# ORIGINAL PAPERS WERE NOT RETURNED

**Department of Interior Was for Two Years Without Original Papers Which Had Been Supplied to Mr. Foster.**

In the debate a few days ago as to whether or not original documents in the custody of government departments may be demanded by members of parliament without reason assigned, the minister of the interior spoke in part as follows, (from Hansard):—

Hon. Frank Oliver (minister of the interior)—Mr. Speaker, I would like to take exception, in so far as the department of the interior is concerned at any rate, to the very definite statement made by the hoon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in the early part of his remarks that every endeavor was made to prevent the opposition from getting information. Since I have had the honor of having charge of the department of the interior, the members of the House will bear me out in saying—their remembrance will be the same as mine—that never in the history of parliament has there been such a demand for information from the department of the interior, or any other department of the government, and never has that demand been acceded to as fully and as readily and with as little question. My hon. friends on the other side of the House absolutely tied up the business of the interior department during the session before last until I had to place the facts before the House and put upon them the resonsibility for the fact that the business of the country could not be carried on through that department. I say that my hon. friend is not warranted in any degree in that statement in so far as the department of the interior is concerned, a fact that must necesarily have been within his knowledge from his long parliamentary experience. I repeat that never in the history of the country has there been a demand upon a single department for information such as had been made upon the department of the interior during this and the past two sessions, and never has the demand been acceded to as readily and as fully.

In regard to the matter in question, or which is stated by my hon. friend to be the matter in question, that is, the right of the hon. member for Montreal, St. Antoine, to inspect original documents on the files of the department, my hon. friend no doubt changed his point of view when he changed his seat in the House. I understand that the business appertaining to the department of the interior is placed under my control as a trust to be discharged in the interest of the people of the country, that while it is the right of parliament to have all information in connection with that department it is only the right of parliament to have that information, and it is my understanding of the trust placed upon me that it is not the right of any individual, whether he be a member of parliament or not, to have access to the documents in that department. As I understand the trust placed upon me, in discharging the business of the people—the people who are behind members of parliament and who send them here—it is that documents placed in that department, the property of the people, or representing the property of the people, shall be duly and properly cared for. If parliament sees fit to issue an order parliament is supreme. Parliament can turn the department of the interior inside out if it pleases, but it is not the privilege of an individual of parliament to do so, I submit. If I am instructed to the contrary, well and good, I will accept the instruction, but in so far as I understand my duties and responsibilities, they are to carefully guard and care for every paper and every interest that is in that department. My duty and responsibility is to carefully guard and care for every paper and every interest that is in that department, and the fact that a certain gentleman has been honored with a seat in this parliament does not give him any more right to investigate the private business of other people which is in charge of the department of the interior, than it does any other citizen.

Mr. Lake—If this resolution is passed by the House, does the minister still intend to refuse to members of parliament the privilege of looking at the files in this department.

Mr. Oliver—Unless otherwise instructed by the House I certainly do. I do not accept this resolution as instruction on that point. If the House so instructs me then the responsibility is taken off my shoulders and I care not. But so long as the responsibility rests on my shoulders I feel bound to discharge that responsibility according to my conscience.

Mr. Bristol—I would ask the minister if it has not been customary in his department for a long time past, to allow members of parliament to examine original documents, just as Mr. Ames said he was allowed to examine the Galway-Brown papers?

Mr. Oliver—Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Bristol—Was it done without your knowledge in the department? When did you first learn that your officers had been accustomed to show original documents in that way?

Mr. Oliver—I never learned they were accustomed to show original documents in that way. If they have been accustomed to do, as I will take occasion to show, it was contrary to my orders and contrary to the orders given before I entered the department.

* * *

Mr. J. D. Reid—Did not the minister invite members from this side of the House to go over to his department last session and the session before, to inspect original documents?

Mr. Oliver—Certainly not. But in the case mentioned by the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) there was a question raised before the House to the correctness of a return and in order to facilitate business, in order to assist in clearing up any doubt or question there might be in that direction, permission was given to the member to look over the originals.

Mr. J. D. Reid—That was in your department.

