

an opportunity of making his intended statement.

#### PRIVILEGE—LONG SAULT DAM.

Mr. J. D. REID. I rise to a question of privilege. I see in the Toronto 'Globe' of March 26 the following item:

The Montreal 'Star' can easily ascertain that the Long Sault dam scheme is not a party measure. Conservatives like Dr. Reid favour it, and the Conservative Brockville 'Times' is exceedingly severe on everybody who opposes it.

I am not now, never was, and never will be, in favour of any scheme that would place a dam across the St. Lawrence river at Long Sault Rapids, or any place on the St. Lawrence.

#### MIXING OF GRAIN.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the government, or of some member thereof, to a matter which concerns the people in the west very much. There has been more than a suspicion regarding it, but there has been nothing to confirm it so well as this article which appears in the 'Globe' of the 25th of March, in a statement telegraphed from Ottawa:

Mixing of the Grain—Serious charges against terminal elevator men—Government has been investigating shippers' complaints, and prosecutions may follow at the head of the lakes.

Ottawa, March 24.—There is trouble ahead for some of the terminal elevator men at Fort William and Port Arthur. There have been many complaints by shippers that at this point there have been mixing and manipulation of grain in transit, in violation of the statute, but to the advantage of the elevator men, though not so to the shippers of grain. There are severe penalties, both fine and imprisonment being provided by the Act. The Department of Trade and Commerce has been making investigations which are said to have resulted in disclosures which warrant further proceedings being taken. It is understood that some of the elevator men will be given an opportunity to establish their innocence or to submit to the penalties provided by the Act.

This is a serious charge. I believe this thing has been going on for a long time, and if any member of the government can give any information about it, I would be glad to hear it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only thing I can say at present is that I understand the Minister of Trade and Commerce is investigating the matter to which my hon. friend has referred.

189½

#### INDIAN ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 141) to amend the Indian Act.—Mr. Oliver.

On section 2—contracts affecting Indian moneys and securities to be approved by superintendent general.

Mr. SPROULE. That is practically the old law, is it not?

Mr. OLIVER. It expresses the intent of the old law, which has not been definitely expressed hitherto, and occasion has arisen for expressing in set terms exactly what the position is. I will read the section which this proposes to amend, namely section 87:

All moneys or securities of any kind applicable to the support or benefit of Indians, or any band of Indians, and all moneys accrued or hereafter to accrue from the sale of any Indian lands or the proceeds of any timber on any Indian lands, or a reserve shall, subject to the provisions of this part, be applicable to the same purposes, and be dealt with in the same manner as they might have been applied to or dealt with but for the passing of this part.

There is not a definite statement as to the position of the money that is considered desirable, and we wish to set down in black and white the exact position.

On section 3,

Mr. OLIVER. We wish to insert the following words in the section as it now stands:

And no annuities or interest on funds, and no moneys appropriated by parliament held for any band of Indians.

The section as it now stands reads as follows:

No presents given to Indians or non-treaty Indians, and no property purchased or acquired with or by means of any annuities granted to Indians, or any part thereof, and in the possession of any band of such Indians, or of any Indian or any band, or irregular band, shall be liable to be taken, seized or distrained for any debt, matter or cause whatsoever.

This protects the Indians in property purchased with the annuity money, but it does not protect the annuity money itself. We desire to put the annuity money itself in the same position as the statute now places the property that is purchased by it.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

#### BOUNTIES ON ZINC.

Bill (No. 182) respecting the payment of bounties on lead contained in lead-bearing