OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

---

5 EDWARD VII., 1905

VOL. LXXII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF MAY TO THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF JUNE, INCLUSIVE

OTTAWA
PRINTED BY S. E. DAWSON, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1905

ERRATA

VOL. IV.

Col. 5974, 1st and 4th lines from top, 'Providence' should read: 'Provident.'

House of Commons Debates

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 15, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY IN NORTH OXFORD.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I beg leave to notify you and this honourable House that, through the death of Hon. James Sutherland, there is now a vacancy in the constituency of North Oxford, and to desire you to take notice of it in the usual way.

THE PORTFOLIO OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inquire of the government whether or not there is any truth in the rumour, which has appeared in the public press, that the member for London (Mr. Hyman), the acting Minister of Public Works, has been sworn into office as a member of the administration ; and also, if that has not taken place, if the government will be good enough to say whether it is contemplated that that shall take place at an early day ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). The rumour referred to as to the acting Minister of Public Works having been sworn in as minister is not correct. With reference to the second part of my hon. friend's question, perhaps he will be good enough to repeat it to-morrow, when the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be in his place.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like also to call the attention of the government to certain papers which were to be brought down, but which, I think, have not been laid on the table. I refer to the papers relating to the contract for a wire fence along the international boundary between the Northwest Territories and the United States. In that connection, I thought possibly the government would bring down some explanation from the secretary of the department, which, I think, has not yet been laid before the House. The explanation which was read before the House on a previous occasion was not, as I understand it, from the gentleman who wrote the letter to the company which made some complaints because they were not afforded an opportunity to tender.

There was also a promise by the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) to bring down the papers in connection with a contract and a proposed contract for bitulithic pavement—the contract being for a pavement in front of the parliament buildings and the proposed contract for a pavement on Wellington street.

In one of these cases there was a promise by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that the original papers should be brought down—I think that was in response to a request of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and related, if I remember well, to the proposed contract with respect to the wire fence.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When this subject of the wire fence was referred to in the House on Thursday last, the Prime Minister stated that he would have the papers laid upon the table at the earliest possible moment. I have no doubt that orders were given for their preparation, and there will be no delay in carrying out the promise made. My hon. friend will permit me to say that, as I understand it, there was no contract, although he spoke of a contract——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, no.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was a draft sent over to the Justice Department of what might have become a contract. That is what he refers to, I suppose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I refer to all the papers in relation to that particular matter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I understood the hon. gentleman to speak of a contract, and I wished to make the distinction, for fear that otherwise it might be assumed that I had assented to that view. I do not understand that there was a contract. As to the bitulithic pavement, my hon. friend the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) will answer.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Acting Minister of Public Works). I shall be glad to

lay the papers on the table or hand them to the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) tomorrow.

FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Mr. J. BARR. I would call the attention of the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) to a question previously asked with regard to the franking privilege of members.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The matter has been arranged in accordance with what I understood to be the wish of this House. I do not want the House to think that I am dominating their view. I understood the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to suggest that, instead of adhering to the decision of the House of some time ago, that the actual signature or the initials of a member should be required, we might still allow a stamp to be used on condition that the member whose stamp is being used should deliver the mail matter to the postmaster himself. The Deputy Postmaster General informs me that that can be arranged, and he is sending a letter on the subject to the postmaster here.

Mr. BARR. That is satisfactory.

PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM DREDGING CONTRACT.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. Can the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) inform me if the contract has been let for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William ? The time for tendering, I think, expired on the 1st instant. If the contract has been let, would the acting minister say who are the successful tenderers ?

Mr. HYMAN. The contract has not been signed, but the Order in Council to let the contract has been passed. The successful tenderer is A. F. Bowman. I do not recollect the particulars. Some ten or twelve tenderers were included in the schedule submitted to Council.

Mr. BENNETT. Is A. F. Bowman the Great Lakes Dredging Company ?

Mr. HYMAN. The Great Lakes Dredging Company—I speak from recollection—were also tenderers, but the lowest tenderer was A. F. Bowman.

PRIVATE BILLS.

OTTAWA AND NEW YORK RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 92) respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.

Mr. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). In the printed Bill there is only one clause. But I understand that another clause has been added, which is not open to objection.

Mr. HYMAN. If I may be permitted, I will read the second clause, which was added in committee :

> The directors may annually appoint from among themselves an executive committee composed of at least three directors, for such purposes and with such powers as the directors by by-law determine ; and the president shall be ex-officio member of said committee.

Mr. DANIEL. What is to become of section 1 ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall move that section 1 be struck out. It was understood when this Bill was under discussion the other night that there would be a motion to strike out section 1 as reported by the Railway Committee, and that there could be little if any objection to section 2 as now contained in that amended Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER We are on the preamble now.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would ask the government to define their policy in the matter of the creation of executives and in the management of large companies. There are some very large interests in this country controlled by boards of directors, and we have in some instances allowed these directors to appoint executive committees of three to administer the affairs of the company. Now if that is to be an accepted principle the public ought to know it. I take objection to it for instance in the case of insurance companies that have large trusts to handle. I object that an executive should be appointed to take control, say, of the funds of an insurance company. It is well worth the attention of the government, and a declaration as to whether they intend to allow great corporations to be managed, to all intents and purposes, by a small executive of three. I believe it is the case in the matter of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was refused in the case of the Canada Life Insurance Company. I would like to know the underlying rule of the government in these matters.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not view this question raised by my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as one of public policy. It is not a question of policy. Each case must be determined upon the merits surrounding it. There may have been some good reason for withholding the privilege from the Canada Life Insurance Company ; I presume that the committee of that day considered that there were strong reasons why the privilege should not be accorded. They have granted it in several instances. It is not a question of governmental policy. I presume that in the case of the Canada Life Insurance Company it was the judgment of the committee that the privilege should be refused.

Preamble agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON moved to strike out section 1 of the amended Bill.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON moved to substitute the following therefor :

The directors may annually appoint from among themselves an executive committee composed of at least three directors, for such purposes and with such powers as the directors by by-law determine ; and the president shall be ex-officio member of said committee.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Can it be the case under this legislation that not one of the members of this executive shall be British subjects, that the executive may be composed absolutely of aliens?

Mr. HYMAN. I presume so, under the wording of that section. But they must be elected by those they represent, a majority of whom must be British subjects. A majority of the directors must be British subjects, and it is they who elect the executive and have control.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But this is another way of having an American directorate over a Canadian railway company. That is the thing we have been trying to avoid, and now we have got it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a condition that the executive must be members of the directorate?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. The same principle has been followed in the matter of some other Bills that were before parliament, notably, that of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and there was no exception raised at that time. The object of this is to have a committee right on the spot here in Canada, and necessarily they would require to be British subjects residing here.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Now will not the same thing happen in regard to the other Vanderbilt interests in Canada? Take the Canada Southern and roads like that—they will be administered and managed in the same way. The object of the Railway Commission is to have men in Canada responsible to the Canadian people and to the Canadian Railway Commission, and who can be brought before it. Now there will be an executive that you cannot reach, men residing in New York; they may be the board and elected by residents here. The other day the Minister of Railways said the object he had in view was to have somebody in Canada who could be called before the Railway Commission, or before the government's Railway Committee, to make explanations, and who could be held responsible. That was declared to be the policy of the government. Now this executive can be in New York, or can be outside of this country ; and in a few days it will happen that the Vanderbilt interest will ask for the same legislation for all their railroads, and once they get in the thin edge of the wedge, they will start buying railroads all over this country and administer them by a small executive in 42nd street station, in New York. If that is the object of the government, they ought to say so.