Mr. Oliver—Yes as a matter of courtesy and for the purpose of facilitating the business.

Mr. J. D. Reid—That is the very point we are raising now.

Mr. Oliver—Precisely, but that was an exception and not as a rule.

Mr. Foster—Any more exceptions besides that?

Mr. Oliver—There may have been other exceptions but I will take occasion to show that they were exceptions and not the rule. I think my hon. friend will agree, before I am through, that it would be a very improper rule. Let us understand what is the nature of the documents that are in charge of the department of the interior and which are particularly the object of the curiosity of my hon. friends opposite. They are transactions between the government as representing the whole people, and individual citizens. They are transactions which if they are not completed then those papers should not be put in jeopardy by being released from the responsibility of the department. My hon. friend knows that transactions in regard to timber limits are never closed; that the license is renewed from year to year; and that at any time a question may be raised as to the right of any person who holds that license and that the only evidence there is as to the right is the document upon file in the department of the interior. It is not a matter of interest particularly to the government whether these files are here or there, but it is a matter of very definite interest to the people whose title to their property rests upon these files. It is in the discharge of the duty of the department to these people that I say I do not think it is advisable either that the files should be released from the custody of the department or should be available to any person who may choose to inspect them. But, my hon. friend may say that a member of parliament, not only has the standing of being a member of parliament but that his position as a member of parliament places him so that he only looks over these files as a matter of public interest. Unfortunately, members of parliament represent individuals—individual voters and people having individual interests—and there is nothing to hindder any individual who wants to acquaint himself of the business of another individual asking a member of parliament to go into the department and discover for him information that he wants, information in regard to the personal interests of that other individual, using the member as a medium for acquiring information. Now, I think my hon. friends will agree that it is not proper that the business of a department should be so conducted as to permit that. The files are there and copies of them have never been refused the House, so that all the public interest in connection with the transaction can be decided by the House and so that every member of the House has an equal opportunity to inform himself in regard to the business upon these files. But if these files are to be kept in the department subject to the inspection of individual members of the House at pleasure, one member informs himself and the rest of the House which is equally entitled is not informed, and the hon. gentleman who informs himself, whether for his own benefit or for the benefit of private individuals for whom he is acting or for the purpose of discussion in the House, is placed at an absolutely unfair advantage as against other private individuals or against other members of the House. What I say in regard to timber limits applies to other transactions dealing with the public resources of the country. We are not asking for secrecy because of transactions in which the government or its friends are improperly interested; we are not asking for secrecy because, as the leader of the House has pointed. If any member of the House will give a public reason for the production of these documents all risks will be taken and they will be produced.

What I said to the hon. member (Mr. Ames) was that I did not wish him to examine the documents in the department because I did not want to allow anybody to do so and I did not wish to make an exception in this case. I said that if he wanted to get the documents the proper course was to get a resolution of the House and then the responsibiltiy was lifted from my shoulders.

What I said in the House was that if my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) would show cause, would give a public reason for the production of these documents I for one would certainly agree to produce them and he would undoubtedly and unquestionably have a right to them. He would unquestionably have a right to them. But he did not give any public reason. In all the reasoning my hon. friend from North Toronto read in the report of the speech made by the hon. member for St. Antoine, no reason was given except the reason of curiosity.

Some hon. members—Oh, oh.

Mr. Oliver—Well, will my hon. friends say what reason was given? Was it because the documents before the House were not copies of the originals? Did he say that he believed they were not? He did not say that? Did he say that the originals were forgeries? Did he give any reason except that of curiosity for the production of those documents?

* * *

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to draw attention to just one or two points in this connection. My hon. friend from North Toronto said that there was not any danger of any documents being mislaid. I have made some inquiry in this connection.

Mr. Foster—My hon. friend, I think, misunderstands me. I could not have stated that there was no danger of any documents being mislaid. That would be a general assertion which no man of any common sense would make, surely. But I did say that even though there was a danger of their being mislaid, that was not sufficient reason for their being denied.

