

ing of the St. Lawrence as safe as it can be possibly made. And as to the dry dock in Montreal, I have long been of the opinion that all governments had neglected their duty in not providing one at that port. What I wanted to point out, and what I think I did point out, from the utterances of those who spoke on the matter at the meeting, that instead of insurance by the St. Lawrence route being decreased, it was increased.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—I think you will find that refers to some very recent action.

Hon. Sir MACKENZIE BOWELL.—Perhaps so.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN.—The hon. gentleman said that he did not know exactly the figures. I heard this discussed very often, especially during the last election, and I heard the Minister of Marine and Fisheries make this statement. I heard him make it on the occasion of placing the last rivet on the sheds in Montreal, that the decrease in the rates in insurance was to such a large extent on the goods coming into Montreal and the goods going out from the harbour of Montreal as to make up an amount of \$922,000 a year. That is on the goods alone. The chairman of the harbour board, Mr. George Washington Stephens, read the figures to the meeting, and, moreover, he asserted that if he took into consideration the decreased insurance on the hulls of the ships, the amount would be equal to \$1,500,000 per annum on the goods and on the ships coming into and going out of Montreal.

Hon. Mr. FERGUSON—I do not intend to make any remarks upon this question, further than to say that I fear the right hon. leader of the House is like myself. His memory is not quite so good as it was, and I have come to this conclusion from a statement he made to the House that the contract with the Transcontinental contained provisions by which the Grand Trunk would forfeit the prairie section if they did not continue to operate the eastern division. I knew when my hon. friend made the statement that he was very wide of the mark. There is no such pro-

vision in the contract of 1903 or the contract of 1904, and I have refreshed my recollection by looking up the statutes. I find also by giving a glance at the discussion on the question, that in this House more particularly, and perhaps also in the other House, the opposition made a most strenuous point against the contract on the ground that there was no guarantee for the operation of the road. The only guarantee that was given was a deposit of \$5,000,000 which was liable to forfeiture if the company did not put on a certain amount of rolling stock upon the eastern division. But there is no provision in either of the contracts, the first one of 1903 or the modified one of 1904, for any such thing as a forfeiture of the prairie section of the road if the operation of the eastern division was not carried out. There was no guarantee of any kind given for the continued operation of the eastern division.

Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.—We will inquire further into that at a future time.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bill (A) an Act relating to the Water Carriage of Goods.—Hon. Mr. Campbell.

Bill (B) an Act to amend the Government Annuities Act.—Hon. Sir Richard Cartwright.

The Senate adjourned until three o'clock to-morrow.

THE SENATE.

OTTAWA, Thursday, January 28, 1909.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Prayers and routine proceedings.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE SENATE.

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—I propose to bring in resolutions for the consideration of this Chamber. In doing so I wish to state that I have not consulted the government nor any member of this Chamber, nor