Mr. EMMERSON. It does seem to me that my hon. friend is straining at a gnat in this matter. In all our corporations we have what we call managing directors, they control the routine, and they practically control the entire business of these corporations.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Who do ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The managing directors, under the responsibility that rests with the directorate who appoint that managing directorate. Now here you have under your legislation required that every railway corporation shall have a board, a majority of whom shall be British subjects. Now that majority can control the board, they can control the selection of the executive provided by this section. Therefore, it seems to me that no difficulty can arise. The mere management, the mere directors, the mere train service surely are not of very material moment in this Bill. They are of moment to the company who are interested in serving the needs of the people, and in accommodating its patrons. But the real responsibility for the corporation rests with the board, a majority of whom are British subjects, and this executive must be responsible to that board ; they must be guided by it, and directed by it on every point. Surely there are no Canadian interests that will suffer by reason of this fact, nor would it be good policy to invite capital to come into Canada and to tie it up at every point. I think it is carrying the principle of restriction quite too far indeed for us to refuse to give a Board of Directors, a majority of whom are British subjects, the right to select any one, two or three of their number to manage the everyday affairs of the company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are not the managing directors of the Grand Trunk Railway all Americans to-day and have they not been for some years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not personally familiar with the facts but if what my hon. friend says is so I can see no wrong in it.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have given no information whether it is fact or not. It would be well for the government through the Minister of Railways to give to the House some information as to the usual custom on the American side with regard to this question. Even with a majority of the directors British subjects a case might arise where the Railway Commission would require some one of the three composing

this executive to appear before them and if they were foreigners what powers would the Railway Commission have to compel their attendance ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Railway Commission have ample power to deal with the railway in Canada even if the board live in Omaha. I do not think it is at all material that the members of the board should reside in Canada. We have corporations the members of whose boards almost wholly reside across the Atlantic, but that does not affect the corporation which has its entity in Canada and is controlled by the laws of Canada and by the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission has power over the entity of the railway in Canada regardless of the residence of the directors ; it can stop the railroad trains, abolish a tariff and impose penalties. I might almost say in numberless ways, the Railway Commission have full power to require any railway corporations to fulfil the will of parliament and the requirements of the laws of Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. We had a case only the other day in the Telephone Committee which bears upon the subject. The committee, if we may accept what appears in the papers as correct, invited the manager of the Grand Trunk Railway to come before them. He said that he could not come and that they had better get the vice-president, who made a similar reply and said they should get Mr. McGuigan, but Mr. McGuigan said he could not come. Suppose the president, the vice-president and the managing director were all in the United States, the question which suggests itself to me is what power would the Railway Commission have to insist on one of those members coming before that committee.

Mr. MONK. At that rate where will we stop ? You would have to oblige the railway company to have all their employees Canadians as the commission might require the presence of an employee other than a director. Not only would require them to be British subjects but all resident within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. It is perfectly absurd.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. MONK. At the present moment what jurisdiction has the Railway Commission over directors residing for instance in England ? No jurisdiction at all: And to render nugatory all the processes and endeavours of the Railway Commission the directors even if they were all British subjects would simply have to cross the line and go into a foreign country to escape the jurisdiction of the commission and render the acts of the commission absolutely impotent. The whole disposition of The Railway Act seems to me to be going very far under the policy which we ought to adopt of encouraging foreign capital. I do not think that the fact of the majority of the directors being British subjects is any assistance at all to the government or to the Railway Commission in carrying out the principles of the Railway Act. Anyway in this case it is only an executive committee, and I believe that without this disposition of the law the directors of this company could name an executive committee, but even if they could not why should we not give them power ? The executive committee is named by a majority of British subjects and I think it is carrying the idea of loyalty a little far to adopt such a restriction as is now proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. I want it understood that I am not objecting ; I only desire to get the information to which I think the House is entitled, so it can understand what power the Railway Commission has and whether there is any necessity for that executive committee or not, and whether the appointment of that executive would in any way retard the Railway Commission. I think the government should be able to give that information.

Mr. EMMERSON. That question is purely a question of law as to what power the Railway Commission has, I am not the keeper of the law conscience that has been referred to in this House.

Mr. SPROULE. You ought to know the railway law.

Mr. EMMERSON. I know just exactly how far, in my judgment, the powers of the Railway Commission go, and I know that in the exercise of these powers it is not necessary to have directors either British subjects or residents of Canada. Some hon. gentleman may dispute that statement but it is a statement of fact based upon an interpretation of the powers of the commission, which of course is a legal question. It seems to me that the powers of the Railway Commission can be carried out without the directors being British subjects or without their residing in Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Minister of Railways does not apprehend what he is doing. He is making it clear that any great foreign railway interest can, if it desires, acquire all the railways in Canada and put their administration in the hands of an executive sitting in New York. That is the object of the Vanderbilt interests at this moment ; they want to get a small admission made in connection with this small railway, so that they can put the principle into effect in regard to all the railways in this country. They will not allow the administration of their railways in the United States to be placed in the hands of a small executive sitting in London, Ottawa, or Montreal ; they keep that authority in their own country and we should treat

them as they treat us. This is a vicious principle that is being introduced by this legislation. The international complications that arise in the world to-day largely arise out of the administration of foreign capital in a country by a board of directors outside of that country, and there is nothing President Roosevelt takes so much interest in as backing up boards of directors living in his own country and exploiting some foreign country with their capital. He says he is the big policeman of this continent to compel all the governments in North America to carry out their commercial obligations and to respect the rights of United States corporations having interests in these countries. If you pass this legislation you are forming the ground work of international complications; you are opening the door for the administration of Canadian railways by a small executive committee sitting in New York and you are giving that power to the great Vanderbilt interests who will extend it and extend it until they take over all our railways. It is not good national policy, and it is not in line with the statement made by the Minister of Railways in this House last week. I am where I was last week, but he has changed his view. He now tells us that Canada has no national policy in maintaining in her own hands the control of the railways in this country. True, the Canadian Pacific Railway has an executive of three, but that executive is in the city of Montreal, and the proposition now before us is that this Ottawa-New York line shall be administered by an executive of three sitting in the city of New York.