Mr. Oliver—I accept the hon. gentleman's statement; possibly I was wrong. What I would like to say is that there is a possibility of documents being mislaid, and it is fair for the House and fair for the country that the responsibility for those documents should not be divided—that there should be no responsibility for them outside of the department. I think everybody will agree that that is in the public interest in the transaction of public business.

Mr. Foster—Suppose I ask my hon. friend a question. Suppose the crown has a suit and certain papers of the department are absolutely necessary to that suit being carried to a conclusion. Suppose the crown's lawyer says, I want those papers to take to my office and have them thoroughly looked over, and I want them taken to court. Will my hon. friend go so far as to say that the moment he delivers them over, his responsibility ceases? Surely not.

Mr. Oliver—His responsibility remains, because he allows them to go out of his hands; but if the House orders those papers to be brought down to the House, then surely the responsibility of the department ceases.

Mr. Foster—I do not think so.

Mr. Oliver—Surely the responsibility is then on the House.

Mr. Foster—I think the minister must follow them.

**Documents Not Returned.**

Mr. Oliver—Should a paper be mislaid, the proof of the fact could not then be made. If the department were anxious to shuffle off responsibility, it would be glad to have original papers brought to the House, and have the responsibility placed on other shoulders. Let me draw the attention of the House to a fact which occurred during the session of 1906. An order was issued for a return, on a motion of the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, for papers relating to timber berths Nos. 1158, 1175, 1192, 1219, 1231 and 1232, including the original tenders and copies of all other papers. The return was prepared in the usual way, that is, by having copies made of all the papers, and the return was sent down to the House of Commons in this form. The hon. Mr. Foster raised the objection that the original tenders should have been included in the return. On his request the original tenders were therefore produced, and have not since been returned to the department. The department has not now the original tenders in these cases, but only copies thereof.

My hon. friend took the responsibility upon the House to take the responsibility for those papers. It is no concern of ours where they are. They were taken out of our custody, and the parties who were the owners of those timber limits are short to that extent of their tiles to the timber limits.

* * *

These documents were called for on the responsibiliay of this House and, on the demand of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), they were taken out of the custody of my department. I presume they are in the custody of the House, but they cannot be a part of the record of the House and a part of the record of my department at the same time. Parliament, of course, is supreme. If parliament decides that these papers must become a part of its records, that decision must be complied with. It is not my business to find fault with the decision of parliament. I assume that my hon. friend has good reasons for his demand. Is he now going to persuade the House to the contrary by informing us that he had no reasons when he moved for the original documents, that he knew nothing about the transaction, and that he actually tampered with property belonging to these people without cause of provocation? That is a fair statement of a simple question, and I must say that, charged with the responsibility of administering the department of the interior, I cannot conceive, except subject to the dictation and authority of the House, that this is a proper discharge of the responsibility placed upon the departmemn.

The incident I have mentioned occurred in the session of 1906. In the session of 1907, on the occasion of a discussion regarding grazing leases, my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) was allowed, at his request, to go over the department of the interior and inspect the original documents in that particular case, but that permission was granted as an exception and not as a rule, as I will have occasion to show a little later on. What happened this session? On the opening of this session, there were placed upon the order paper notices by the hon. member for Algoma West (Mr. Boyce) asking for original applications and tenders with regard to four timber berths; by the same hon. member for original applications and tenders regarding five timber berths; by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) for similar papers regarding four timber berths; by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) regarding five timber berths, and by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division (Mr. Ames) regarding three timber berths. Thus, at the very beginning of the session we had demands made for the original applications and tenders with regard to twenty-one timber berths, so that the instance which I have already alleged as occurring in the session of 1906, at the request of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was to be repeated in twenty-one cases at the very begining of this session. I submit, if I have any responsibility at all for a proper discharge of the work of the department of the interior, that it is desirable that the question should be brought to an issue, and that we should know whether the responsibility placed in our hands with regard to private individuals, transacing their private business, shall be dealt with in this way or not. I submit to the judgment of the House whether or not I was justified in asking that the motions be changed so that the originals should not be called for, and the hon. gentlemen acceded to my request.

* * *

We all agree that the hon. gentleman was not dishonest, but he was absolutely regardless of the private rights concerned in these particular interests.

