Lamenting Quartette On Penitent Bench

Foster, Fowler, Bennett and Lefurgey of the Notorious Western Land Deal did Stunts in the Federal House in a Effort to Defect Criticism From Themselves---The Minister of the Interior Presents a Comprehensive Refutation to the Charge Against the Department Made By Mr. Herron, of Alberta.

Ottawa, Feb. 27—The Foster, Fowler, Bennett, Lefurgey Quartette were on the penitent bench yesterday, though like many a band of truant youngsters their lamentations were less because they had sinned than because they had been punished.

Bourassa Did It.

Henri Bourassa, it was who brought them to this repentant frame of mind. Mr. Bourassa had had the privilege of not being present on Tuesday afternoon, but he understood that in his absence the dignity of the House had been lowered and he wanted it forthwith restored and said so.

This paved the way for either direct charges backing up the allegations which had been made or for retraction of the language which was considered to embody such allegations. Instead of this, however, the opportunity was taken by the Opposition gentlemen cited for our afternoon of pathetic pleading that the venomous Grit had been "alludin'" to their private affairs during the course of the session, and that the remarks of Mr. Fowler on Tuesday were the outcome of such allusions.

Bennett Starts Apologies.

Mr. Bennett of East Simcoe began the apologies. He gave a somewhat inexplicit version of the celebrated Opposition pilgrimage through the West in 1902 when in company with the other gentlemen already publicly reported to have been associated with him he became interested in a large amount of Western lands. This, he considered by no means an unjustifiable thing and tersely expressed his views by saying, "I think I had a perfect right to buy a dollar's "worth of land as well as anybody else." Even in his apology, however, Mr. Bennett could not recollect the bounds of civility and his speech was punctuated with corrections from the chair. The conventionalities of civilised debate fit badly with the disposition of the member from East Simcoe.

Foster Disturbed.

Hon. Geo. E. Foster, of North Toronto, in contributing his share of the general confession appeared to be very much exercised because the public had drawn from the evidence produced at the Insurance Commission the opinion that Mr. Foster's course in the Western lands transaction had not been such as to enhance his qualifications as a member of the House. The press had even been guilty of suggesting that some taings were cleared up by a word or so of explanation. He expressed the hope, however, that the members would distinguish clearly between what was the private business of a member and that which interfered, or might interfere, with his representative capacity. He illustrated this by saying that if he kept a grocery store and gave his customers light weight, that that was a matter between the customers, himself, and the laws of his country and not a subject with which Parliament would have any right to deal,—presumably, regardless of the circumstance that the grocer was a member of Parliament.

Only Half Sorry.

Mr. Fowler adopted somewhat different tactics than his friends and though he informed the House that the language he had used on Tuesday was the language of anger, he still made it quite apparent that he stood ready to make such language the normal tone and character of Parliamentary discussion, and, that so far as lay within his power to do so, he would devote himself to this purpose, providing his private dealings were discussed in Parliament. His confession consisted of the somewhat suggestive and unconvincing query:—

"Do you Mr. Speaker; do honourable gentlemen and the people of "this country imagine that I am the "only individual in the House, among the 215 or 217 members against whom "things can be said in connection with "their private business?"

Caught in Their Own Trap.

The contentions of honourable members that their private affairs were not matters of discussion in the House would be quite in order in ordinary circumstances and would have been at once admitted without argument or the necessity of proof. But the gentlemen who now claim that their private affairs are not the business of the public are the same gentlemen and political associates of the same gentlemen who have to the two sessions of all Parliament, under the pretext of discussing the administration of Western lands, pursued the policy of repeated, persistent and malicious onslaughts on the conduct of members of Parliament exercising their private rights as citizens of the country to do business in the country and with the Government of the country. And have likewise held up to ridicule and scorn private citizens of this country who owe to the country no responsibility in a representative capacity.

During these two sessions of Parliament time after time a coterie of Opposition members headed by Mr. Ames, of Montreal, have under a pretext of condemning and censuring the Government, devoted themselves for days at a time to attempts to give public currency to the notion that the private transactions of certain of their fellow members were such as to detract from their standing as public men, and have devoted themselves equally energetically to an attempt to make political capital at the expense of berating and belittling the characters of private citizens.

Ignoring the Issue.

