

WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any information available as to when the waterways treaty will be laid upon the table of the House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have just received a despatch on this subject which I will be glad to lay on the table of the House on Monday or Tuesday next.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) an Act to incorporate the Prudential Trust Company, Limited—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 92) an Act respecting patents of the Hart Otis Car Company, Limited—Mr. Geoffrion.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE moved the adoption of the first report of the select standing committee on standing orders, as follows:

Your committee have considered that portion of the petition of the Kettle River Valley Railway Company which asks for an extension of time for the completion of their authorized lines of railway, reported by the examiner of petitions for private Bills as not being covered by the notice. Your committee, in view of the fact that proof having been received to the effect that the required notice is now being published and will have sufficiently matured before the Bill can be considered by the Railway Committee, they therefore recommend that the same be deemed sufficient.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. H. CLARKE,
Chairman.

He said: I have been asked to move this report in the absence of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What precaution will be taken to assure the House or some committee that the required notice shall have been given at the time mentioned. This motion is based on the expectation that something will be done, but what guarantee is there that that particular thing will be done. Who will take cognizance of it to see that it is done before the Bill goes on?

Mr. A. H. CLARKE. I am scarcely able to answer the question. The chairman of the committee is not here and the report was placed in my hands as a matter of form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If some assurance could be given for example, that the chairman of the Railway Committee would take cognizance of the matter and exact proof that the provisions of the rules had been complied with before the Bill came under the consideration of the committee it would be

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

satisfactory, but in the absence of that assurance the motion does not seem to me to be satisfactory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The motion had better stand.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stands.

SUPPLY—FRENCH TRANSLATION OF LAWS.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into committee of supply.

Mr. E. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the French edition of our statutes. In perusing the series of volumes from 1867 to 1903 inclusively, that is up to the time of the retirement of the late Mr. Coursoles, the then chief French translator, one cannot help noticing that the designations of railway companies and others, even of those outside of the province of Quebec are, except in a very few cases, given in French.

It will be noticed on the other hand, that in the French edition of the statutes for 1904 and the years following, the English designations are seldom translated. Moreover, in the French edition of statutes relating to the amalgamation of two companies of two lines of railway, the contract entered into by the two corporations, and included as a schedule to the Amalgamation Act used to be translated into French, so that we had a French edition that was complete, a homogeneous work. Why has this rational system which remained in force during so many years been abandoned?

Let me point out a few striking discrepancies. In the first place we have Bill (No. 8), session of 1908, the French version of which refers to 'The Tobique Manufacturing Company'; that company was incorporated in 1898, 61 Vict., chap. 116, under the name of 'La compagnie manufacturière de Tobique.' Here then is a company designated in the French edition of our statutes, at times under an English name, and at times under a French name.

In the second place we have Bill (No. 13) for 1908 the French copy of which relates to 'The British Columbia Southern Railway Company'; while in the statute-book for 1899, the company is designated as 'La compagnie du chemin de fer du Sud de la Colombie Britannique.' That is, we have the same discrepancy as in the previous instance.

In the third place, we have Bill (No. 15) for 1908, the French version of which refers to 'The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company'; while in the statute-books, for 1886, chap. 15, 1888, chap. 89, in 1905, chap. 90 and 1906, chap. 92, the company is designated as: 'La compagnie du chemin de fer