Mr. EMMERSON. Selected by a board, the majority of whom are British subjects.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the majority of whom are elected by one man in New York.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I agree with the member for East York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) as to affirming the principle of Canada for the Canadians, but it does seem to me that the strongest blow you can strike at this principle is to try to apply it in defiance of common sense. I suppose there is nothing more generally admitted in this country than that what every part of Canada wants is as much foreign capital as we can possibly induce to come here, and it is just a question whether or not we in this House are doing anything to assist the investment of foreign capital if we throw as many obstacles as possible in the way of foreigners investing their money in Canada. I feel very strongly that anything we may do to make it more objectionable from the standpoint of an outsider to invest his money in Canada, is doing just so much to retard the progress of this country. There is another consideration that strikes me. Looking at the matter practically, while I am very glad to see the majority of the board, Canadians, and while I would be very glad to see this committee of three, Canadians, I do not feel that practically it makes one iota of difference whether you have them Canadians or not. If the Americans are bound to purchase this railway, and if we pass a law that all the directors or a committee of three must of necessity be Canadians, we will have dummy Canadians, men who are merely placed there to do what they are ordered to do by those who own the road, and in such a case it seems to me the latter end of that railroad would be worse than the first. When my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) inquires as to whether or not the Railway Commission would have still more authority over this railroad in case the committee of three were all Canadians, it seems to me the Railway Commission has this advantage; that in case this railroad comes before the commission the railway is in the position of a litigant in court. If the litigant lives on the other side of the line and he has a case in a Canadian court I do not think his opponent need be worried as to whether or not he will call his witnesses, for the Railway Commission will have perfect power to proceed whether any witnesses are called on behalf of the railway company or not. I think we can give credit to these Americans for sufficient common sense to rest assured that if a question arises before the Railway Commission they will protect their own interests by calling all the witnesses they think necessary, and if they do not so much the worse for themselves and so much the better for the people of this country, because then judgment would be given in favour of those who are attacking the railway.

Mr. LENNOX. I am very sorry that I may be open to the insinuation that I am not capable of exercising ordinary common sense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We get that insinuation often now.

Mr. LENNOX. Even in view of the possibility of being open to that imputation I will venture to do my own thinking. I ventured to express my view on this matter briefly the other day, and it is of such importance that I feel justified in restating that view. I had not the pleasure of hearing the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle) to-day, but I infer from something which has been said since I came into the Chamber that he had put the matter in a somewhat different light.

Mr. HAGGART. He has not spoken to-day.

Mr. LENNOX. Then probably he has done so by his silence. This is not a question as to what we shall do generally, but, it is a question as to what we shall do in a case where we have invested the money

of the people of Canada, and in such a case I am perfectly sure that we have the right to have a say in the question of whether the directors shall be British subjects or foreigners.

Mr. PRINGLE. Does the hon. gentleman understand that clause has been struck out of the Bill ? It reads now that a majority of the directors shall be British subjects, and it simply gives these directors the power to operate this small line of railway by three delegates who must be three directors. I have accepted that amendment.

Mr. LENNOX. I was not aware until this moment that a change had been made, but the position I take is that we do not want special legislation for individual companies ; what we want is the same legislation for all companies and this company like all other companies should be made to conform with the general law we enacted a year ago. I have not had an opportunity of examining the proposed amendment to this Bill, but I assume it does not conform with the general railway law, and if it does not it ought not be allowed to pass. We have invested a very large amount of money in this railway. I cannot perhaps do better than read a few lines from an article on Canadian railway taxation in the 'Canadian Magazine a year or two ago by Mr. Pettypiece. He says :

> At Cornwall, a bridge across the St. Lawrence, connecting the Ontario and New York sections of the New York and Ottawa Railway, furnishes another example. The New York end of the bridge is assessed at $40,000, and pays taxes on that amount ; the Ontario end is neither assessed nor taxed. On the New York portion of the road the fare is two cents per mile ; on the Ontario portion three cents. The New York end of the bridge received no government aid ; the Ontario end received $125,000 from the Dominion and provincial parliaments.

All that I mean is expressed in the statement which I have already made that what I want to govern this railway is the General Railway Act.

Mr. PRINGLE. I feel that the request of the owners of this railway is a very reasonable one, in view of the fact that the money which built the Ottawa and New York Railway was invested at a time when the law was on an entirely different footing from what it is to-day. However, I have accepted the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and have consented to the elimination of section 1 from the Bill. The reason for asking for this substituted clause is simply this. The original Act incorporating this company requires a board of directors of nine. As I stated the other evening, this is a very short line of railway, extending from the town of Cornwall to the city of Ottawa. It was a line of little or no use to either of the great railway corporations running through the province of Ontario, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is of use only to the New York Central Company, who have acquired the system to the south of the River St. Lawrence, and who have acquired it as a result of its sale by the bondholders. Now, they are about to expend some $400,000, I am instructed, in putting this road in first-class condition. It seems to be the desire of some hon. gentlemen here to get the matter into such shape that it will be absolutely impossible for the New York Central to carry on business in this country. That is not the feeling which I have in regard to capital coming in from the United States of America. We have seen some splendid results from American capital coming into this country. You have only to look at the city of Hamilton to see the enormous works which have been constructed there by American capital ; and it is much the same in other cities throughout our Dominion. So far as I am personally concerned, while protecting the rights of our own people, I would like to see encouragement given to the Americans to come in here and invest their money, which is absolutely subject to and under the control of our laws. Some hon. gentlemen seem to be very much alarmed that if the New Yory Central comes in and runs this fifty-six miles of railway, and expends some $400,000 in improving it, it is going to do a great injury to the Dominion of Canada. All I have to say is that we are pretty well safeguarded by the Railway Act of 1903, from clauses 23 to 25, which give the Railway Commission large powers over every railway corporation doing business in this country. I have accepted this amendment with the greatest reluctance, because I felt that we had made out a very strong case in favour of exemption under the general law. However, as there seemed to be objections to that, we have accepted this amendment, which simply gives this board of directors power to appoint three directors for the purpose of carrying on and managing this road. I think it is important in the interest of this country, that the New York Central should be put in a position to carry on and manage this road by this board of three directors. We do not in any way amend the general law.

Mr. FOSTER. When this Bill was in the Railway Committee, without the amendment which has been moved at the present time, I was opposed to it, because it was cutting out the general law in the special instance. I thought then and I still think that it is a good thing sentimentally, and it may be a good thing practically, to have a majority of the directors of a road which is being operated in Canada, British subjects. That is maintained by the excision of the first clause, and at the same time a modus vivendi is prepared, by which this road can be managed practically by an executive ; but it

seems to me that we have kept all the power in the Dominion of Canada. That executive may manage the road from New York, but all the operations of the road are under Canadian law and are subject to the Canadian commission ; and if the officers who reside in New York do not bring their evidence and make their case good, that does not deter the commission or the laws of this country from having their full effect. Foreign capital is a thing we require in this country. The more we get the better, and we can scarcely consider it foreign capital after it comes here and becomes fixed. It then becomes Canadian capital, and all that the foreign holders will get will be the profits over and above the working expenses. I am quite willing that the Bill, with the amendment now proposed and the first clause taken out, should pass and become law.

Mr. SPROULE. I want to say a word in answer to the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Pringle). He says that it seems to be the desire of those taking part in this discussion to retard or prevent these people bringing capital into Canada. I think that statement is quite gratuitous. So far as I know, that is not our desire or intention ; but while we are willing that capital should come in with the greatest possible freedom, we merely wish to know what safeguards are taken so that these railways may be controlled in the interests of Canadians. I asked for that information from the Minister of Railways, who speaks for the government and ought to be able to give it, but with no desire to prevent these people from spending their money in Canada. That is not the intention, at least it is not mine, and I have never spoken with that object in view.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CITIZENS' BANK OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 133) respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Finance Minister any objection to this extension ?