A fortnight ago these, the Opposition, distinguished themselves by an attack ostensibly on the Government for the Robbins' irrigation contract—but really upon the individuals who had become interested in that project. The House was invited on that occasion to look with ridicule upon one member of the company because he had at one time kept a livery stable. They were invited to remember, as though it had relevancy to the case, that another gentleman had been a clerk in a butcher shop, that another was a private banker, and that another was an English gentleman. What earthly connection the previous occupations of these gentlemen had or could have had with the merits or demerits of the grant-ing of the contract was not disclosed and the only possible assumption is that their assailants hoped to make political capital for themselves at the expense of the reputation of their victims.

The whole tenor and substance of these repeated attacks has been to make the people of Canada believe that a member of Parliament is and ought to be derived of the ordinary opportunities and liberties of citizenship; that the member who does not regard himself as ostracized in this manner is recreant to his public duty; and further that the citizen who dares do business with the Government is of necessity a culprit and worthy of all condemnation.

Now the honourable gentlemen are fearful lest the public should draw from their own private transactions the conviction that they have in some degree lost their representative usefulness or their public reliability and when the danger became apparent we find the honourable gentlemen opposite raising their voices in solemn protest that the private transactions of a member have nothing to do with his representative capacity.

Judged by Their Own Standard.

The trouble of the gentlemen appears to be that in the language of the Scripture, "The Fowler has fallen into his own snare." If the people of Canada are taking an interest in the private affairs of the honourable gentlemen whose doings were investigated by the Insurance Commission, it is because those gentlemen and their associates have taught the people of Canada that members of Parliament can have no business which is not public business. And when they occupy the time of Parliament registering their protests against their private affairs being made the subject of Parliamentary allusion or of public discussion they are merely protesting that they do not want to be tried by the standard which they themselves have set up for others.

As if to emphasise the difference between the standard which the gentlemen opposite wished applied to themselves, and that which they wish to apply to others, their wails for mercy yesterday ceased only in time to allow Mr. John Herron of Alberta to elevate the usual signal for the onslaught on the private characters of their political opponents. While Mr. Herron occupied the honourable position of flag carrier the distinction of leading the assault belonged as usual to Mr. Ames, the member for St. Antoine division, Montreal. How protracted residence in the metropolis of Eastern Canada could be supposed to engender special qualifications for shaping the policy of a political party on the questions of Western development remains as yet a mystery. But however this may be, the fact remains that Mr. Ames has been selected as the acknowledged chief of that band of political Indians who trust to redeem the misfortunes of their party by onslaughts upon personal character of gentlemen of differing views both in and out of Parliament. And fitness of the leader for the task need not be called in question,—under the manners of a gentleman he carries the methods peculiarly adaptible to this savage species of hostilities.

The resolution introduced by Mr. Herron concerned a lease granted to the Galway Horse and Cattle company and curiously enough asked the House not only to condemn the Government for having given the lease to the Galway Horse and Cattle company but also to condemn the Government for what the Galway Horse and Cattle company had done with the lease after securing it. The attack made under cover of this remarkable revolution resolved itself into two sections; the one being made on the Government for the granting of the lease, the other on the member for Humboldt, because after getting the lease the company had seen fit to sell it.

Whatever else was needed to demonstrate the inconsistency of the Opposition was furnished by the fact that while the afternoon was occupied in pleading that the private affairs of Opposition gentlemen should not be made the standard by which their public services should be judged, the evening of the same day was occupied in belittling and besmirching the private character of two of their political opponents, the only conceivable purpose of which was to detract from their standing as public men.

THE MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

During the debate Hon. Frank Oliver, the Minister of the Interior, spoke as follows:

