete lists of those papers published in the blue-books.

Mr. TARTE. It was a very small blue-book.

Mr. GIROUARD. If those papers were mentioned in the blue-books, there could not have been any intention of hiding them.

Mr. TARTE. They were not produced.

Mr. GIROUARD. But there could not have been any intention of deceiving him or the public. I wish to make another statement as to the papers which were not found in the two boxes, but which were mentioned in the blue-books. They were produced on the very day that it was noticed they were missing, and I notified the hon. gentleman that he could have access to them. With regard to the correspondence of Mr. Trutch, I was informed yesterday that the hon. gentleman had made a demand on the clerk of the Committee for those papers. I looked at the order of the Committee, and I found that he was entitled to have them produced; I therefore, immediately, gave instructions to the clerk to demand the production of the papers from the Public Works Department. I do not know yet what answer he has received from the department. I am sure the hon. gentleman has no reason to complain of delay. He has received from the Committee and the Government all the assistance he could get.

Mr. IVES. I wish to say, on behalf of the private members of the House, that we do not complain that the Committee on Privileges and Elections should sit every day; but we have been in session now nearly two months, and we have had only two meetings of the Railway Committee, and none of the Committee on Banking and Commerce, or the Committee on Private Bills. The whole time has been monopolized by this investigation. Now, it seems to me that arrangements should be made by the Government for this Committee to sit simultaneously with the sittings of the other Committees, and for its vacating the Railway Committee room. We had a short meeting of the Railway Committee this morning with over forty orders on the paper. Among them was one Bill the promoters of which asked that we should not only pass it, but that we should reduce from two months to two weeks the notice required to be given to the Governor General in Council for the sanction of a lease, the reason given being that the whole season would be lost for the work of construction if the time were not reduced. I have no doubt that other very large interests are being injured and imperilled in consequence of the monopoly of our time by this Committee, to the exclusion of all the ordinary legitimate business of the country. Now, while we sympathize with the Government in their anxiety not to delay this investigation, I think it is not too much to ask them, because they have the control of the matter, to make provision that the ordinary business of the country may go on in the meantime. Of course, we do not expect to satisfy certain gentlemen who seem bound to find fault anyway—to find fault with the non-production of papers which were only asked for yesterday, and all that sort of thing; but we do think that the Government—and I am speaking not only for my own friends, but for hon. members on the other side who have Bills before the different committees—should make arrangements so that the other committees may meet simultaneously, and that they should not ask us to wait till the end of the Session for private Bill legislation which is urgently needed.

Mr. LAURIER. I am sure it is not the intention of any hon. member to cast suspicion or blame upon anyone in connection with this matter. For my own part, I will gladly add my testimony to that of the hon. member for Montmorency (Mr. Tarte), that the hon. Minister of Justice is entitled to credit for the manner in which he has discharged his duty to the House in this investigation. At the same time, the anxiety of the hon. member for Montmorency is natural, because he has assumed a task which is painful to him, and the consequences of which may be very serious to him if he does not establish the charges which he has made; and it seems to me that a remark made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) fully justifies the complaint of my hon. friend. My hon. friend has complained that certain papers which were ordered to be produced by the Department of Public Works were not produced.

Mr. TARTE. A month ago.

Mr. LAURIER. Ordered to be produced a month ago. The hon. Minister of Public Works says that he gave orders for the production of those papers. I unhesitatingly accept his statement; but it appears from what the hon. member for Jacques Cartier has said that up to yesterday certain papers which were ordered a month ago—that is, the correspondence of Mr. Trutch, the inspector of public works in British Columbia—were not yet produced. Therefore, while I will not say that there was a failure of duty anywhere, for one reason or another the papers were not produced, and the remark of my hon. friend that the Order of the House has not been complied with is fully borne out. It is easy to understand that some warmth of blood may be exhibited; but when we come to sift the matter, let us admit that no one has intended to do wrong, though there has been a hitch somewhere, and it is quite natural that the matter should be brought to the notice of the House.

Mr. GIROUARD. The Order of the House was for papers, correspondence, and so forth, without specifying any particular papers. As the papers produced filled two trunks, it was quite possible that some of the desired documents might be missing; but the moment any paper was specified, an immediate order was given for its production.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think this matter is irregularly before the House, not only because we are having a debate on the Orders of the Day being called, but also in this sense—and it may not be amiss that I should make the suggestion now for future guidance—that we are really prosecuting the business of the Committee in the

House. It was an order of the Committee that was given for the papers some weeks ago; that order covered not particular papers or letters, but all papers, contracts, specifications, plans, accounts, vouchers, and so forth, relating to four large transactions, and extending over a period of twenty years. From my experience of the departments, I venture to say that if any order were given for documents extending over that period of time, there would be no surprise if when we came to examine them we found that a further search would have to be made and further papers obtained. But I submit to the hon. member for Montmorency that if he again finds that to be the case, as is not at all unlikely in view of the circumstances, it would be more convenient for all purposes to bring up matters of that kind in the Committee. Then if it is found that the order of the Committee has not been obeyed, the officers will be called up and put on their guard to be more vigilant; and instead of anyone in the House being subject to suspicion, we shall have the officers before us under oath to say why the papers were not produced and produced before. If such a course is followed, I think feelings of impatience and irritation will be less likely to be excited.

Mr. TARTE. I did more than that. I went myself to Mr. Gobeil four or five days ago. I indicated to him the papers that are missing, and these papers are not yet brought down.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Justice is a very proper one. It is only the importance of this question that, to my mind, justified its being brought up here to-night at all. These papers were ordered by the Committee, and the proper place to deal with their non-production is in the Committee and not in the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not going to enter into a discussion as to these papers at all, but I would like to say to the Minister of Justice and the Government generally, that I think there is a good deal in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Ives) thus far. I think the importance of this enquiry demands that precedence be given at any cost, even to the delay of ordinary business, to the investigation before the Committee of Privileges and Elections; but, after all, that Committee only comprises forty-two members, and there is no reason why the various committees of this House should not sit in other rooms during a reasonable number of days. If questions arise which absolutely require the presence of Ministers who have to be present at this investigation, these questions might be held over, but I think it is desirable the other committees should sit as well as the Committee on Privileges and Elections. If there is any difficulty with regard to obtaining a sufficiently large room, it might possibly be necessary to poach on the room immediately adjoining this, which is now handed over to gentlemen of the Conservative party; but I think the other committees, and certainly the Public Accounts Committee, should sit even while this investigation is going on, but, of course, in other rooms.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I think the other committees will have to be called.