Mr. FIELDING. That was considered in the committee ; and as we have granted a similar privilege to one or two others, we agreed to grant it in this case. We desire however, to discourage the policy of extending charters, and our hope is that hereafter we may apply the rule more rigidly.

Mr. TISDALE. Is this the first extension ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there was a previous extension.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PROVIDENCE SAVINGS ASSOCIATION (LIMITED).

House in committee on Bill (No. 134) to incorporate the Providence Savings Association (Limited).

Section 3—capital stock.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the reason the capital stock is so very small as $25,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is certainly small capital, and the first impression of the committee was against the charter. On examination it will be found that the Bill has been changed very materially. We objected to the title as calculated to associate the company in some way with a savings bank, and we had the name changed. It is merely an investment company for the doing of ordinary financial business ; and it was represented that if we insisted on a larger capital, we would be shutting out smaller people from doing business which is very legitimate.

Mr. TISDALE. Are they allowed to take deposits ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 6—the number of directors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The new subsection has been added to section 6 by the Banking and Commerce Committee ; a director must be a holder of at least ten shares capital stock and have paid up his shares and all the liabilities incurred by him to the company.

Section and subsection agreed to.

On section 7—power of company,

(a) Underwrite, buy, pledge and otherwise deal in, for cash or on the instalment plan, stocks, bonds, debentures or obligations of corporations, whether secured by mortgage or otherwise, and Dominion, provincial, British, foreign or other public securities, with the privileges and rights thereto attached ;

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The words 'for cash or on the instalment plan' were struck out by the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. What powers does this give them with regard to stocks ?

Mr. FIELDING. The right to buy and sell these securities which an individual could exercise for himself without a charter.

Mr. FOSTER. If you give them power to underwrite and buy and sell and pledge, you give them all they sought to have. Otherwise they could deal in stocks on margin.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt they could, under subsection (h).

Mr. FIELDING. Why should they not be allowed to deal in margin, if they wish

to ? It may be inadvisable, but it is no crime. Any individual can do it. If it were a trust company or insurance company, it might be different, but I do not see any objection to this company being allowed to deal in margins with their own funds.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not simply that they buy themselves on margin, but they buy for other people.

Mr. FIELDING. Even so, that is an ordinary broker's business, and any individual would have a right to carry it on.

Mr. HENDERSON. The object of the Banking and Commerce Committe in striking out the words 'or on the instalment plan' was to prevent dealing in margins. But I think the committee went too far when they struck out the word 'cash.' Had that been left in, the clause would have had much stronger effect in preventing the corporation from being used as a means of buying and selling on margin—it would limit them to the cash plan. I would favour having the word 'cash,' reinserted, to accomplish the purpose the Banking and Commerce Committee had in view.

Mr. TISDALE. Why should not this company have, to the extent of their capital, the right that any individuals would have? This is simply a combination of capitalists instead of any of them acting separately.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand that the promoter of the Bill has accepted the amendments as they are.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose that a large estate is left in the hands of this company and they use it to deal on margin ?

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a breach of trust. Any individual might be made trustee of an estate, and if he used it on margin, he would be guilty of a breach of trust. As I understand it, there is nothing here except an ordinary Act of incorporation allowing these people as a company to do what any of them can do individually if he has the money.

Mr. DANIEL. I was under the impression, though I may be wrong, that bucket shops were illegal and that those who frequent them were breaking the law and were liable to being arrested. I know that in my own city such people have been arrested.

Mr. FIELDING. This does not affect the criminal law. Whatever is illegal remains illegal. We give no power to the company that they would not have as individuals.

Mr. FOSTER. There are many things which an individual can do alone which you do not authorize a company to do.

Mr. FIELDING. Not many, I think. The object of incorporation is to enable individuals to unite their capital and so put themselves in a position to do what they would not have the financial strength to do as individuals. Though there may be exceptions I think, that, as a rule, whatever a man has a right to do alone we authorize the formation of a company to do.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that under subsection (h) they will have to borrow money on what they absolutely own.

Bill reported, and read the third time, and passed.

ANTHRACITE COAL RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 136) to incorporate the Anthracite Coal Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. FOSTER. Where does this railway run ?

Mr. GALLIHER. It runs from the town of Lethbridge in a westerly direction south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and crossing the Calgary and Edmonton Railway and on to a point called Lineham, and from there jogs down to some coal lands, although I forget the number of the township and range in which these lands are situated. It is entirely through a new portion of country, and I may say that the amendment that was made to the first section is simply because they wish to have five names instead of three.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 151) to incorporate L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 154) for the relief of George Dance Harper.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Bill (No. 152) An Act for the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—Mr. Campbell.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great West Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 143) to incorporate the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—Mr. Telford.

QUESTIONS.

RECRUITING—PERMANENT FORCES.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—asked :

1. At what points in the Dominion has recruiting been carried on for the permanent forces during the present year up to May 8th ?
2. How many men have been recruited at each point visited ?
3. What is the number recruited for each arm of the service ?
4. What is the total number recruited ?
5. Is it the intention of the government to cause recruiting in England for the Canadian permanent forces, or is such recruiting now going on ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Militia) :

1. Ontario.—Alexandria, Almonte, Arnprior, Belleville, Berlin, Brantford, Brockville, Carleton Place, Cornwall, Cobourg, Chatham, Deseronto, Gananoque, Georgetown, Guelph, Hamilton, Lindsay, London, Millbrook, Morrisburg, Napanee, Oshawa, Ottawa, Perth, Pembroke, Peterborough, Petrolia, Picton, Port Hope, Prescott, Renfrew, Sarnia, Sharbot Lake, Smith's Falls, Stratford, St. Catharines, St. Mary's, Toronto, Trenton, Tweed, Watford, Whitby, Woodstock, Walkerville, Windsor, Yarker. Quebec.—Acton Vale, Coaticook, Cookshire, Cowansville, Drummondville, Granby, Magog, Megantic, Montreal, Richmond, Sherbrooke, Stanbridge, Stanstead, Sutton, St. Hyacinthe, Waterloo, West Farnham. New Brunswick.—Moncton, St. John. Nova Scotia.—Halifax, New Glasgow, Pictou, Sidney, Truro. Prince Edward Island.—Charlottetown.
2. There is no record at headquarters.
3. Royal Canadian Dragoons, 37. Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles, 20. Royal Canadian Field Artillery, 35. Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery, 35. Royal Canadian Regiment of Infantry, 215.
4. Total, 417.
5. Application has been made to the imperial authorities to permit of some 30 to 40 artillery reservists being enlisted in that arm of the service of the Canadian permanent force.

POSTMASTER AT KENTVALE.