Mr. Foster—I must enter my caveat against that.

Mr. Oliver—I wish to repeat that the House granted the motion of my hon. friend that these documents should become a part of the record of the House. Well, they cannot be a part of the record of the House and at the same time be a part of the record of the department of the interior, and until they are released from the custody of the House they are not at my disposal, even if I be the autocrat my hon. friend suggests I am.

Mr. Foster—If you wanted them badly you could get them.

Mr. Oliver—I certainly would not expect to get them out of the custody of the officers of this House, in whose hands they were placed by the order of the House. It has been suggested to me that if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) had taken the interest he ought in these matters, which he apparently did not, when he had satisfied himself regarding the documents, he would have asked for a resolution of the House to return the papers to the department.

* * *

I might mention also that if there were a fair amount of give and take as between members on the other side and the government departments, that would greatly facilitate business. Let me bring before the House the instance of the documents relating to the North Atlantic Trading company, which were produced before the committee of agriculture and public accounts in the session of 1905. These documents, which are not of course private matters in the same sense as documents regarding timber births, and which were documents perfectly proper to be brought before a committee of the House for investigation, were furnished to the committee on the 4th April and they were returned on the 23rd July. I submit that, speaking for the department interested in those papers, that was not a fair or reasonable way of transacting public business and was not giving that department a fair opportunity to transact public business. I think it was an arbitrary exercise of the authority of the two committees to retain the documents for that length of time. So far from the department of the interior in any of its branches having attempted to conceal anything or prevent the House from getting information, I have placed these instances before the House to show that the department of the interior has been seriously hampered in the transaction of the public business at the instance of members on the other side of the House without cause or reason.

Now, with regard to the precedent in connection with examining original documents in the department: I have already pointed out why it is not fair, it is not reasonable, it is not desirable that there should be a general right, on the part even of members of parliament, to go into the department and demand an examination of these documents. It is not fair to the people whose business is contained in these papers. It does not matter whether it is fair or not to the department or its officers—that is not the question. But it is not fair to he people whose business is carried on the files of that department. As to the rule in that matter, I notice that on June 16th, 1905, a memorandum was adddressed to the chief clerks and heads of branches of the department of the interior, as follows:—

It is requested that, in future, no papers or documents attached to the official files of the department are to be shown to any person or persons outside of the department without a direct order from the deputy minister.

Be good enough to note the above and instruct the officials of your branch accordingly.

By order,
(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES,
Secretary.

I note further a memorandum dated October 14, 1904, which was before I took office, addressed to the chief clerks and heads of branches of the department of the interior:—

Attention has been called to the fact that copies of departmental orders in council, and other important documents have been given to outside people without the knowledge or approval of the head of the department. As the minister of the interior is the custodian of the records of the department, and he alone has the power to authorize the giving out of any information contained in departmental papers, no such information should be furnished to any one without his consent. Even when an official of the department is summoned by subpoena of the court to produce departmental documents, such documents should not be produced or any information given without the knowledge of the head of the department.

The officials of the department are asked to remember that its records must be regarded as confidential, and that no one has any right to disclose to outside inquirers the contents of any files or public documents of the department. Such information can only be given out through the proper channels.

I am to request that you will be good enough to impress the importance of this matter upon the officials of your branch.

(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES,
Secretary.

I notice this memorandum also dated May 7th, 1898:—

With reference to persons coming into the department and examining papers, it is to be understood that only those files with which they have to do directly and for which they have authority to make an examination are to be shown to such persons. This rule applies to every person coming into the department to examine documents.

(Sgd.) JAMES A. SMART,
Deputy Minister.

That is to say, the man whose business is shown upon a certain file may examine the file in regard to his own business or his authorized agent may do so, but no other person should be allowed to examine that file with regard to that man's business. This was addressed to the chief clerk of the patents branch, and also to the chief clerk of the registration branch.

Here is another memorandum from Calgary, dated December 4th, 1897, which throws some light on the subject, showing that this was not a new autocratic ruling on my part, but simply carrying out the thoroughly understood principle of the department and insisting that it should be acted upon:—

Office of the Superintendent of Mines,
Calgary, Alberta, Dec. 4. 1897.