LANGEVIN BLOCK—PAPERS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before proceeding to the Orders of the Day, I wish to bring to the attention of the Government the non-production of certain papers ordered some time ago. I refer to the papers connected with what is known as the Langevin Block. The hon. Minister of Public Works has several times promised to have the Order complied with.

Mr. SPEAKER. Were these ordered by the House or the Committee?

Mr. MULOCK. There is an Order both of the House and of the Public Accounts Committee; but, even if the order were only made by the Public Accounts Committee, you will see there must be some way of getting the order of the Committee complied with. We have not had a meeting of that Committee for a month, and, if we cannot ask for the papers until it meets, we may not be able to ask for them at all. I was notified by the clerk yesterday afternoon that these papers had been produced, and this morning I attended before the clerk to examine them. I can only say that there has been, in my judgment, a great deal more attention paid to the non-production than the production of the papers. The most studious efforts have been apparently made to prevent their production. As far as I went, I made a note of a few of the papers that I could see have not been produced and are pertinent to the enquiry, but I am perfectly satisfied that there has not been a proper compliance with the Order of the House or of the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The deputy of my department has told me that he had sent to the Committee on Public Accounts all the papers that were in the department and were asked for by the Committee. In so far as this House is concerned the hon. gentleman asked for a number of documents and information, which the House granted. I said to the hon. gentleman, and I repeat it now, that it is impossible for my department to comply with the Order of the House so long as the Committee on Public Accounts has the original documents from which we could give the information asked for: and I said to the deputy of my department that whilst he was sending these documents to the Public Accounts Committee he should tell the clerk of the Committee that so soon as the Committee would send back the documents, we would prepare a statement for the House; but we have no double sets of original documents, and therefore cannot comply with the Order of the House until the Public Accounts Committee has returned the originals.

Mr. MULOCK. The documents, the non-production of which I complain of, are not with the clerk of the Public Accounts Committee, but have been withheld from him.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is no intention on the part of my department or my deputy, who is an honest, straightforward man, to keep away from the Committee or members of the Committee any paper or document that is to be found in my department. If the hon. gentleman will send a list of what he says is missing, and if these papers are to be found in the department they will be sent here. It must have been because the documents could not be found that they have not been sent, but if they are in the department they will be laid on the Table. We have no reason to fear the investigation of the hon. gentleman or the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. LISTER. I understood the Minister of Justice to say that all the documents are not produced to the clerk of the Committee because the officers in his department are engaged in copying them.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. LISTER. There can then be no possible reason for not producing the original documents before the Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. All the original documents which are not in a book used every day by the department have been sent. Documents, such as letters, which are in books that are used every day, must be copied, because we cannot stop all the work of the department by sending away the books; but all the original documents which are not in books are sent.

Mr. BARRON. I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works if he will comply with the promise made last session by the late Premier in regard to the production and laying on the Table of the evidence taken by the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners in regard to the completion of that route. That subject is very important to a great many people in Ontario, who are very anxious to know something about it. Of course, we have the report of the Trent Valley Canal Commissioners, but we require to have the evidence on which that report is based in order to discuss it intelligently.

Mr. BOWELL. Might I ask the hon. gentleman if those papers were moved for in the House, either last session or this session?

Mr. BARRON. I am glad the hon. gentleman has referred to that question. They were not moved for because the late Premier promised that, if they were not too voluminous, they would be printed during the recess and given to each member of the House, but that, in any event, I or anybody could see them on applying at the office where they are kept. He intimated, at all events, that members could get possession of them as soon as possible, and, inasmuch as the promise was of a nature which did not require anyone to move for the papers, I mentioned it at the beginning of this session, and there was an intimation that they would be given to the House.

Mr. BOWELL. I will make enquiry in the department as to the character of the evidence. There is no possible reason for withholding it, and I will see that such evidence as it is possible to lay upon the Table shall be brought down as early as possible.

Mr. LANDERKIN. When are we to have a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee?

Mr. FOSTER. I understand a meeting has been called for Friday morning.

PROHIBITION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC.

On the Order being read for the proposed motion of Mr. Jamieson:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived when it is expedient to prohibit the manufacture, importation and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes.

The motion of Mr. Mackintosh in amendment thereto and the motion of Mr. Taylor in amendment to the amendment.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have to renew the request which I made when this subject was called on the Order Paper the week before last and for the same reason. The motion will, of course, be reached this night week, and, unless something unexpected occurs in the meantime, we shall not ask for any further postponement.

Order postponed.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) to amend the Dominion Elections Act. He said: The object of this Bill, as I partly explained on its introduction, is to change the Dominion election law in two respects: first, as regards the form of oath; and, secondly, to remove some confusion which exists in consequence of the provisions of the Act as it now exists. The first part of the Bill seeks to prevent British subjects who have become American citizens from voting in this country. The second part seeks to amend the law in such a way as to make the instructions contained in the Act itself correspond with the 46th section of the Dominion Elections Act. It is within the recollection of almost every member of this House that, after the recent elections, recounts were had, and difficulties arose over the taking of the ballots in certain constituencies. The result, I submit, was owing to no fault on the part of the deputy returning officers themselves, but might very naturally be attributed to the peculiar or confused reading of the instructions contained in the Act. There is no necessity for enlarging any further upon the Bill, but I will read one of the clauses of form "M" which it is proposed to change, and I think hon. members on both sides will see the necessity for a change:

"The voter will then fold the ballot so as to show a portion of the back only, with the number and initials of the deputy returning officer."