Mr. BOYCE—asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at Kentvale, Ont. ?
2. Who were his sureties ?
3. When was he appointed ?
4. Who was the former postmaster there ?
5. When did he vacate the office ?
6. Was he discharged ? If so, for what reason ?
7. Has the post office been removed from the site on which it was established ? If so, when, and for what reason ?
8. Where is it now established ?
9. Has any protest been made against such removal ?
10. If so, how was such protest dealt with ?
11. What is the salary attached to the office ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) :

The former postmaster at Kentvale was F. B. Kent. On the 4th January last, he was directed to be removed from his office because of his having been an active political partisan during the last Dominion election, and also with a view to removing the office to a more convenient site. The present postmaster is John Rousseau, who was directed to be appointed on the 4th of January, 1905. He is insured under the assessment system. Instructions were given to the inspector to transfer the office to the new site, and the department is not aware whether such transfer has actually taken place. A petition against the change in the location was presented, but the decision of the 4th January last has been adhered to. The salary is $25.

FISHERY OVERSEERS IN COLCHESTER.

Mr. LAURENCE—asked :

1. How many fishery overseers are there in office in the electoral district of Colchester ?
2. What are their names, what is their remuneration, and the names of the rivers over which they have care or jurisdiction ?
3. Does the government assume the duty and responsibility of enforcing the laws and regulations respecting the preservation of the inland and coastal fisheries of Canada ?
4. Is the law regarding the pollution of rivers, especially in respect to depositing sawdust and other substances therein, being enforced ? If so, by what officials ?
5. Does the government contemplate any efforts to restore or revive the shad fisheries of the Bay of Fundy ? If so, what scheme for the revival of said fisheries has been decided upon ?
6. Have the federal and provincial governments completed any agreement or understanding in regard to the protection and preservation of the river, lake and coastal fisheries of Canada ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Three.
2. J. W. Davidson, salary $100 per year. E. H. McGregor, salary $100 per year. G. W. Henderson, salary $75 per year. Each of these overseers has jurisdiction over the whole county of Colchester.
3. Yes.
4. Yes ; by the federal fishery officers.
5. Yes ; provision has already been made for the construction of a shad hatchery.
6. The federal government, by constitution, possesses the sole right to legislate for the protection of the sea-coast and inland fisheries. No agreement in this connection is therefore necessary. There is a question pending between the Dominion and the provinces regarding rights of fishery below low-water mark in tidal waters. While this is undecided, by arrangement with the local governments, the federal government is continuing the policy obtaining before the Privy Council decision, with regard to fishery

licenses affecting proprietary rights, except in the province of Ontario and a portion of the province of Quebec.

PACKING AND SALE OF STAPLE COMMODITIES.

Bill (No. 155) respecting the administration of an Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier—was read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Section 8 of the Act to be amended says :

> The Governor in Council may assign the administration of this Act to such member of the King's Privy Council for Canada as he sees fit, and may make such regulations as are deemed necessary for the proper working of this Act.

A portion of this Act is in regard to fruit packing. Under the Fruit Marks Act, the Department of Agriculture has a staff of inspectors to deal with fruit marks and we thought it better and more convenient that they should also deal with the administration of the fruit packing. We therefore desire to have the power to transfer to the Department of Agriculture the administration of that part of this Act which deals with fruit packages. The administration of the rest of the Act remains in the Department of Trade and Commerce. As the law now stands only the whole of the Act can be allotted to any one department, but by the amendment a portion of the Act can be so allotted.

Mr. HENDERSON. This amendment will transfer the administration of this particular Act respecting the sale of certain commodities, absolutely from the Department of Trade and Commerce to the Department of Agriculture ?

Mr. FISHER. No ; the present law covers a number of things such as the size and weight of certain measures, standard of weights, the size of packages of salt and registered trade marks, and it also refers to apple packages and the size of fruit packages. The intention of the amendment is to transfer by Order in Council to the Department of Agriculture, the administration in regard to fruit packages, but it does not deal with any of the other matters. This is done for the convenience of utilizing the inspectors under the Fruit Marks Act to administer the law in respect to the size of fruit packages.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am under the disadvantage of not having a copy of the Bill before me, but I understand that the Act or any part of it can be transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. The present law authorizes the administration of the whole Act being put under any minister, and the amendment allows any portion of the Act to be put in charge of a minister as well as the whole Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. The administration of the law as regards the matters referred to in this Bill is now under the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the amendment will authorize the Governor in Council to transfer the administration of that Act entirely to the Department of Agriculture ?

Mr. FISHER. The present law allows the administration of the whole Act to be transferred to any minister, and as a matter of fact an Order in Council has been passed entrusting its administration to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. There is no desire to put the administration of the whole Act under any other minister, but we think it better to put the fruit inspection under the control of the Minister of Agriculture so that his officers who are doing similar work may be enabled to do this work. It just happens that although the whole administration might be transferred to another minister, a portion of it cannot be, and we want to have the power to transfer a portion without transferring the whole.

Mr. HENDERSON. But the power to transfer a portion gives the power to transfer the whole.

Mr. FISHER. We have that already.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have noticed from time to time the tendency of the Minister of Agriculture to practically take away from the other departments matters which properly belong to them and to overload his own department. We have had an example to-day when the Minister of Agriculture presumed to answer for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of War. That was referred to prominently last session, when the hon. gentleman was acting for the Minister of War. To-day he is answering for the Minister of Militia and Marine. I think the great agricultural interests of this country demand that the Department of Agriculture should not be overloaded with every other conceivable thing, detracting from the time which the minister should devote strictly to the interests of the farming community. We know that large interests pertaining to agriculture have been neglected. Last year that was prominently brought out in regard to transportation, when it was shown that the Minister of Agriculture or some other minister had neglected to see that the people of Canada got as fair rates by shipping from a Canadian port on lines which had been largely subsidized by the parliament of Canada, as were obtainable on the same class of goods shipped through American

ports. My own impression is that the Minister of Agriculture is so extremely fond of work that he has practically overloaded his own department by adding various branches to it. Why should the Census Department be added to the Department of Agriculture? It should be taken away and given to another department. We have the Department of the Secretary of State with practically nothing to do, practically a non-existent department, while the Department of Agriculture is overloaded with a great deal more work than any ordinary minister can properly attend to. I think there should be a fairer division of the work of the various departments. The Minister of Agriculture especially should devote his time exclusively to matters pertaining to agriculture, and leave the Minister of Trade and Commerce to deal with matters of commerce, so that we can have a more thorough administration of the agricultural affairs of this country. I think the minister is making a mistake in reaching out at every opportunity to get some further power, to aggrandize himself and make himself exceedingly prominent in the face of the country. If we go on in this way, in the course of a year or two we shall be able to dispense with nearly all the other departments and simply have the Minister of Agriculture, with power to add to his powers by Order in Council, and taking away matters belonging to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who, I am sorry to say is not now privileged to have a seat in this House. I think the work of the departments should be more fairly divided, and more especially that the Minister of Agriculture should be left free to deal with matters belonging strictly to what we understand by a Department of Agriculture, and not have every other department robbed for the sake of aggrandizing that minister.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend, in his care for me and my interests, has I think, made a little mistake ; because he will notice that this Bill came from the Senate, where it was proposed by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. So that, instead of my grasping for things, it was the Minister of Trade and Commerce who desired to put this into my charge—not with any desire of relieving himself, but simply as a practical matter of administration, because I had officers who had to look after the fruit, and who could quite easily, with out adding to the expense of the government of the country, look after the packages as well. That is the only reason for it. I can assure my hon. friend that I am not desirous of adding to my prestige or responsibility. I have quite enough without anything more, and I would be glad to divest myself of part of the work of my department if I could induce some of my colleagues to take it. Perhaps that good day will come, when I shall be relieved and my hon. friend's mind will be set at rest.