Sir,—On reaching my office on the 3rd instant I was served with a subpoena by the counsel for the defence in the case of the Queen vs. Arthur Collyns and Romain Gervais, and the subpoena ordered me to produce all the papers in my possession regarding the entry to the west half of 34-16-1 west of the 5th meridian. There has been, as you are aware, considerable correspondence over the entry of Romain Gervais to the southwest quarter of said section. I collected all the papers in my possession regarding this matter and appeared in court. When I was called upon to produce them I protested against doing so unless ordered by the court. At first the judge was inclined not to insist on their production, but afterwards he decided that I must produce them. I had a discussion with the judge over the principle at issue, that is whether any official of the department could be compelled to produce documents out of his office unless under the authorization of his minister. Had I considered that in the case at issue there was anything in the public interest that should not be divulged I should probably have refused point blank to produce the papers even had the judge ordered me to do so but as there was nothing in them which was detrimental to the public interest in the slightest degree, of course I saw no reason to refuse or demur to the order of the judge. However, I would desire instructions in this case. When I appeared in court the counsel for the defence asked me to hand him the papers This I refused. I told him that if he desired to see the papers that he had plenty of time to have written to the department to ask for authority that I should show them to him and obtain, if he desired, certified copies of any document he might require. Would you therefore kindly instruct me what is to be done in cases like this. It might be well that a general circular be issued to all officers of the department giving the necessary instructions on the point raised in this.

Your obedient servant,
WILLIAM PEARCE,
Agent.

The Secretary,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Mr. Pearce had been an officer of the department for many years at a time when the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was a member of the administration, and this letter of Mr. Pearce was written a year after this government acceded to power.

**What Former Government Did.**

I have a circular dated 11th May, 1892, which reads as follows:—

It has been brought to the attention of the minister of justice that, in some istances, persons having claims against the government, either in preparation or in suit have been allowed personally, or through their solicitors, to have access to departmental records connected with the claim or to inspect departmental files for the purpose of obtaining therefrom desired information and that such a course has been found to be prejudicial to the government's interests.

The minister of justice is of opinion that no inspection of files or records for the purpose above mentioned should be allowed unless under the advice and direction of this department and he desires me to request that in future any such application should be referred to this department.

You will understand, of course, that the present letter is not written for the purpose of making any charge or conveying any blame in respect of past matters, but simply with a view of safeguarding the interests of the government in respect of claims, present or prospective.

I have the honor to be sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) ROBERT SEDGEWICK,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

The Deputy Minister,
Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

And that was followed by the following:—

Ottawa, July 14, 1892.

Sir,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 28th ultimo, and inclosures, and in reply and to state that the interpretation placed upon my recent circular on the subject of the production of departmental files for examination by outsiders is not correct. The suggestions of that circular were not intended to apply only to such papers as might be made the foundation of a claim for damages or other monetary considerations but generally to all files of correspondence and other papers. So far as your department is a registry office, any one desiring to do so ought to be permitted to see instruments affecting title, but departmental correspondence and documents dealing therewith should not be shown except, perhaps, in special cases.

I have the honor to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ROBERT SEDGEWICK,
Deputy Minister of Justice.

My hon. friend from North Toronto has entertained this House for a considerable time tonight, and I have no doubt his voice will be heard throughout the country denouncing me personally for having, as an autocrat, introduced an arbitrary rule into the administration of my department which, on the evidence of the records, was a rule which, if not made by him, was a standing rule and a confirmed rule when my hon. friend was a member of the government of Canada; a rule which, on the evidence of those documents, has been continued ever since, and which I leave to the judgment of this House is a reasonable and proper rule, and necessary for the proper safeguarding of public business. I want to draw this distinction between the position as it has been taken by myself and the position taken when my hon. friend was a member of the government. The first of the circulars I have read intimates that information is to be denied for fear the information will be acquired that may be used as an attack upon the government.

For the purpose of obtaining therefrom desired information, and that such a course has been found prejudicial to the government interest.