From that wording, I submit that any person, even though he had a legal education, might consider that not only the initials but the number of the deputy returning officer should be placed on the back, and, when you consider the very small number of persons who are allowed to each polling sub-division, and the consequent necessity for a large number of deputy returning officers, farmers' sons, clerks and others, who are not versed in law, it will be felt that every line or clause in the Act which tends to confusion should be made as clear as possible, because, when a mistake is made, the quick tendency is on the part of those against whom the mistake may be made to say that it is done from some improper motive. We know that, when we are in the heat of a conflict and even when the smoke of the battle has not quite cleared away, none of us are too careful to avoid imputing motives, and in that way many are brought under the ban of suspicion. I think both sides of the House will assist me in putting this Bill through so that we may make the Act as clear as possible.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman who moves this Bill seems to have in his mind the idea that he is going to make a tremendous reform in the law by preventing British subjects who have been naturalized in the United States from voting here as British subjects. I apprehend that is the main scope of his Bill. I am very much mistaken in my reading of the law if that is at all necessary. I think the hon. gentleman must know that a British subject who goes to the United States and becomes

naturalized there has no right to vote in Canada to-day. He is no longer a British subject when he becomes naturalized in a foreign country, and under the Franchise Act he cannot vote, he cannot be placed on the list, and he cannot take the oath as it stands to-day, because he cannot truthfully swear that he is a British subject either by birth or by naturalization. Perhaps he was a British subject once by birth, but he cannot swear that he is to-day. That there may be no doubt whatever on this subject, I will refer the House to the Naturalization Act in the Revised Statutes on the subject of "Repatriation," and there it is laid down that

"Any British subject who has voluntarily become naturalized in a foreign state shall, from and after the time of his so having become naturalized in such foreign state, be deemed within Canada to have ceased to be a British subject, and shall be regarded as an alien."

Now, a man who has ceased to be a British subject has no right, in the first place, to be placed upon the voters' list under the Act, because only British subjects can be placed there, and he cannot take the oath truthfully, because he has to swear that he is a British subject by birth or by naturalization. Therefore, the introduction of this additional clause proposed by the hon. gentleman, "and am not a subject of any foreign country," while, perhaps, it will not do any particular harm, does not work any reform in the law as it stood. It does not do any good. I will not refer to any former debate, but I think I have a distinct recollection, indeed I know, that the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) was on one occasion very loud in his expression of opinion that the only thing necessary to make the law perfect and to stop non-residents voting, was a Bill such as the hon. member proposes now. I think I heard the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Davin) say the same thing, and I think the Minister of Justice even did not, on that occasion, point out to the hon. member who is moving this Bill to-day, that a British subject who became a naturalized citizen in the United States, was no longer a British subject and could not vote. The hon. gentleman thinks that it does no harm to make this change. If he puts it on that ground, and will admit that it is not necessary, then, I think, there may be something in his Bill; but he cannot surely pretend that he is going to effect a great reformation in the election law.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Bill which my hon. friend has introduced to the House is one that should receive the approbation of this House. If it has the effect of making clear what before was somewhat confused, it will be advantageous. Any person who has any experience at all in election matters knows perfectly well that so far as marking the ballots is concerned, many deputy returning officers throughout the country not only initial the ballots, but they also number them, which is against the law. The provisions of this Act make it perfectly clear that the numbering of the ballots should not take place, and that only the initials of the deputy returning officer are allowed upon the ballot which is handed to the voter. Then again, as respects the affidavit, or oath, which the voter has to take on presenting himself to vote, I think the amendment of my hon. friend is one which should receive favourable consideration. As I stated a moment ago, it makes clear what was before confused. We all know that many men present themselves to vote who have become citizens of the United States, and they satisfy their conscience by swearing that they are British subjects by birth. There is an idea prevalent throughout this country that once a British subject, always a British subject, that nothing he can do divests himself of that natural allegiance that he owes to his country by birth. I think it is safe to say that during the last election hundreds and hundreds of people who have taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign state, and have, under the law as it is, no right to vote, satisfied their conscience by declaring that they were British subjects by birth. This section makes it clear that if they have become subjects of a foreign state they lose their right of franchise under the law of this country. For these reasons this Act shall receive my support, and I think it ought to receive the support of hon. gentlemen who want to make the law perfectly clear. It may be, as my hon. friend at my right says, that under the law as it is, they have no right to vote, and their names ought to be struck off the first list. But who looks after the first list? When you come to make out your list then you find out whether a man has really a right to vote or not on the ground of being an alien. That is the time you object to him, and although men have over and over again been challenged, they have taken this oath, believing they were entitled to vote, and they did vote. This law makes it clear, and I think it should receive our support.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I desired to make remarks very much in the line of those which the hon. gentleman has just made. I do not think any one overlooks the fact that a British subject who renounces his allegiance to Great Britain and becomes a subject of a foreign country, is no longer a British subject. But that is not the point. The point is that our statutes at present do not, at any rate with clearness, proscribe such person from voting or from being on the election list. For my part I have no doubt whatever, except such doubt as arises from the opinions expressed by lawyers just now—I have never had any doubt that such persons have an absolute legal right to vote, because the only thing we ask is the oath which requires them to say they are British subjects by birth or by naturalization. Undoubtedly, although a man may have renounced his allegiance to Great Britain and be no longer a British subject, he is a British subject by birth, and if the intention of Parliament was, as it probably was, to prevent such persons from voting as being no longer British subjects, the least that we can do is to make the law plain. I think the current opinion is that such persons have a legal right to vote. The hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) says hundreds of persons voted in the last election who had renounced their allegiance to Great Britain and had become subjects of a foreign country; they took the oath and satisfied their consciences in the belief they had a right to do so. I may indicate to the House that if it should be the pleasure of the House that the Bill should be read a second time now, I will move that it be referred to a sub-committee. There are other Bills on the Order paper touching the same subject, some provisions of which it may be wise to adopt, and it would be convenient for the Committee to weld these together, so that we may have one Bill on the one subject.

Mr. BURDETT. While approving most of the letter and spirit of the Bill, I would suggest that we go a little further and that the ballot should not only be initialled by the deputy returning officer, but that it should be initialled also by authorized agents of the opposing candidates. Deputy returning officers are not always emblems of purity. A deputy returning officer, if he is so inclined, may issue a few ballots before the polling occurs with his initials upon them, and they can be circulated outside the booth, and a man may get his five dollar bill and the ballot already marked, provided he goes in and brings out one with the initials upon it not marked. That may occur, and if the initials of the deputy returning officer and the agents of the opposing candidates are allowed to be put upon the ballot as well, nothing of this kind can occur. Speaking on another point of the Franchise Act, I think that men who have gone to the States with the intention of residing there, ought not to be allowed to come back here and vote and thus affect the conduct of affairs in a country that they have left practically forever. Respecting the matter of postage, it is one of great importance to those who object to votes on the list. Now, these lists have to be registered and sent out at a cost of eight cents, and I think it ought to be made as cheap as possible to those gentlemen who revise the list, because under the present Act enough trouble and difficulty occur to both political parties.