Mr. LENNOX. The text of my hon. friend from Halton may be wrong, but the sermon is all right. In this particular instance, the Minister of Agriculture may be right ; but I have had occasion to speak of this matter before, and if a remedy is not brought about, I shall have occasion to speak of it again.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. LENNOX. And the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who are uneasy, if they consult the agricultural interests of this country, will have occasion to think of it as well. A year or so ago we were discussing our exhibits in Great Britain, when the question of the Imperial Institute came up. The Minister of Agriculture was good enough to give us a description of the Imperial Institute, or that branch to which our exhibit, was assigned, and he said that it was an ' omnibus department, into which was put everything that there was no other place for, similar to the Department of Agriculture in this country '—in other words, a general dumping ground where everything that was not wanted anywhere else was put. We have not only the speech of the hon. member for Halton to-day, but evidence all along the line to show that there are too many matters undertaken by the Minister of Agriculture, at the expense, I venture to say, of the best interests of Canada. The minister on the occasion I refer to spoke of the fact that he had charge of the census and some other things that might very well go to some other department not so loaded with work as his. The minister to some extent misapprehends, I think, the meaning of the hon. member for Halton when he speaks of his solicitude for the Minister of Agriculture. I think it is not so much that as it is solicitude for the best interests of the farmers of Canada. I have ventured on previous occasions, and I will again venture, to call the attention of this House to the fact that the interests of agriculture in this country, are large enough, great enough, important enough, to have a minister whose attention shall be undistracted, and solely and exclusively devoted to agriculture. The interests of the farming community require it, the magnitude of our farming operations justifies it, and from time to time I shall take occasion to press upon the minister, my good friend the minister—and, as I have said before, there is a very strong bond of union between us, because of the similarity of our pursuits—the importance of applying all his

energies, all his talent and all his industry to the interests of the farmers of Canada.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To repeat what I said a few days ago, there is not a single province in this Dominion to-day, as their Lordships of the Privy Council held in the second Manitoba case, which can exclusively make laws in relation to education. That subject is separately dealt with, and has its own code in section 93 of the British North America Act, by which section the power to make laws in relation to education is expressly limited.

1. The right to denominational schools which any class of persons has by law in each province at the union must be preserved ;

2. The powers, privileges and duties conferred in Upper Canada upon separate schools and school trustees of the Roman Catholics are extended to the dissentient schools of Protestants and Roman Catholics in Quebec ;

3. Where in any province a system of separate or dissentient schools exist by law at the union, or is thereafter established, an appeal shall lie to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of any provincial authorities affecting any right or privilege of the minority.

Manitoba has a special code, contained in section 22 of the Manitoba Act. This section 22, which, as Sir John Macdonald, who drafted the Bill and introduced it into this parliament, declared, was intended to establish a separate school system in Manitoba and to make section 93 applicable as far as possible to that province, failed to accomplish the object this parliament then had in view, as was subsequently determined by the judgment of the Privy Council in the case above cited.

The Territorial draft Bill, called 'Haultain's Bill,' which contains the provisions of the constitution which the inhabitants of the Northwest Territories asked this parliament to grant them, by section 2 makes applicable to the new province all the provisions of the British North America Act applicable to all the provinces originally embraced in the union, except where inconsistent with the expressed provisions of that Bill.

There being in that Bill no provisions relating to education, the provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act would have become applicable to the new province.

The effect, therefore, of that Bill would have been to preserve 'any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools (not merely separate) which any class of persons had by law in the province at the union.' If the words 'in the province at the union' mean the time at which the Territory came into the union as a province, the word 'law' would include the provisions of section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act of 1875 and ordinances 29 and 30 of 1901.

The effect of section 16 of the Autonomy Bill would be no greater than the effect of the introduction of section 93 of the British North America Act by section 2 of the Territorial Bill, and clause 16 was only deemed necessary to remove doubt which had been expressed as to the meaning of the words 'province' and 'at the union,' and to secure to the schools, whether public or separate, of the minority, the government aid which in practise they have always received, and which is necessary to place those schools 'in a position to play their necessary part in the scheme of national education.'

Section 16, as originally drafted, was intended to confirm the minority in the rights they now enjoy and makes :

First. Section 93 of the British North America Act applicable to the new province as if it were a regularly organized province coming into the union at the date of the passing of this Act ;

Second. Re-enacts section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act of 1875 ;

Third. Makes provision for the continuation to the schools of the minority of the grant now made in aid of education by or through the territorial government.

The effect of the section which it is proposed to substitute for the original section 16 is to limit the rights and privileges of the minority to those secured to them by chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances, to the exclusion of the rights and privileges guaranteed either by section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act, 1875, or any other legislation in force in the Territories with regard to any class of schools.

The differences in the rights and privileges under section 11 of the Northwest Territories Act, 1875, and those under the ordinances, chapters 29 and 30, are as follows :

1. Section 11, Act 1875, empowering the 'majority of the ratepayers of any . . . portion of the Northwest Territories . . . to establish such schools therein as they may think fit,' and the minority of the ratepayers in any . . . portion of the Territories to establish 'Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools.'

The meaning of this section was expressed in the earlier school ordinances.

Under the present ordinances, chapters 29 and 30, the public schools are the schools of all the ratepayers ; so that under the present ordinances only three classes of schools are authorized, viz.:—

(a) Public (undenominational) schools ;

(b) Protestant separate ;
(c) Roman Catholic separate ;
And a separate school district can be established only in an existing public school district.

2. Under the ordinances no rights or privileges exist with respect to separate schools as contrasted with public schools, except the initial right of effecting the separation, which right carries with it resulting advantages hereinafter set out in detail.

Under the regulations there is one difference only :

'Authorized text-books, standards i—iv, approved, August, 1903 ; the Dominion (Catholic) Readers, first (part 1, part 2) and second. These are optional for Roman Catholic separate schools.'

The rights and privileges which result from the right of effecting the separation, and which the proposed substituted clause 16 preserves to the minority, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, in a public school district, appear to be these :—

(1) Right of separation—by the ordinance —common to Protestants and Roman Catholics alike ;

(2) Half-hour religious instruction—by ordinance—to Protestants and Roman Catholics alike ; common to public and separate schools ;

(3) First and second Catholic readers—by regulation ;

(4) Right to elect trustees, who choose the teacher—by ordinance ; common to all schools.

I thought proper to carefully draft what I intended to say on the subject and read my opinion, so that there might be no doubt or uncertainty as to the position I take.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the hon. minister has adopted a very proper course in carefully preparing and reading, as a judgment, so to speak, his opinion as the law officer of the Crown on a question which has been discussed a good deal in this House. I do not know whether it is the intention of the hon. minister to go on this afternoon with clause 16, and move the amendment——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thought, that, in the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) we might allow clause 16, the amendment to which is to be moved by the Prime Minister, to remain over so that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) might have an opportunity to consider the matter. We might take up one of the other clauses of the Bill now.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 16 stands.