"The resolution before the House is divided into two parts, if I remember it correctly, the first condemning the action of the Department of the Interior, in the granting of the lease, and the other condemning, I presume, the grantee for having disposed of the lease. The one is an attack upon the department and the other an attack upon a member of this House. It is my concern, at the moment, to deal with the question as it relates to the department. I was very much interested in the presentation of the case made by the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) in which he depicted to the House the happy conditions in connection with the ranching business generally which prevailed in the Northwest under the administration of the late government. One would suppose, from his telling of the story, that all the trouble began with the accession to power of a Grit government and that up to that time there had been a well-defined, continuous and successful policy, and that that policy had no relation whatever to closed leases. Now, investigation of the matter in the Department as well as my knowledge of the facts from residence in the country runs something like this: The first regulations in regard to grazing leases were passed on December 23, 1881. And, in this connection let me just say that when hon. members on the other side complain, as they have frequently complained, of the tendency of this government to concentrate arbitrary power in the hands of the Minister of the Interior, the fact should not be overlooked that this order in council of 1881 to which I have referred constitutes the Dominion lands law. In those happy days they did not depend upon the mandate of Parliament for control of the lands, but dealt with them by order in council. And one part of this order in council provides for the granting of closed leases for terms of twenty-one years, at a rental of one cent per acre per year, and, of course, with the privilege of purchasing any land within the lease at the going price of land, which is defined in the regulations as from $2 to $2.50 an acre. Now, I ask hon. members to take the trouble to follow the somewhat devious course of these resolutions regarding grazing leases in the Northwest for the purpose of seeing the difficulties of dealing with the principal features of the land business of this country and of noting that the late government had the same difficulty in arriving at a definite and fixed conclusion as the present government has, or as any future government must have so long as grazing lands are open as they are. These regulations of December 23, 1881, were so popular and so generally approved that we find by order in council of April 11, 1882, that some two and a half million acres had been applied for as grazing lands up to that time. The quantity of land that was going to be alienated for twenty-one years under this order in council of 1881, I presume, rather staggered the government of the day, for they decided that it was not advisable to continue that policy. They framed regulations dated April 11, 1882, which provided that leases could be cancelled on two years' notice. In March, 1886, another change was made, and the rent was increased to two cents an acre. In April, 1887, it was decided to invite public competition in the issue of leases, with the exception of eight cases which are mentioned. I merely draw attention to the fact that there are exceptional consideration in those days, as there has been in these—I only hope that the reasons were as good in those days as they have been in these. In September, 1889, other regulations were issued providing that leases should be opened to homesteading or purchase unless otherwise provided in the lease. That is to say that the government provided that the question should be opened, and the government had the authority under these regulations to grant a closed lease or an open lease, as they might see fit.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Would the hon. minister please mention the year?

Mr. OLIVER. This was in September, 1889. I can let the hon. member have the order in council if he would like to have it. Now, the ranching business had run on in a way that as my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) mentioned today, was not altogether satisfactory. In October, 1892, notice was issued to all and sundry the lease holders in the country that on December 31, 1896, their leases would be finally cancelled, but preliminary to that they would be permitted to purchase ten per cent. of their lease holds, at $2 an acre. Incidently it was mentioned that this course was taken for the reason, among others, that the land that had already been given to the leaseholders was now required for railways under railway land grants. In February, 1893, an order was passed which repealed the previous clause providing for competition in regard to leases, and the reason given for it, is that there was no competition and the advantage gained did not compensate for the expense of advertising. In April, 1893, it was decided to reduce the price at which ten per cent. of the leaseholds might be purchased to $1.25 an acre. In September, 1903, by the present government, all regulations in regard to the granting of leases were suspended.

Now, in order that we may understand the reasons for the order in council of 15th February, 1905, I may explain that up to this point that I have mentioned, the grazing leases were granted without regard to the quality of the country which they covered. That is to say, they were granted irrespective of whether the land was only suitable for grazing or whether it was suitable for farming, and it was because leases had been granted without that discrimination that they had given rise to so much dissatisfaction, and it was consequently decided in 1903 to cease giving leases at all. By that time the ranching industry had grown to be very important, and while the abolition of the right to grant leaseholds gave satisfaction to a certain part of the community, it gave a great deal of dissatisfaction to men who were largely interested in raising cattle and who were thereby deprived of the opportunity of protecting themselves in carrying on that industry.

Shortly before the grazing regulations were suspended in 1903, these regulations which did not discriminate between good land and bad, the Brown application was made, and the McGregor and Hitchcock applications were made. These applications were based on the allegation that, as the land applied for was unfit for agricultural purposes, it was right and proper that they should be closed leases, that homesteading should not be permitted upon them. The government recognized the propriety of granting closed leases under such circumstances provided the circumstances were thoroughly established. Several members who are familiar with the conditions in the West have spoken to-night, and I think I can include the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) in that number, who agree that wherever the conditions were such that the land was not suitable for agricultural purposes then it was right and proper that it should be granted under closed lease regulations for the grazing of cattle. It was on that principle and in that belief, and under those circumstances that an order in council was passed granting a closed lease to E. P. Brown, J. M. McGregor and Arthur Hitchcock. But there had to be a good many preliminaries gone through before the department could be satisfied that there were not other claims for the land, and that the land was of the class mentioned, and before these preliminaries had been gone through the grazing regulations were suspended. There was then no authority to grant leases to these gentlemen, although the government had decided to grant them leases. Therefore in December, 1903, a special order in council was passed providing for the granting of closed leases to these gentlemen of the areas in question, on the ground that it was sound public policy to grant a closed lease for 21 years to men engaged in the cattle industry, providing it was established that the land was not suitable for agricultural purposes. That is a proposition that no man in this House or out of it will dissent from if he understands the subject or cares to understand it.