Mr. BARRON. I, too, would like to see the Bill become law, including the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Burdett), because it has come under my own notice that electors go to the polls and take the oath that they are British subjects by birth, relying upon the fact that, though they had removed to the States, they were born British subjects. But my main object in addressing the House now is to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice and also the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill to the fact that this Bill should not become law at all events this year, because it specifies what is a qualification for an elector. It may be that the revising officer in accepting declarations, knowing what is the qualification of an elector by this Bill, might require the clause setting forth that I am a British subject by birth and not the subject of any foreign country, to be incorporated in the declaration. We know that the revising officers, by statute, began their work on 1st June last, and if this Bill became law, without a clause being provided that it shall not be retroactive, those officers might hold that declarations received before this Bill became law would be bad, inasmuch as they would not contain the whole of this paragraph, "I am a British subject by birth and not the subject of any foreign country." I, therefore, suggest to the Minister of Justice and the promoter of this Bill that there should be a clause making it not applicable to the present revision, or, at all events, not to become law until after this year.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). It is only the form of the oath that the Bill seeks to amend. A person coming from the United States to Ontario could take the present oath because he could swear, and with something of a clear conscience, that he was a British subject by birth, notwithstanding that at the same time he was a citizen of the United States. The objection taken does not hold, because in the declaration required by the revising officer the party who seeks to have his name placed on the preliminary list only swears that he is a British subject.

Mr. BURDETT. The revising officer can accept the declaration whether this clause is in it or not.

Mr. MASSON. Surely the question as to what the revising officer may do cannot interfere with the passage of this Bill. It will be his duty to act in accordance with the Franchise Act and this Act, and I understand that the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), also proposes to amend the Franchise Act bearing on the same subject. I am glad to see that made clear which was obscure. I would suggest that a further step be taken, and it should be declared that the person making the declaration is not only not the subject of a foreign country, but has not filed any declaration of intention to become the subject or citizen of a foreign state. In many of the Western States persons resident a few months are allowed certain privileges as citizens, provided they file a declaration with the county clerk of their intention to become citizens of the United States. I think such a clause should be embodied in the Bill as drawn, because, to use the sentiment expressed by Mr. Blaine, that Canadians should be taught that they cannot be Americans and Canadians at the same time. Canadians must be taught that they cannot be American citizens and at the same time come here and assist in controlling the legislation of this country.

Mr. FRASER. That argument does not apply to this case. The fact of a man declaring his intention to do a thing is not the performance of it. If so, every man who declared his intention to steal would be entered as having stolen. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Bill should cover cases where the parties had simply declared their intention to ultimately become American citizens.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). Some of the States permit a man who declares his intention, and makes a formal declaration to that effect, of becoming an American citizen, to enjoy all the rights of American citizenship although he may not have been a resident long enough to have become a citizen.

Mr. FRASER. He has only certain rights concerning municipal matters, and he is not a full citizen. He is not a full citizen unless he has taken out his naturalization papers, as in this country. There is no necessity of placing such a clause in this Bill.

Mr. MASSON. In the Western States men, on filing such declarations, secure many of the rights of citizenship. If these people choose to go to a foreign country and make a declaration of their intention to become citizens, it is only right that we should provide that they should have nothing to do with the Government of this country.

Mr. CHARLTON. The object of making this declaration is to enable persons to hold real estate. In many States aliens are not allowed to hold property, but in no State, I believe, does the filing of such declaration entitle such a person to the right of citizenship and suffrage. The person has simply the right to acquire property; but he is not a

citizen, he has simply made a declaration of his intention to become a citizen, and is looking forward to the enjoyment of the rights connected therewith. I do not think that a person going from Canada to the United States, making possibly a declaration of his intention to become an American citizen in order to hold real estate, but not consummating his papers by becoming a citizen, perhaps returning to Canada and never becoming an American citizen, should be prevented from subsequently voting here. We will go far enough in declaring that an individual shall lose his right to vote after he has become an American citizen.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Does the promoter of the Bill intend to bar out any persons who have acquired property in the United States? Some young men may go to that country, may possibly file declarations to become American citizens in order to acquire property, and may subsequently return to Canada. Will this Bill permit such young men to vote or not? This question should be carefully considered, and it should be stated as to whether this Bill will place such men under the ban, and if so, for how many years after the return. There are members in this House who have acquired property in the United States, and I wish to know if this Bill is intended to strike a blow at them. It would be well that the promoter of the Bill should take the House into his confidence and let it be known whether it is intended to meet such cases.

Mr. McMULLEN. I concur in the view expressed by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Masson). There are no less than fifteen states in which a man may vote for President if he has declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States. I can give the names of the states, if my statement is challenged.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON moved:

That Bill No. 5 be referred to a special committee consisting of Messrs. Wood (Brockville), Cameron (Huron), Amyot, Barron, Sir Adolphe Caron, Sir John Thompson, Langelier, Desjardins (L'Islet), Montague, Skinner and McKeen.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISE ACT.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 31) to amend the Electoral Franchise Act. He said: The Bill I shall call the attention of the House to is one which I trust will commend itself to the Minister of Justice and to the Cabinet. I have introduced this Bill without any desire to make political capital or to make a point against the Government, but simply with a desire to correct an abuse which has existed and which is liable to occur again. The Bill is a brief one and I shall preface my remarks by reading its provision:

"Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—

"1. Section thirty-nine of '*The Electoral Franchise Act*,' chapter five of the Revised Statutes, is hereby repealed and the following substituted therefor:—

"'39. If, from any cause, the list of voters for any polling district is not revised and certified at the time when it should, under this Act, be sent to the returning officer at any election, then the last list of voters, revised and certified for such polling district, shall be sent to the returning officer and used at such election: but if such last list is not as recent as the last list of voters prepared under the laws of the province in which such polling district is situate, then such last provincial list shall be sent to the returning officer and used at such election.'"