Now, I want to point out that this case brought before the House by my hon. friend from Montreal, and emphasized so strongly, and I think so unfairly tonight, was not a case of protecting the government against the people, but it was a case of protecting the people whose business was in charge of the government. We do not ask for any advantage in protecting the government; but we do say that if we are to be held responsible for the safeguarding of documents which are necessary to the title of the people's property, we be permitted a fair and reasonable opportunity so to safeguard them. So far as the government are concerned, the right hon. leader of the House has said on a previous occasion, and said again tonight, that private interests will have to take second place, and that if any member will give a reason, a public reason why these original documents should be placed before the house, they will be placed before the House without the slightest hesitation. We are in the position of undertaking to safeguard the interests of the people, and all we ask is that when our friends opposite have an argument to make, they substitute statements for insinuations and responsibility for innuendos.

# LONDON IS FOGBOUND BIG DAMAGE RESULTS

**Burglars Find Conditions Favor Energetic Application to Work—Havoc in Street Traffic—Shops Suffer Loss By Diminution of Business.**

London, Jan. 31.—London never appreciated its splendid system of underground electric trains so much as it has this week, for the fog cannot penetrate there, so excellently ventilated are the tubes, and in such weather it is the only safe and comfortable way to travel.

In a season which have been remarkable for the suddenness and variety of its meteorological changes the experiences of this week have been phenomenal. Last week we were enjoying a general warmth which breathed of early spring and actually made the trees begin to bud and to shoot until there came an icy blast of winter. Now with higher, though not very high, temperature, we have got into a fratum of fog which is working havoc in all directions.

**Burglars Make Hauls.**

Such a visitation has always been hailed with rapture by burglars, and jewellers in particular have to take extra precautions to protect their windows against these members of society.

Notwithstanding this, some of them have made a few good hauls. The dramatic Academy on King street, Covent Garden, was entered, and because very little money had been left for the thieves to take away, they smashed all the furniture and left the place a wreck.

The robberies of jewellers' shops are most daring. The thieves watch their opportunity and then smash in the windows, grab all the jewels they can and disappear in the fog.

The fog has disorganized street traffic and robbed the West End shops of their customers, one firm alone complaining of a loss of $3,000 each day the fog has lasted. It has suspended the workings of the ferries on the upper part of the river, delayed the crossing of the mail boats in both the channel and North Sea, and allowed a tank steamer to break from its moorings and go smashing into a number of tugs and other smaller vessels at anchor. It has also caused collisions on the railways, without any loss of life, though in one case, at Wimbledon, seventeen people were more or less injured.

**Life Guards Lost in Fog.**

The First Life Guards, who went to Hampstead Heath to carry out a series of reconnoitering duties, had to give it up. Some of them got lost, and it was not for several hours later that they were discovered by scouts. This is a pretty considerable record for one fog to accomplish, and there is a richness and variety about its exploits which give it quite a special prominence and importance of its own, and no doubt the tale is not yet ended.

There will probably be plenty more to come. It seems to be European in extent. The North Sea, the lower part of the Baltic and the English channel are all covered by it. It appears to be particularly dense on the east coast of England and the coasts of Holland and Belgium. It was estimated yesterday that the fog covered 600,000 square miles of Europe.

**New Custodian of Jewels.**

London, Feb. 1.—It is said that as a result of the vice-regal commission of inquiry into the mysterious disappearance of crown jewels from Dublin Castle last July, Mr. Birrell, secretary for Ireland, ordered that Sir Arthur Edward Vicars, custodian of the jewels, be superseded. It is said that Captain Neville Williamson has been appointed his successor. The report of the commission declares Sir Arthur Vicars did not exercise due vigilance and proper care.

I wish that I might talk with all sick ones about the actual cause of Stomach, Heart and Kidney ailments. To explain in person how weak Stomach nerves leads to Stomach weakness, I am sure would interest all. And it is the same with weak Hearts or weak Kidneys. This is why my prescription—Dr. Shoop's Restorative — so promptly reaches ailments of the Stomach, Heart and Kidneys. It is wrong to drug the stomach or stimulate the Heart or Kidneys. These weak inside nerves simply need more strength. My Restorativ is the only prescription made expressly for these nerves. Next to seeing you personally, will be to mail you free, my new booklet entitled, "What To Do." I will also send samples of my restorative as well. Write for the book to-day. It will surely interest you. Address Dr. Shoop, Box 8, Racine, Wis.