On clause 15.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will ask to have that kept over. Part of it has reference to joint stock companies. I am drafting a clause in view of the objection made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). We might take that up to-morrow and in the meantime go on with clause 20.

On clause 20 :

The Dominion lands in the said province shall continue to be vested in the Crown and administered by the government of Canada for the purposes of Canada, subject to the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act, as amended, with respect to road allowances and roads or trails as in force on the thirtieth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and five, which shall apply to the said province with the substitution therein of the said province for the Northwest Territories.

2. The Rocky Mountains Park shall continue to be subject to the provisions of the Acts of the parliament of Canada applying thereto and to regulations made or to be made thereunder; provided that the provincial laws shall apply to and be operative within the said park so far as they are not inconsistent with such Acts and regulations.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I am not out of order, I would ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) if it is possible to have a reprint of these Bills with the amendments as proposed by the government so arranged that we could readily turn to them and deal with them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The practice is when the Bill is in committee, to prepare the amendments and have them read here so that they may go on 'Hansard' that hon. members may have an opportunity of reading them ; and then have the Bill reprinted before the third reading. If it would suit the convenience of the committee, I should be glad to have a reprint made. I think, however, there are only three clauses left over. And it might take a little time, as just now work cannot be rapidly pushed through the Printing Bureau. I will be glad to give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) personally typewritten copies should he desire them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the object of the change ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The addition of the subsection is to provide that the control of the Rocky Mountain Park shall remain in the federal government as it has been heretofore. That is the only thing. Of course, the intention of the section generally is to retain in the Dominion government the public lands of the territory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The provisions with respect to lands in the draft Bill submitted by Mr. Haultain are contained in sections 18, 19, 20 and 21, which are as follows :

18. All lands belonging to the Crown situate in the province of other than lands reserved by statute or Order in Council, for the use of Indians or for and earned by any person or corporation, and lands entered for homestead or pre-emption, but not granted, and all sums due and payable on the first day of January, 1903, for such lands shall belong to the province.

19. All mines, minerals, timber and royalties belonging to the Crown situate, being or arising in the province of , and all sums due and payable on the first day of January, 1903, for such mines, minerals, timber or royalties shall belong to the province.

20. The province shall receive and retain all the public property of the Northwest Territories not otherwise disposed of in this Act.

21. All buildings in the Northwest Territories belonging to Canada used or intended for court houses, jails, and land titles offices and for residence and offices of the Lieutenant Governor and government of the Northwest Territories, together with all appurtenances connected therewith, and all moneys, the proceeds from the sale or leasing of school lands in the Northwest Territories, and all moneys forming the assurance fund under provisions of the Territories Real Property Act, and the Lands Titles Act, 1894, shall be the property of the province of .

These are all the provisions, at least all that I have noticed, relating to the disposal of lands which are contained in the draft Bill submitted by the government of the Northwest Territories some two or three years ago. I assume that my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has had these provisions under consideration—possibly not so much under consideration as would have been the case if the government had adopted a different policy from that embodied in their Bill. But he has probably had them under consideration sufficiently to answer a question which I now wish to ask. That question is: Whether, assuming that the policy of the government had been the reverse of that which has been announced, that is, assuming that they had thought proper to hand over to the control and administration of the new provinces these public lands which are not at present used for the public service of Canada, would the provisions of these four sections which I have read, in the opinion of the government, be reasonable provisions? In other words do these sections provide for reservation to the government of Canada of such land, public buildings, &c., as might properly be reserved to the government of Canada if a policy the reverse of that which has been announced had been entered upon by the government in connection with the establishment of the new provinces?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not considered the sections from that standpoint. As we have decided to retain the control of the lands, it seemed unnecessary to consider the matter. Such sections as my hon. friend refers to would have been necessary had it been intended to divest ourselves of that title. I had not looked at it from the other standpoint whether or not we would have left to us that share or part of the public domain which, taking into account the distribution made at the time of confederation, would have accrued to the Crown under the British North America Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may inform the Minister of Justice that it is probable an amendment will be moved to this clause, and in moving that amendment I desire to give such information as will make it a reasonable amendment, and one which will fully protect public rights.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will be prepared to answer that question to-morrow afternoon. But I would like to consult the officials of the department, who are more familiar with these details than I am.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will be much obliged to the minister. I think it would facilitate our work, perhaps.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We might perhaps discuss the general principle.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. While we have had, of course, a great deal of discussion of a general character on the question, sometimes we can endeavour to test each other's conclusions a little better by short discussions in committee. As I understand the policy of the government on this question, it is largely based upon the necessity of the retention of these lands for the purpose of immigration. I realize that there have been other reasons put forward by individual members on the other side of the House; but so far as the policy of the government is concerned, my understanding is that if it were not for the supposed danger to the policy of immigration upon which the country has entered, we might have expected that the lands would be handed over to the Northwest provinces for the purpose of administration and control. It is true that one hon. gentleman opposite, speaking when he was not a member of the administration, I refer to the Minister of the Interior, took the view that from the standpoint of the finances of the new province it would be better for the government of Canada to retain these lands, to administer and control them at the expense of Canada, and to make the provision for carrying on the government of the Northwest provinces which have been made in the Bill we are now discussing. The Prime Minister, however, in introducing the measure and in speaking to it subsequently, has not, I think, put forward any such contention as that. He has based his argument solely upon the ground to which I have already alluded, except that he drew an argument from the example in this respect of the government of the United States which has retained control of the administration of the public lands in that country. So far as immigration is concerned, I am bound to say, with all due deference to the views of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that I have not yet heard any argument or any statement of facts which leads me to believe that the new provinces would not as thoroughly conserve the interest of the country as a whole in respect to immigration into the

Northwest, as the government of this Dominion might be expected to do. Let us consider for a moment what has been the trend and object of the immigration policy of the present administration during the last four or five years. It is a complaint in some of the eastern provinces, as I personally know, that the money which has been expended on immigration by the government of Canada during the past four or five years has been expended practically altogether in the interest of the Northwest Territories and for the purpose of attracting immigration to those portions of the country. I am not for the moment concerned with discussing the question as to whether that complaint is well founded. As a matter of fact we know that the efforts of the government, if they had any result at all, have resulted in attracting immigration to the Northwest Territories rather than to other portions of the country. I am inclined to think that the immigration to the Northwest Territories has been the result, not so much of any efforts on the part of the government or of its officials, as of the advertisements which the Northwest Territories have received by reason of the splendid crops which have been raised in that country, and by reason of the enormous amounts of wheat it has sent forth to the markets of the world. But if the immigration which has come to Canada during the past four or five years has come chiefly to the Northwest Territories, if an expenditure of $600,000 or $700,000 is to be made annually for the purpose of keeping up or possibly of increasing that immigration, is it to be considered that the people of the Northwest are likely to embark upon any policy which would have the result of deterring immigrants from coming into that country? We are told, I think by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, certainly by other gentlemen, that an immigrant going into the Northwest is not of value so much to the Northwsst as he is to the people of Canada as a whole. I would not be inclined to look at the matter from that standpoint. I would think that when you send into the new province of Alberta for example 100,000 or 150,000 immigrants each year, the settlement and development of the country thus created must be a very potent factor in increasing the value of the possessions of the people of the Northwest who are already settled there. There cannot, it seems to me, be any doubt about that. It is quite true that that immigration may be a source of increased expenditure to the government of the new provinces, and for that reason some provision must be made for such increased expenditure. But to say that an immigration of 100,000 or 150,000 annually is not of benefit to the people of the Northwest Territories, seems to me to arrive in short at this conclusion, that it is not the interest of the people of the Northwest that there should be any more immigration into that country. That is the logical result of it, and that is a conclusion, I am sure, that no one of us would concur in. Then if I have made my premise good that the people of the Northwest of Canada are interested not only equally with the rest of Canada, but to a far greater extent than the rest of Canada, in attracting immigration to that country, in having it opened up and settled, then surely we might reasonably arrive at the conclusion that the people of the Northwest, through their representatives in their legislature, would not embark upon any policy or undertake any action which would be inconsistent with the best interests of the country viewed from the standpoint to which I have just alluded. Therefore it seems to me that so far as that particular aspect of the case is concerned, the government have not founded their policy upon good and substantial grounds in declaring that these lands shall continue to be administered and controlled by the Dominion as a whole.