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had two revisions of the Dominion list under the Franchise Act since 1885. These revisions are expensive and vexatious. They are vexatious to the members, vexatious to the provinces and to the Dominion at large, and I have no doubt that many members of this House would be pleased if the revision of the lists for the present year is postponed. We had the last general election held upon an old list, and I presume that there was scarcely a young man in the Dominion of Canada under twenty-three years of age who was entitled to a vote. The result was that many thousands of young men who ought to have voted and who were entitled to a vote, were not able to do so in consequence of the delay in the revision of the voters' lists, as the list was practically two years old at the time the election was held. The elections were held upon a list which disfranchised all the young men, which left on the voters' lists thousands of men who were dead and who were in many cases personated; a list which included thousands of men who had removed from the country, because the older the voters' list is the larger the number of people on it who do not live in the country. The consequence of this was that at the last election we had not a fair expression of public opinion. It was estimated that there were fifty thousand young men debarred from voting who had a right to vote, thirty or forty thousand dead men on the list, many of whom were voted for by personators, and tens of thousands of voters who were out of the country, and there was a disposition in some quarters to use improper means to bring these men back. The result of this condition of things was most unfavourable to political morals, and the consequence of it was to secure a verdict which in many cases was not one that would not have been given if the lists contained the names of those actually entitled to vote.

This Bill does not propose that the provincial list shall be substituted for the Dominion lists except in cases such as occurred last election, where the Dominion list was an old one and where manifestly it was unjust to have used this list. This Bill proposes that in such cases, where the provincial list is a more recent one, and if for any cause a revision has not been made under the Dominion Franchise Act, and the Dominion list does not properly represent the electorate of the country, then in such cases the provincial list if more recent, will be substituted for the Dominion list. I think this proposition is a very fair one and if the Government orders a revision of the Dominion lists every year, its provisions are of course inoperative, but if for any reasons, one, or two, or three years should elapse without a revision and there should be a bye-election in the meantime, this election would be held on the provincial list. If, as was the case last year, there should be a general election precipitated on the country and there was an old Dominion list, under the operation of which no one under twenty-three years of age could vote, then it would be in the interest of the country generally to adopt a voters' list which would allow these young men to vote and which had all the names of those entitled to vote upon it, and the names of dead men and absentees excluded. Looking at the matter entirely free from political bias I think that it would be in the interest of the country generally

to adopt the provision of this Bill. I move the second reading of this Bill, hoping that my motion will be carried and that the Minister of Justice will consent that the Bill be referred to a special committee to see if there is anything in its provisions which would be advantageous or useful to the country.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I am very sorry that I cannot acquiesce in the opinion so politely expressed by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he invited me to concur with him in making this Bill law. I think its adoption would introduce very serious confusion into the franchise law of this country and I am inclined to believe from the observations which the hon. gentleman himself made at the close of his remarks that he has hardly himself realized the confusion that would result. If the qualifications of voters for local elections and for Dominion elections were the same, and it were a mere question of the remoteness of the revision it would be a matter of no concern which list was taken and it would be most desirable to have the most recent one, but we cannot forget that the franchises are materially different in some of the provinces ; indeed in some of them widely different.

Mr. CHARLTON. They are different under the Dominion list also.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Now, it is absolutely necessary that we should have certainty, whatever inconvenience or delays there may be, as to what the franchise is, and as to the persons who should exercise that franchise. But under this Bill, in certain circumstances one set of persons might be qualified to vote for a member of Parliament, and a few days later an entirely different set, and only that set, would have the right to vote. I suppose the case which the hon. gentleman probably had in his mind, and in which the inconvenience would be somewhat less, is the case of a suspension of the Franchise Act for a year. I infer that from the hon. gentleman's closing remark that the operation of a Bill like this would have the effect of compelling the Government to prompt revisions—I suppose he meant regular revisions without suspensions. If that is his object, the Bill would come up more appropriately as a clause in a Bill providing for the suspension of the Franchise Act, because I need not inform him that without a special Act the revision must go on. But what I wish particularly to call the attention of the hon. gentleman and the House to is the unforeseen inconvenience—for I think the hon. gentleman has hardly foreseen it—which would result, even with prompt and regular revisions of the lists, from the passage of this Bill. Let the present law be carried out regularly and fairly, and the lists completed by the 1st of November every year, as I suppose they could be. In all conscience those lists ought to be good for twelve months. But a vacancy occurs in the following June, before the time for revising the lists again comes around. In the month of May, the local revision has taken place ; so that in the month of June, were the hon. gentleman's Bill in force, we should find that all the electors who were qualified in November would be disqualified in June, and the lists made in the month of May would come into force instead. Not only would that inconvenience be open to occur in any province in which there would be a different date for revision from the date for the revision of the Dominion lists, but in point of fact there would be different dates in the different provinces, because I venture to say that the revision is completed at a different date in every province in Canada. So that, if we adopt this amendment we shall never know, when a bye-election is likely to occur in a province, under what list or what electoral qualification the election is to be carried on. I think the hon. gentleman will see that it would lead to an enormous amount of uncertainty, an uncertainty multiplied by the number of provinces in Canada ; and I therefore feel compelled, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's courtesy in recommending this Bill to my consideration, which I duly appreciate and very often comply with, to move that it be not now read the second time, but that it be read the second time this day three months.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) With most of the observations made by the hon. Minister of Justice, I must say I concur. I think my hon. friend, whose motives I have no doubt were the best, had not fully considered the difficulties and inconveniences that would arise necessarily from the passage of his Bill. It is absolutely essential, in matters of this kind, that there should be certainty—that the candidate on the one hand and the electorate on the other should know on what lists the election would be conducted ; but the Bill of my hon. friend, so far from introducing certainty, would introduce an amount of uncertainty which would be very trying. As between the Dominion franchise and the provincial franchises I have never scrupled to declare my preference for the provincial, but this is not the question now before us. The fact that the provincial lists are not coterminous with the Dominion electoral districts would involve a difficulty which could not be overcome. I hope my hon. friend will not press the Bill to a division, as I certainly cannot concur in it, and would be obliged to vote against it.

Mr. WALLACE. Another difficulty would arise in this way : The provincial lists are prepared by the various municipalities. In case there are no appeals to the county judge, the lists are certified by him at least as early as October in each year, while if there are any appeals, the hearing of them is fixed for some time ahead, and the lists are not completed until a later period, perhaps not till January. The result might be that in the same district you would have to use the Dominion list in one municipality and the provincial list in another. For this reason I think the Bill should not become law.