On February 15, 1905, regulations were made which adopted the principle of these special orders in council in favour of McGregor, Hitchcock and Brown. For the first time the principle was established that leases should only be granted upon land unfit for agricultural settlement, and that in such case the leases should be closed leases and should be for 21 years. With that principle, again I say, no fault can be found. When these regulations were passed at once applications began to pour in for closed leases. When I came into the department I found the conditions exactly the same in 1905 as they were under the former government in 1882. They had provided for closed leases for 21 years, and they were flooded with applications for two and a half million acres of land. As soon as the provisions for closed leases were passed in February, 1905, at once the department was again flooded with applications for such closed leases, and I found it absolutely impossible to administer that regulation according to its intent; that is to say, we had so many applications and they covered so much of the country that we had no means of making proper discrimination between the agricultural land and the land that was purely grazing. I found that we could not make that distinction, we could not be satisfied that the application which was made for a closed grazing lease was for land that was not fit for agricultural settlement. It seemed to me coming face to face with the question, as I did, that the only thing to do was to stop the regulations there and then, which I did, and to substitute regulations which would give a breathing space, as it were, would give time for the department to find out what part of the country was absolutely unfit for agricultural and what part of it was fit. Therefore I brought in the regulations providing for the cancellation of these leases on two years' notice. It was not because I objected to the principle of the closed lease provided that the fact was established that the land was unfit for agricultural settlement, but it was because I found that it was impossible to carry out that principle with satisfaction to the people who were clamouring for the leases and with justice to the country which was entitled to the best results from the land. I found certain applications for these closed leases in the department. Some of them had been closed up and some had not. If it was demonstrated as satisfactorily as the department could expect that the land applied for was not fit for agricultural purposes, and if the government had become committed to granting the leases, it was granted even although it was at a date subsequent to the suspension of the regulations. This then was the position. I found the lease there, it had been granted under a special order in council, and I had no authority to revoke the right that these gentlemen held. They had been granted that right by the authority of the government at large, by the authority of the Privy Council, and that right could only be revoked by the same authority. My suspension of the regulation, my suspension of action under the regulation, did not revoke the right that these gentlemen held. When the rent was paid in and the question was raised as to how the lease should be issued I gave the decision as the hon. member from Montreal, St. Antoine, has read it to the House. It seemed to me that it was a fair proposition looked at from the administrative point of view. Action was taken accordingly, but when later on it was represented to me that these people had rights that were not subject to my individual order, when it was pointed out to me that the rights originally granted had passed into the hands of second parties, when it was plainly evident that the intention of the government was that this lease should be granted, when it was demonstrated that it was proper it should be granted because of its character, and when it was evident that it was being granted to people of standing, character and ability to use it, it seemed to me, that, although I might have appealed to council and asked for a revocation of the lease, I would have been going somewhat out of the ordinary line of my duty if I had done so. It would only be acting according to the ordinary principles upon which the department of the interior, or I fancy any other public department was administered, to give the individual who is dealing with the government every consideration with respect to rights that he has acquired.

In regard to the payment of the back rent, all I can say is that these gentlemen had the right under the order in council, but they did not hold, nor were they under the terms of any lease. They were not in the position that we could compel them to pay us that back rent, except by the cancellation of the right which they held, by revocation of the order in council. At the same time, these people had, in their own persons, never received any use of the land. They had derived no advantage from it. In so far as I am aware, there was no other counter applicant who might have been deprived of the right to the land, and it seemed to me that under all the circumstances it was not unfair to give them the consideration that was given. Now, it may be that an error was committed. I cannot answer for every act of the department in all parts of its administration, but I do say that it is better in administering a public department to err on the side of fair consideration to individuals than it is to err on the side of exercising the dominant authority of the government to deprive an individual citizen of an equitable right. That is a principle which is accepted fairly in the department of the interior, and is acted upon every day in regard to homestead rights and in regard to every other right. I would suggest to my hon. friends, who have been so very careful about the interest of the government in this particular case, involving, mind, they say, of some $1,200 or $2,000, that the line of policy which they advocate here today, whereby they stand to exact the last cent from the man who happens to be dealing with the government, was the line of policy carried on by their friends when they were in office that stagnated that Northwest country and stagnated this Dominion of Canada for so many years. It was because of that idea that hon. gentlemen advocated here last session, that there should be an automatic cancellation of homesteads, and that every man should be compelled to live up to the letter of the law.