ALL DEALERS.

# WHYTE ADVOCATES ONE MAN STALL BARS

**General Manager of C. P. R., One of Temperance Delegation Before the Manitoba Cabinet, Advises Two Scheme as Method to Eradicate Treating Evil.**

Winnipeg, Jan. 31—An influential delegation, representing eight thousand signatures, waited on Hon. Robt. Rogers and Hon. C. Campbell today to ask for the closing of all bars at 6 p.m. Among those present were Wm. Whyte, general manager of the C. P. R.; Mayor Ashdown, and Rev. Father Cherrier, representing the Archbishop of St. Boniface; Principal Sparling, Rev. J. L. Gordon, W .W. Buchanan and others interested in the liquor reform. Some notable opinions were advanced, significant of which was the statement of Second Vice-President Whyte, of the C. P. R., that he believed the majority of railway accidents were due to the liquor curse. He went on to vigorously attack the treating habit, and advocated bars in which each thirsty sould would be compelled to imbibe in a one-man stall.

In replying Hon. Rogers produced statistics to show that the government had gone to the limit in the suppression and limitation of licenses as compared with other provinces. He believed the fault was not with the licensed victuallers of Winnipeg, but with the "blind pigs" which had sprung up all over the city and where inferior liquor could be sold day and night. These blind pigs were the direct result of the action of the police and citizens in breaking up segregated quarters, and if a six o'clock law was put in force it would lead to a greater extension of these points. He quoted figures to show that the majority, by far, of cases under liquor laws were against unlicensed victuallers.

Hon. Colin Campbell presented a serious indictment against the city authorities and the police of Winnipeg, saying that all laws were rigorously enforced but the liquor laws, to which Mayor Ashdown gave a vigorous negative. The minister thought it would be beter to abolish all bars.

Hon. Robert Rogers said the government was bringing down a bill to double all fines.

## P. E. I. NEW PREMIER.

**Is F. L. Haszard Formerly Law Partner of Judge Davies.**

Charlottetown, P.E.I., Jan. 31.—F. L. Haszard, has been appointed premier in succession to the late Hon. Mr. Peters. The new premier was born near Charlottetown in 1849. He was admitted to the bar in 1872, and was first a partner with the late Hon. John Longworth. He later practised independently. From 1890 to 1891 he was a partner with L. P. Davies, now Sir Louis Davies, judge of the supreme court. Mr. Haszard was stipendiary magistrate for Charlottetown from 1892 to 1900; first elected to Legislature in 1904 for the fourth district Queen's; became member of the executive without portfolio on the reorganization of the government. He is deeply interested in agriculture, and since 1897 has been president of the Charlottetown Driving Park and Exhibition Association.

**Trumper Arrives in Kamloops.**

Kamloops, Jan. 31—F. J. Trumper, arrested for the murder of George Coleman at Pouce Coupe prairies, arrived here today. Witnesses must be brought from the scene. This will take a couple of months. The prisoner admits killing, but pleaded not guilty, alleging it was in self defence. The charge is likely to be reduced to manslaughter.

**Japan Considering Change.**

Tokio, Jan. 31.—Promoters of the movement for the abolition of the ideograph and the substitution of Roman letters in the written and printed language of Japan are enlisting the aid of many persons prominent in literature and business.

*Accidents will Happen.*

But if you are prepared for them beforehand, they are soon mended. **Bruises, Wrenches, Neuralgia, Sciatica and Strains** yield instantly to

*Hirst's Pain Exterminator*

Always have a bottle with you. 25c. at all dealers.

Try **Hirst's Little Liver Pills.** A perfect after-dinner pill. Will assist digestion. Ask your dealer or send us 25c. A handsome souvenir card free.

THE F. F. DALLEY CO., Limited
Hamilton, Ont. 163