Mr. SPROULE. I think all amendments should be designed to make the law as simple as possible ; but if this Bill were carried, it would only cause the worst kind of confusion. Suppose a voter came up to a polling booth, and you wanted to swear him, which oath would you put, the Dominion or the provincial? Then, the Dominion law provides that one man may vote in different ridings, while the provincial law provides for one man one vote. In other respects the rules of voting in the two cases are different. So that the only result of passing this Bill would be to introduce confusion, and perhaps a violation of the law, though unintentionally, by returning officers and voters.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. Minister of Justice is not willing to accept the Bill or to submit it to a committee to see whether it can be made acceptable, I submit to his decision and will withdraw it. I must say, however, in justice to myself, that the reasons urged against the Bill, many of them, I am not able to see the weight of. In every state in the American Union the revision of the lists takes place immediately before the elections, and it is held wrong to hold an election on a list even three months old. I think it is not an objection to this Bill to say that a revision of the Dominion lists might take place on the first of January, and then an election be held six months later on provincial lists revised a couple of months later than the first of January, but on the contrary that is a recommendation. It is an advantage to have an election on lists revised one month previously rather than on those revised seven months previously. I do not see any advantage in the Dominion franchise, with regard to equalization over the provincial lists. There is as much inequality under the Dominion Franchise as in the franchises of the various provinces. Under the Dominion Act, there is universal suffrage in some provinces and not in others, and there are different property qualifications in different provinces, so that no claim of uniformity can be made with regard to the Dominion lists in preference to the provincial lists. I believe the most recent lists should be used, as it is not in the public interest to use a list seven months old in preference to one revised but a month previous to the election. Although the object of the Bill is to provide for cases where a greater disparity exists than that, I do not believe the objection made can lie against the measure. Of course, I hold that the provincial franchises are, on all occasions, preferable to the Dominion franchises. I hold that we should go back to the provincial lists and that any step in that direction is in the right direction; but of course I bow to the decision of the Minister of Justice, and will give him not only three months but twelve months to consider it.

Amendment (three months' hoist) agreed to.

PREVENTION OF FRAUDS.

Mr. BURDETT moved second reading of Bill (No. 42) to prevent fraud in the sale of certain articles. He said: I cannot speak for the eastern or western provinces, but I know, as a matter of fact, that very extensive frauds have been committed on the farming community in the central part of Ontario by men who have sold hulless oats and other seed grain to farmers, obtaining from them promissory notes, the sellers giving the farmers bonds to purchase in the fall the produce of the seed grain so sold. For example, they will get a farmer to buy ten bushels of hulless oats at ten dollars per bushel, taking his note for a hundred dollars. They will then give him a bond to take back twenty bushels of the proceeds of those oats in the fall at ten dollars a bushel and to sell the balance of the crop produced from that ten bushels at $7.50 per bushel, the farmer allowing 25 per cent. commission. When the fall comes round, these parties will redeem their bond by selling the crop to the neighbouring farmers on similar terms, being thus enabled to hand over to the first farmer sufficient notes or money to cover their indebtedness. Thus, they can go on perpetrating the fraud, and in the county from which I come it has been carried on for three years. Last year public attention was drawn to it by newspapers in the city of Belleville, and the schemers had to leave the country. Still, frauds to a very great extent were committed there. I think I am within the bounds when I say that in the neighbourhood of one hundred thousand dollars has been taken out of the community in this way. That scheme has been practised of late in other parts of Ontario. This same class of men will go to a farmer and dispose of an article, say a piano, and get the farmer to sign a document by which he agrees to assist in selling four on condition that he will then become the owner of the one in the house. Another agent will soon come along and the farmer will find that he has signed an absolute order for the piano at a price of, say, $480, for which the agent will insist on his giving a promissory note, and all he will have in return is a basswood box filled with penny whistles. I propose to meet that class of frauds, first, by preventing any person from taking notes or other securities for the sale of cereals or other grain, or musical instruments, or farm implements, where the sale is of a fictitious character, or at double the market value of the article sold. I propose also to reach the case of persons who give bonds to become agents for selling this class of property. I propose to make guilty of misdemeanour all those who, knowing the character of those notes, receive or dispose of any notes or securities they may get in that way, or that they may get by reason of their becoming agents to sell for the farmers. This Bill reaches the case completely and in saying that I speak with knowledge of the law of which it is a transcript. This is virtually taken from the statutes of Ohio, where similar frauds were committed for a number of years, and where it was found effectual in putting down that class of fraud. It is true our court of appeal has held that the persons to the original transaction, those who had knowledge of the character of the notes and the transaction, could not recover from each other, but that if the notes had fallen into the hands of an innocent purchaser, they would have to be met at maturity. I may also state that I understand from the legal gentleman who argued the case in the Court of Appeal in Ontario, that it was suggested by the court it was time a law of this nature was passed. I know of the case of a man who is to-day in prison for having carried out one of those piano transactions, but under another section of the criminal law, he having been indicted for fraud. I trust the Minister of Justice will permit this Bill to become law. It can do no injustice to honest dealers, as it only treats of cases where property is sold at a fictitious price or at a price double its value. I trust, therefore, there will be no serious opposition to this Bill. It is in the right direction, and I believe its passage will deter men from going into similar transactions and being robbed. It may be said that anyone who enters into such a transaction and makes a note of this kind is served right if he gets beaten. That is true to a certain extent, but a man's folly often reaches further than himself. His wife and family who have done more than he has to make the farm valuable may suffer, and thus innocent people may be wronged.

I hope this Bill will meet with the approval of the House as it has met with the approval of the Legislatures in many of the States and as I believe it has the approval of the people generally.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. Is this the Bill which was introduced last year?

Mr. BURDETT. Yes.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I forget what the fate of it was last year.

Mr. BURDETT. You intended to bring in some amendments to the criminal law. I was unfortunately ill at the end of the session and was unable to be here, and the Minister of Justice did not deal with this measure. I think it was to have been incorporated in the criminal law amendment, if the Minister of Justice approved of it.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I remember now that I was introducing a Bill amending the criminal law, and intended to refer that Bill and this one to a committee, but the hon. gentleman was unfortunately not able to be here. I think the Bill is a good one. The only objection is the preference it proposes to give. We are endeavouring to pass a criminal law amendment Bill which will probably be dealt with by the House, but, if the hon. gentleman thinks this measure is urgently required, I will not persist in objecting to its passage.

Mr. BURDETT. I know that there is a person now charged with attempting to commit some of the frauds at which this Bill is aimed. They are attempting to reach him through another clause of the criminal law. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should allow the Bill to pass, and, when he does codify the criminal law, he should incorporate this provision, or something like it, in his measure. I know this is of paramount importance to the people of the County of Hastings and the adjoining County of Prince Edward, and I think the Minister of Customs will agree with me in that.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) Is this a copy of the law in force in the United States?