I say that when these hon. gentlemen insist upon the letter of the law and upon the last cent, when they decline to consider any of the circumstances surrounding any case that comes before them, they take a position which vendors a satisfactory or successful administration of the department of the interior absolutely and utterly impossible, and the proof of that is that in the years when that system was in vogue in the department of the interior its administration was a total failure, and that instead of the country having lost a matter of $1,200 or $2,000 if you like, because of leniency in carrying on the business with the public, this country lost hundreds of thousands of people and millions and millions of money because of that policy.

In regard to the second part of the resolution, I do not know that it is any part of my business particularly to discuss it, and may I suggest to the House that I do not think it is any part of the business of this House to discuss such a motion. I think the hon. gentleman who proposed that resolution, who suggested that it was a part of the duty of this House to review the private business of private individuals, or even of public men, has placed a very serious responsibility upon the House, a responsibility which nobody repudiated so strongly six or seven hours ago as three or four prominent members of the opposition. If it is a proper matter for discussion in this House what disposition Mr. Adamson made of certain property of which he was placed in possession by the department of the interior, then I say it is part of the business of this House to follow the private business of every member of it as far as they like to follow it. I do not believe in that kind of politics; I do not believe in that kind of parliamentary discussion. Whatever in this case appertains to the action of the Department of the Interior is a legitimate, and more than a legitimate, subject for discussion, and if the department of the interior cannot stand criticism on that point, then certainly it should not be in its present hands. When the duty of parliament has been discharged by discussing the administration of a public department, if we go further and discuss how this or that or the other man has disposed of that which it was his right to dispose of, we are treading on very, very dangerous ground. All we ask is fair play in this matter, and today our friends on the other side were crying for fair play. During this session and for the greater part of last session, the alleged scandals charged against the interior department have not been against the department, but against private individuals in their private business, or, against public men in their private capacity, to a very large extent. The country has become used to that style of argument; the country has come to believe that such is proper parliamentary discussion, and hon. gentlemen opposite have seen fit to set up certain standards to which they say public men should conform. They have endeavored to create in the public mind the idea, that if there has been a improper idea, any kind in any part of the resources of this country, which has resulted in profit to any person, that is graft, that is corruption, that is improper administration. These gentlemen opposite have created that idea in the public mind. It is a false idea, it is an improper idea, and if they are judged by that idea which they themselves have created, that is their fault and not ours.

Police Investigated Alleged Poisoning

Found No Complaints Along the Athabasca of Posioned Bait or Loss of Dogs From Such Cause.

Ottawa, Mar. 1—Some time since reports were published at Edmonton that poison had been put out by trappers along the Athabasca river and that a tribe of Indians had been reduced practically to starvation because of their dogs having eaten the poison and died. The Mounted Police investigated the reports and the result of their investigation is practically that no signs can be found of any poison having been laid out nor any complaint made by the Indians or half-breeds in the district mentioned on the subject.

Constable Rockwell was sent on patrol along the Athabasca down to Pelican Portage, a distance of 225 miles down the Athabasca from the Landing. He visited all the trappers along the river as far as the Portage Lake trail ,100 miles below the Landing and went across to Portage Lake 6 miles from the river to visit an Indian encampment there. Owing to inability to secure food he was unable to proceed to Pelican Portage. In consequence he returned to the Landing from Portage Lake. He made enquiries enroute from all the trappers along the Athabasca and they all informed him that they had never heard of any poisoned bait and that they never had any dogs poisoned. He examined the fur in their possession and in every case found the marks of the trap on the front legs of the pelts. During the trip he made several trips inland but could not see any sign of poison and found absolutely no such complaints as have been reported current. Constable Phillips who in company with Constable Aitkin patrolled from Fort Saskatchewan to Fort McMurray on Athabasca River reported similar results. He left Fort Saskatchewan on December 30 and travelled by way of Lac La Biche, Saddle Lake, Heart Lake, Waterhen Lake, Jack Fish Lake, Little Jack Fish Lake and Willow Lake. He returned by way of Lac La Biche, Saddle Lake and Andrew, while in Fort McMurray and during the trip both ways enquiries were made wherever trappers or traders were found but no single complaint was made of dogs having been lost nor any single instance reported of poisoned bait having been seen.

