

the Auditor General's Report would obviously not be of much importance, we might go on with those.

Hon. Mr. FIELDING. Each branch of the service has items of contingencies, and so each would be open to the same remark.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there nothing else we can take up?

Hon. Mr. FIELDING. Not so far as civil government is concerned, and that is all we expected to touch to-day. If the hon. gentleman would rather not go on, I have no objection to the committee rising. We have made good progress for the first day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am anxious to go on, but I do not want to deal with items as to which we may require information contained in the Auditor General's Report, which is not yet before us. I may say that my hon. friends on this side would like to see the Auditor General's Report with regard to this particular item, and perhaps we could not make much progress with regard to such items to-day.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 4.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 21, 1904.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ANTI-CIGARETTE LEGISLATION.

Mr. W. S. MACLAREN (Huntingdon) moved that on Tuesday next the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.

Motion allowed to stand.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. CHAMPAGNE moved:

That the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the official report of the debates of the House during the present session be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

THE MINT.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Clarke—asked:

1. Has a site for the mint been selected?
2. If so, what is the location?
3. Have tenders been asked for the erection of the building?
4. If not, why not?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (Minister of Public Works). The matter has not been finally settled.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. What is the date of the first appropriation for the Trent Valley canal?
2. What is the date of the actual commencement of the work?
3. What are the sums annually expended on the said canal?
4. What is the total estimated expenditure required to complete the work (a) via Port Hope; (b) via Trenton?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The date of the first appropriation by the Dominion of Canada for the Trent Valley canal was 1879-80.

2. The date of actual commencement of work by the Dominion government was the year 1880; portions of the canal had, however, been constructed before confederation.

3. The sums annually expended by the Dominion government on capital account were:

Year.	
1880..	\$ 561 50
1883..	40,767 16
1884..	120,393 91
1885..	121,382 84
1886..	75,103 30
1887..	179,541 63
1888..	114,879 35
1889..	47,592 13
1890..	58,644 50
1891..	9,826 49
1892..	4,457 28
1893..	5,962 47
1894..	3,412 32
1895..	53,907 70
1896..	392,976 08
1897..	486,575 70
1898..	351,273 31
1899..	166,611 49
1900..	334,583 01
1901..	284,503 89
1902..	449,075 45
1903..	523,950 74

4. The estimated cost, via Trenton, is \$6,960,000; the estimated cost, via Port Hope, \$6,850,000.

DRY DOCK SUBSIDY—PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Sproule—asked:

1. Has the government received any communication during the past two years with respect to creating or enlarging dry dock facilities on the Pacific coast?
2. When were such communications first received by the government?
3. Has the government promised a subsidy to any person or persons for the construction or enlargement of dry docks on the Pacific coast? If so, to whom has such promise been made; and if the promise has been made to a company or corporation, who are the persons interested in such company or corporation?
4. If a subsidy has been promised, what information has the government received with