Mr. BURDETT. Yes; of the law in the State of Ohio.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am glad to hear that the Minister of Justice approves of the principle of this Bill, and I hope he will allow it to become law this session. I understand that he does not intend to proceed this session with the Bill for the codification of the criminal law, and I, therefore, hope he will allow this Bill to pass. I know that the frauds which have been spoken of by my hon. friend prevail to a considerable extent in the west. The only objection I have to the Bill is that it does not cover a great many other cases, but it does cover a very extensive class of frauds; and if the Minister of Justice is in favour of the principle, I hope he will allow it to pass the second reading, refer it to a special committee if necessary, and by the strong arm of the law stamp out a class of frauds which is very prevalent.

Mr. BERGIN. I think this is a very valuable Bill, and will be productive of much good, but I agree with the last speaker that it should take a wider range and include other articles which are being sold in a most fraudulent way by which people are being robbed every day. I hope the Minister of Justice will allow this to go through this session.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that there might be some conflict of jurisdiction between this measure and the provincial laws in reference to contracts, but, if it were possible to frame a Bill which would not interfere with the provincial legislation, I think it would be very important that this Bill or some other provision of the kind should become law at an early date. It is patent to every member, especially from the rural districts of Ontario, that a certain class of individuals are going around every year victimizing the farmers and taking their hard earnings and giving little or nothing in return. If a law of this kind were put in force, I believe the passage of it would have a good effect. These people are careful not to go into towns and villages but to keep to the rural districts where they are not likely to be detected by those who understand the law better. I think there were thousands of dollars taken out of East Grey a few years ago for seed grain. One year it is seed grain, another year it is implements, and so on, but the fraud is carried on almost incessantly and the farmers are being victimized by unprincipled men. I think, if it were possible, this Bill should go further, and that manufacturers who sell agricultural implements should be prevented from taking a lien of such a character that prevents the farmer from disposing of any portion of his stock until that lien is disposed of. If the farmer sells a horse, if he has bought a mower or binder or reaper, the manufacturer has a lien, with such provisions that the note becomes due at once, though it may not be properly due for a year, and the purchaser of the horse may be sued at any time and the note collected from him. While it may be true that many manufacturers will not take advantage of this provision, I think it should not be left in their power to do so, and the notes which are given out at present by manufacturers to their agents for signature by the farmers are a disgrace to any civilized country. There is no reason why the manufacturer should have a lien on all the property of a farmer, when perhaps the value of his purchase may be only $14. I think the law should prevent the manufacturer from having the power to do that. I would not abrogate the section itself, but I would prevent manufacturers from taking a lien upon a man's property that would prevent him selling that property to advantage when necessary.

Mr. McMULLEN I desire to say a word upon this subject. Hon. gentlemen will remember that during the last Parliament one of the members from Hamilton (Mr. Brown) asked for a committee to enquire into frauds practised upon farmers. I happened to be a member of that committee, and the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), whom I do not see now in his place, was also a member of that committee. We took up something like six weeks in the investigation, and although we were aware in our individual experience of the frauds committed in the several sections of the Dominion from which we came, we were surprised to find how general they were in all sections of the country, and I am quite certain that the interest taken by Mr. Brown at that time in finding out the existence of those frauds led to the introduction of this Bill. I think it is fully time that we should have such a measure. I quite agree with the remarks dropped by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). There are enormous frauds practised in

the way in which notes are now taken by implement agents, the notes reciting that if the party parts with any portion of his property the note shall mature at once. I have known cases in which these have been used, and parties have almost ruined some men by suing on the notes, although they were not due for two or three years. I do not know whether we can reach anything of that kind in this House. I think there is an Act of the Ontario Legislature which would reach these parties, although I am not sure. However, I am quite in accord with the spirit of the Bill introduced by the hon. member, and I am exceedingly pleased to learn that the Minister of Justice is disposed to recognize its importance, and to give it his serious consideration, with the view of having it become law at the earliest possible date.

Mr. McMILLAN. The hon. gentleman has not alluded to another class of frauds that have been largely practised in the West—that is, the lightning rod frauds. A case came under my observation where a lightning rod agent came into a settlement and went to a farmer, and asked the privilege of putting lightning rods on his buildings without costing him anything, as the agent only wished to put up the rods for an advertisement. The farmer was simple and uneducated, and the agent got him to sign what he supposed was a paper allowing him to put a lightning rod on his barn without being guilty of trespass. But after the man had left the farmer's suspicions were aroused, and it turned out that he had signed an order for a lot of lightning rods, and given his note for them, and it almost ruined the man when he had to pay the note. I think this Bill is necessary in the interest of the agricultural community, and I hope the Minister of Justice will not throw any impediment in the way of its becoming law. It may be impossible to include in this Bill all classes of frauds practised upon farmers; but if a Bill was once passed and it was found to be ineffective, it could be amended so as to cover other classes of frauds.

Mr. CORBY. I agree with the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Burdett) that it is very important that this Bill should pass this session. The County of Hastings has been overrun for years with hay-fork agents, hulless oats agents, and seed-wheat men, and I hope the Government will take up this Bill and pass it this session.

Mr. BARRON. The House will probably remember that in the first and second session of the last Parliament this matter was brought up by way of resolution, and a committee was appointed, who went on and took evidence throughout the first session, and also, I think, during the next session. That evidence was printed in book form and distributed, and was very useful indeed. I think there was a consensus of opinion in that committee that it would be very difficult indeed to legislate so as to meet the variety of cases which came before the committee. There is no doubt whatever that a large portion of the community, throughout Ontario especially, are demanding legislation of the kind proposed by the hon. member for Hastings. It seems to me, however, that the criminal law, such as we have to-day, will reach nearly every case that has occurred.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. McMULLEN.

Mr. BARRON. Well, some hon. gentlemen say "no," but I think that if they will put the criminal law in force they will find that it will reach the majority of cases, at all events. That has been my experience, because I have had something to do in prosecuting men who have carried on these vicious practices. There is, however, this much to be gained by this legislation, that it aims at these practices which have been carried on, and it may frighten people who have been in the habit of carrying them on and prevent them from doing so in the future. However, if it is possible I hope that some such legislation as is proposed may be brought about, and perhaps my suggestion that the work of the committee during the first and second session of the last Parliament might be utilized will be adopted by the Minister of Justice. He might examine that evidence and take in the variety of cases that came before the committee, with a view of framing legislation that would cover them all.