While at Fort McMurray, Colin Fraser, the well known trader of Fort Chipewyan arrived enroute to Edmonton. Mr. Fraser had not heard of any complaints from the Indians of any poison having been found or of any dogs having been poisoned. From information received at Fort McMurray it appeared that Mr. Von Hammerstein who had reported the alleged poisoning, and the supposed straits of the Indians in consequence, was met by Mr. John McDonald, chief guide on the Athabasca River. "Mr. McDonald" the report says, "had to supply Count Von Hammerstein and party with provisions to take him to the Pelican Rapids. Mr. McDonald also sent his son with the count to guide him through the Mountain Rapids free of charge."

WILL SELL NO MORE COAL

Special to the Bulletin.

Lethbridge, Mar. 7—J. W. Stafford, Dominion lands agent for the Lethbridge district, has received instructions from the department of the interior to receive no more applications for coal lands. Filings for coal lands have been a daily matter at Lethbridge for a long time past, the territory embraced in this district being the whole southern part of the province and it is said that probably hundreds of sections are covered by applications at present. It is presumed that new regulations are being drafted to govern the coal lands, or something of great import may be behind the move. Several unsuccessful applications have been made in the last day or two.

Knock at Door of Enemy's Country

C.N.R. IS AFTER ONT. CHARTER

Bearding C. P. R, and G. T. R. Lines in Their Dens---Connee Desires all Railway Routes Fenced---Merits of Ross Rifle and Lee-Enfield.

Ottawa, Feb. 26.—The Canadian Northern Railway passing here under the name of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, is getting busy in Eastern Canada and asked the assent of the Railway Committee of the House this morning to construct the following lines through Ontario. The scene of the operations is not the wild and unmapped districts of Northern Ontario either, but the thickly-settled countries of Central and Southern Ontario which have been the inevitable stamping ground of the Canadian Pacific and the Grand Trunk for decades. Unlike the course of empire and regardless of the traditions of Canadian railways the present progress of McKenzie & Mann is to be from the prairies toward the sunrise. The Ontario branches, included in this program, are doubtless designed as links in an eastern sytem designed both to afford ample eastern connections for their western lines and at the same time to provide food for reflection to their two great competitors, who secure in the eastern field, have been doubling energies to invade the western territory, which the Canadian Northern had marked for its own.

2. The Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, hereinafter called "the Company," may construct the following lines of railway:—

(a) from a point on its authorized line near Washago to a point on Lake Huron at or near Kincardine;

(b) from a point on its authorized line at or near Arnprior, southerly to a point at or near Gananoque.

(c) from a point on its authorized line at or near Pembroke, southwesterly to a point on Lake Ontario between Toronto and Belleville.

(d) from a point on its authorized line between Toronto and Ottawa, north-westerly to a point on the Georgian Bay at or near Collingwood or Owen Sound;

(e) from a point on its authorized line at or east of Toronto, westerly passing near or through Toronto, Hamilton, London and a point on the Detroit River at or near Windsor, with branches therefrom to St. Thomas and to a point on the St. Clair River at or near Sarnia, and a branch or loop passing north of Toronto;

(f) from a point on the Niagara River, northwestrly, passing through or near Hamilton to a point on Lake Huron at or near Goderich;

(g) from a point on Lake Erie west of Fort Colborne, northerly passing through or near Brantford or Berlin to a point on the Georgian Bay;

(h) from a point on its authorized line at or near Washago to a point on the Georgian Bay east of Collingwood;

(i) from a point on its authorized line north of Montreal, westerly to a point on its authorized line in the county of Leeds or Lanark.

JAMES AFTER THE RAILWAYS

James Conmee, M.P., introduced a bill to amend the Railway Act by forcing railway companies to fence their entire rights-of-way. The present law, he said, worked against the farmer who wanted to recover damages for stock which wandered on to a railway and was killed.

CURIOSITY ALLAYED

Mr. Lennox, of South Simcoe, evinced a curiosity to know whether W. T. R. Preston had written letters to English papers setting forth the advantages of South Africa as a field for immigration. He directed his query to the Minister of the Interior and was informed that the gentleman in question was not employed on any department. But inquisitiveness being still unsatisfied, the Premier informed Mr. Lennox that he would make inquiries in the matter.

"WEAPONS OF WAR."