Mr. MASSON. I quite agree with the principle of this Bill, and think it is very necessary that these frauds should be met in detail by special legislation. Many years ago we had a very extensive clause put in our Criminal Act, known as the omnibus clause, which was supposed to embrace all these kinds of frauds. The gentleman who has just spoken says that in many cases these frauds can be reached by that law, but my experience, not in prosecuting, but in defending, is that it is very hard to secure a conviction. In fact, grand juries throw out the bill. When the Crown closes the case judges dismiss the accused: when petit juries consider them they find them not guilty. These fraudulently-disposed persons display great ingenuity, and with a full knowledge of the statute as it stands to-day, they try in some way to evade the strict language of the statute. Even when this Act provides a penalty for selling these articles at a fictitious price or at a double price, they will evade it in some way by selling a little less than double price, and in that way, being at the same time assisted by grand juries and by petit juries, they will succeed in evading the penalties which they should incur. I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, and I think many of the points that have been spoken of should be embraced in it—not that I believe the placing of such an Act on the Statute-books would frighten or alarm those fraudulent persons and prevent them attempting to carry out their nefarious practices, but it would enable us, when they do so, to secure convictions.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) If the state of our society is that indicated, I fear very much that the passage of this Bill will not give any relief. If grand juries fail to find bills against such parties, if petit juries refuse to find them guilty, and that under the direct cognizance and with the consent of the judge, no Act that can be passed will relieve the evil. I am quite sure nearly every hon. gentleman is in favour of the object of the present Bill. Personally, I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barron) in the opinion, and I think it is one worthy of consideration, that the law as it stands enables you to reach any person who commits a fraud such as is contemplated by this Bill. The difficulty I have always found is, that the person committing the fraud leaves the country, and the note or other security signed by the farmer is left in the

hands of an innocent endorsee. The bill is sued on, and recovery cannot be prevented. There is no measure to punish a man who holds innocently a bill. If this proposed measure were adopted the obstacles and difficulties would be increased, because if grand and petit juries are disposed not to find these persons guilty—and I cannot see why their sympathies should be with the criminal or offender—you are, by defining the offence, as this Bill does, rendering the difficulties of conviction double what they are at present. I find some of the clauses very difficult to understand. For instance, a man must sell an instrument, and he must sell it at a "fictitious price." What is a "fictitious price?" How are you going to define it? The law does not define it. The hon. gentleman must not imagine I am raising captious objections. I am only looking at the Bill as a lawyer. I personally would like to assist in the passage of any Bill which would punish people engaged in these frauds, but I have been long enough in Parliament to know that hasty legislation does not always attain the desirable end which many hon. gentlemen have in view, and it is very desirable that this Bill should be very closely scrutinized and its language to a certain extent simplified.

Mr. COCHRANE. I desire to offer a remark from the farmer's standpoint. These frauds are being perpetrated throughout the country, and I am sorry to come to the conclusion that all the legal ability in this House appears unable to frame a statute that will cover these cases. It is strange that with all the legal ability here, and the knowledge that these frauds are being constantly perpetrated, this House is not able to cope with the evil. If lawyers cannot cope with it, let a committee of farmers be appointed and they will try to do so. We had the fact brought prominently before the House and country by a committee appointed to consider this question, and of which I happened to be a member, that these frauds were perpetrated to an alarming extent in the western part of Ontario, and my constituents suffered very largely from these frauds. Some people say that farmers are fools. They are not fools, but they allow these rascals to impose on their honesty. It is because the farmers are honest, and not fools, and because they expect that other people are as honest as themselves, that they permit these frauds to be perpetrated on them, and then find they are mistaken. I hope the House will try to frame a Bill to cover the case. It goes without saying that at present these rascals cannot be reached, but I trust the law will be so amended that they will be dealt with by its stern hand.

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. The hon. gentleman has too little faith, both in the power of lawyers to frame a suitable Bill, and, more than all, in the common law of the country, which is more to be relied on than is the ingenuity of any draughtsman. I agree with a great deal that has been said by hon. members. Any man who commits the offences enumerated is guilty of a felony or a misdemeanour, and can be indicted and punished; nevertheless, I do not oppose the passage of the Bill on that ground. I am convinced that sometimes offences of a peculiar nature crop up all over the country, and people do not realize that the law is strong enough to punish the offenders. It is supposed that some of these offences are not punishable by law, and sometimes advantage is gained by declaring what the law is. I hope the Bill will be read a second time, and to-morrow we can go into committee on it, after giving attention to the points mentioned by hon. gentlemen to-night.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 18th June, 1891.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DOMINION LANDS ACT.

Mr. DAVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to enable coulées, where water can be stored, to be guarded from contamination. The first clause provides that wherever, under this Act, lands entered either for homestead or pre-emption are sold or otherwise disposed of, and there is water on a coulée or ravine in said lands, or which may be utilized for the purpose of forming a reservoir for storing water, such entry or disposal may be made subject to the condition that no building shall be erected within a specified distance from the border of such coulée or ravine, the object being to provide water for the cattle and to keep it from being contaminated by outhouses or other buildings. The other clause provides for the repeal of section 43 of the Dominion Lands Act, and proposes to substitute one in its place, the only difference between the clause to be substituted by this Bill, and the clause in the Act of 1887, being that instead of 1887, 1889 is inserted. Should this clause be adopted, you will hear no more of second homesteads in this House. The next clause provides that where land has been homesteaded and five years have elapsed without the homesteader taking out his patent, his interest may be sold by the municipality, or the school board, for the taxes levied by the municipality or school section in which they are situated. At present, by not taking out a patent in time, the homesteader escapes the school tax, and, if in a municipality, the municipal tax, whereas those who have been energetic and have taken out patents have to bear the whole burden. There is a difficulty about this, but I fain would hope, if the Government approve of the clause, they will be able to overcome it. The difficulty is that we are trying to collect taxes in regard to land, the patent of which has not passed to the homesteader. The Government is still seized of the land, but these people if they have, say, forty or fifty acres and a house worth $500 or $600 on the one hundred and sixty acres, have clearly an interest there; and if we could so manage that the municipality or school board should be able to tax the interest, then the chances are that, instead of the homesteader holding back to avoid taxation he would, at the end of three years, take out his patent, or, at all events, as soon as he had fulfilled the conditions.