The remainder of the afternoon and most of the evening was occupied by Opposition gentlemen trying to settle among themselves the merits and demerits of divers and quirky species of small arms for military purposes.

Colonel Samuel Hughes, Opposition member for Victoria and Haliburton, had heard or read or understood that someone had said or written something reflecting of the efficacy of the Ross rifle, the arm with which the Canadian troops are supplied. Whereat the valiant Colonel rose and singled out seven points of advantage of the Ross rifle over its nearest competitor, the Lee-Enfield.

This drew Colonel Worthington, also an Opposition member from Sherbrooke, to the defence of the discredited weapon.

It remained for Mr. Northrop, Conservative member for East Hastings to butt into this little family difference. He sided with Col. Worthington, ridiculed Col. Hughes, and patriotically tried to deflect the antagonism of both toward the president of the Ross Rifle Company on the ground that that individual gentleman.

On the whole Col. Hughes appeared to have the advantage of knowing what he was talking about. Politically, too, he figured much more consistently than those of his fellow high-protectionists who devoted themselves to proclaiming the inferiority of a Canadian-made gun.

TORONTO CENTENARIAN DEAD.

Special to the Bulletin.

Toronto, Mar. 7—The death occurred yesterday of Mrs. Jas. Harman (Susannah Dan Booth) whose life extended over almost 101 years. Her career is unique in Canadian annals. Mrs. Hardman was the widow of the late James Hardman, and sister of the late Henry G. Booth, founder of the Booth Copper Co.

RICHELIEU HOTEL.

Third street north of Jasper (near Canadian Northern station)
Board $6.00 per week
" $1.50 and $2.00 per day
J. N. POMERLEAU ... ... Proprietor

GRANDVIEW HOTEL.

FIRST-CLASS ACCOMMODATION.
FINEST LIQUORS AND CIGARS.

H. SIGLER, Prop.

MEDICAL.

H. L. McINNIS, M.D., C.M.
Member of the British and Canadian Medical Association.
Office, Fraser avenue, Hours, 1 p. m. to 4 p.m.

LEGAL.

BECK, EMERY, NEWELL & BOLTON,
Advocates, Notaries, etc.
N. D. Beck, K.C. Public Administrator.
E. C. Emery. C. F. Newell.
S. E. Bolton.
Solicitors for the City of Edmonton, Imperial Bank of Canada, Bank of Canada, Bank of Montreal, Hudson's Bay Co., Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation, Canada Life Assurance Company, B. C. Permanent Loan and Savings Co., the Reliance Loan and Savings Co., the Dominion Permanent Loan Co., The Colonial Investment and Loan Co., Credit Foncier Franco Canadien.
Office: McDougall street, near new Imperial Bank building.

Wm. Short, Hon. C. W. Cross
O. M. Biggar
SHORT, CROSS & BIGGAR
Advocates, Notaries, etc.
Offices at present in Cameron Block. Over new offices of Merchants Bank of Canada after May 1st, next.
Edmonton, Alta.
Company and private funds to loan.

TAYLOR, GOYLE & GARIEPY, Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries. New Offices, Gariepy Block, Edmonton. Solicitors for the Canadian Bank of Commerce, Imperial Life Assurance Company, Standard Loan Company, Union Trust Company, The Sun and Hastings Savings & Loan Company, Dominion Life Assurance Co. Phoenix Life Assurance Co.
Private Funds to Loan.
C. TAYLOR, M.A., LL.B.,
J. R. GOYLE
WILFRID GARIEPY, B.A., B.C.L.

GRIESBACH, O'CONNOR & ALLISON.
Advocates, Notaries, Etc.
Solicitors for the Traders Bank of Canada.
Offices: Gariepy Block, Jasper Avenue, Edmonton.

The Canada Life Investment Department
Money to Loan
On Improved Farm Property a Current Rates of Interest
NO DELAY.
Mortgages and School Debentures Purchased.
W. S. ROBERTSON,
Sheriff's Office. Edmonton.

OMER GOUIN
REAL ESTATE AND INSURANCE AGENT.
Loans issued on first mortgage.
Farm lands and town lots receive our careful attention.
YOUR PATRONAGE SOLICITED
NOTE—It will pay you to write for information to me.
OMER GOUIN,
Morinville, Alta.

Trade
We can supply you with an Article second to none in the market, in the line of Hams, Bacon, Lard, etc, Fresh Meat, Sausage, etc. at reasonable prices.
Patronize Home Industry and help keep the Money in the Country.
Satisfaction guaranteed or money refunded.
The Vogel Meat and Packing Co., Limited.

P. Heiminck & Co.
AGENTS
HUDSON'S BAY LAND COMPANY.

McLEOD TOWN LOTS
There is money in buying lots here.
Very Easy Terms.
Correspondence Solicited.
Apply
G. F. BEERE,
McLEOD.

ADVERTISE IN THE BULLETIN

Equity Oats Wanted
Bring in your best and have them shipped on our Special Equity Cars.
Highest Price and Cash.

LACOMBE GETS POST OFF
Thursday's Daily.
Mr. Puffer's bill to incorporat Lacombe General hospital, whi been before the House for sometin passed all stages and is ready f assent of the King's representativ

W. F. PUFFER, M.P.P.
For Lacombe.

The movement to establish a h in Lacombe was started by Mrs. W Burris, wife of ex-Mayor Burris postmaster in that town, who has most tireless in his efforts. C through her work the funds to pur a site and commence building o tions have been collected by sub tions, proceeds of bazaars and in va other ways.

A beautiful site of three acres has secured on the high ground adj the west side of the town. No pla the building has yet been prepared the directorate intend to erect a stantial building suited to the re ments, modern and up to date in respect.

Too much cannot be said in p of Mrs. Burris, who is truly the m of this enterprise. She has bee leader and has been able to enlis sympathies of others in behalf o afflicted. No one will be turned from the proposed hospital owing poverty, but those who are able w expected to pay for board and att ance.

AS TO GRAZING LEASES
(Tuesday's Daily)

During the debate on the motio Mr. Ames, of St. Antoine division Montreal to condemn the govern for the issue and disposal of the B lease Mr. Oliver spoke as follows:—

Hon. Frank Oliver (Minister of Interior). The resolution before House is divided into two parts, remember it correctly, the first cond ing the action of the Department of Interior, in the granting of the l and the other condemning, I pres the grantee for having disposed of lease. The one is an attack upon department and the other an attack on a member of this House. It is concern, at the moment, to deal the question as it relates to the de ment. I was very much interest the presentation of the case mad the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. ron) in which he depicted to the H the happy conditions in connection the ranching business generally prevailed in the Northwest un ministration of the late govern would suppose from his telling story, that all the trouble began the accession to power of a Grit ernment. That up to that time had been a well defined, continuous successful policy, and that that had no relation whatever to closed es. Now, investigation of the matt the department, as well as my l edge of the facts from residence country runs something like this: first regulations in regard to gr leases were passed on December 23, And, in this connection let me jus that when hon. members on the side complain, as they have freq complained, of the tendency of this ernment to concentrate arbitrary in the hands of the Minister of th terior, the fact should not be ove ed that this order in council of 18 which I have referred constitutes Dominion lands law. In those h days they did not depend upon the date of parliament for control o lands, but dealt with them by ord council. And one part of this ord council provides for the granting of ed leases for terms of twenty-one at a rental of one cent per acre per and, of course, with the privile purchasing any land within the at the going price of land, which fined in the regulations as from $2.50 an acre. I ask hon. membe take the trouble to follow the somw devious course of these regulation garding grazing leases in the North for the purpose of seeing the diffic of dealing with the principal featu the land business of this country a neting that the late government ha same difficulty in arriving at a de and fixed conclusion as the present ernment has, or as any future go ment must have, so long as gr lands are available as they are. regulations of December 23, 1881, so popular and so generally app that we find by order in coun April 11, 1882, that some two and a million acres had been applied f grazing lands up to that time. quantity of land that was going alienated for twenty-one years unde order in council of 1881, I imagine, er staggered the government of the for they decided that it was not able to continue that policy. framed regulations dated April 11, which provided that leases could be celled on two years' notice. In M 1886, another change was made, and rent was increased to two cents an In April, 1887, it was decided to i public competition in the issue of l with the exception of eight cases are mentioned. I merely draw atte to the fact that there was except consideration in these days, as there been in these—I only hope that the sons were as good in those days as have been in these. In September, other regulations were issued prov that leases should be opened to h steading or purchase unless othe provided in the lease. That is to the government had the authority these regulations to grant a closed or an open lease, as they might s

Mr. A. C. Macdonell—Would the minister please mention the year?

Mr. Oliver—This was in Septe 1889. I can let the hon. member the order in council if he would li have it. Now, the ranching busines run on in a way that as my hon. f from Alberta (Mr. Herron) mentione