And in that connection I might point out to the gentlemen who sit on the Treasury benches the words of the Minister of the Interior, words it is true, uttered not exactly in this connection, but equally apt and equally appropriate to this occasion. That hon. gentleman said that in his opinion the government of Canada should lose no time in ridding itself of the control and administration of distant territory—and for very good reason. Does any one for a moment contend that the people of the Northwest Territories are less capable of dealing with their own lands than the people of Ontario, Quebec or the maritime provinces? Is there any special advantage or reason in making it necessary that the people of the Northwest Territories should come to Ottawa or send to Ottawa for the purpose of dealing with their lands, their mines, their minerals, or their timber? For what reason should the people in the Northwest Territories, 2,500 miles away from Ottawa, be obliged to have these matters dealt with at the capital of the Dominion instead of by their own officials at their own provincial capital. For what reason should these matters be considered by 215 men in the House of Commons of whom only a small proportion come from the west, rather than by the people of the province itself in their own legislature every one of whom has an intimate personal knowledge of the local affairs of that country? For all these reasons it seems to me that the policy upon which the government has entered is a mistaken policy, and one which is not in the interests either of the people of the Northwest Territories, the people of the new provinces, or the people of Canada as a whole. Then my hon. friend the Prime Minister alluded to the example of the United States. I think some hon. gentleman from the Northwest

Territories on the other side of the House during this debate has expressed his apprehension that if these lands were handed over to the control and administration of the provinces we might expect maladministration. I venture to think that that suggestion should be repudiated by every hon. gentleman in this House and especially by every hon. gentleman from the Northwest Territories. I think these people are as fully alive to their rights, as fully alive to the necessity of utilizing the public domain in the public interest as the people of any part of Canada. The brief observation of the conditions in that country which I was enabled to make some two and a half years ago and my knowledge derived from some acquaintance with the public affairs of this country in connection with the Northwest Territories, would lead me to the conclusion that they are at least equally alive to the value of the public domain as are the people of the rest of Canada and certainly we might expect that the people of the Northwest Territories would be at least as much alive to the value of their own domain to themselves as the people of the whole of Canada would be alive to the value of that domain to the people of the Northwest Territories. We are referred to the example of the United States. Well, if we are to look to the example of the United States, do we find any very great encouragement so far as the hope of wise administration is concerned? I think that if we look to the example of the United States we would rather reach the opposite conclusion, than the one at which the Prime Minister has arrived. We would find in the United States that administration of distant territory in the departments of the government at Washington has not been conducive to good legislation, good administration, good executive action, and if I am not mistaken—although I have not refreshed my memory recently on this point—I think that the administration of public lands by the central government in the United States of America upon more than one occasion has been attended with grave scandals. For these reasons it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the grounds advanced by the Prime Minister to the House in support of this policy are not well founded, and that it would be in the interest of the people in the provinces, in the interest of the people of Canada as a whole, to entrust the administration of those lands to the people of the provinces, and in doing that we would be doing exactly that which the British government has done so far as the public lands in Canada are concerned. Every one who has the slightest acquaintance with constitutional history knows that the idea of British statesmen years ago was to retain the control and administration of public lands of all the British dominions in North America, and to administer those lands not for the benefit of British subjects residing in British North America, but for the benefit of the empire at large. That was the view expressed by British statesmen of years ago, that was the policy embarked upon by British statesmen years ago, that is precisely the policy on which the government of this country has embarked in connection with these lands in the Northwest Territories, and as the British government and British statesmen long years ago abandoned, and wisely abandoned, the policy upon which they then entered, so I venture to think it will be found that the policy on which the government of this country has entered with respect to the administration of lands in the Northwest Territories is equally unwise, and will have to be abandoned sooner or later with the result that complications will arise in respect of provincial subsidies and financial assistance which would not arise if the government had adopted the policy which has been adopted by the home government with respect to the public domain in Canada. What would have been the result in British North America long before this if the home administration, the imperial government had insisted upon retaining the public domain throughout the British possessions in North America and administering those lands, not for the benefit of the people of this country, but for the benefit of the empire at large? Could any one realize what the result would have been? Can any one at this moment, looking back over the history of this country for the past 50 or 60 years, have any doubt as to what the result would have been? It seems to me that the same reason, to a certain degree at least, exists for giving the control and administration of these lands to the people in the provinces and I for one have in conclusion to express my regret that the government have not seen fit to adopt that policy.

Mr. OLIVER. This question has been gone over already in the House since the Bill came up, and I do not know that anything new requiring special attention has been brought before the House on this occasion. The contention as I understand it is that the province is the better authority for the administration of the land. That contention has already been placed before the House and in opposition to it has been placed the contention that the Dominion is the better authority for controlling these lands. There is no question involved as to the respective business ability of the people of the Territories and of the Dominion. There is no question as to the respective honesty of administration on the part of the territorial or provincial government as compared with that of the Dominion. I presume there are honest men in the Territories as well as in other parts of the Dominion and that the honest men are fairly represented in the territorial or provincial governments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I only mentioned that because one gentleman from the Territories pointed out a danger from that source which I did not think existed more than would exist here.

Mr. OLIVER. Probably not. I can only repeat that the Dominion government under the necessity of the case, under our system of confederation, necessarily has a greater interest in securing the establishment of a settler upon land in the Northwest than the provincial government has. As I understand it the Dominion revenue is principally derived from customs and excise, and each individual in the country contributes on an average about $8 or $40 per year for a family of five. I do not know that these figures are exactly correct but they will do for the purpose of comparison. When you consider the different expenditures of those settled on lands in the Northwest as compared with the dwellers in eastern cities, I think it will be admitted that a family in the Northwest Territories is worth a great deal more than $40 per year to the Dominion revenue. I would be inclined to think that such a settler's family established on their land would be worth perhaps $100 per year instead of $40. To the provincial revenue they are worth absolutely nothing; the province does not levy direct taxation upon these settlers. It is true that a school district or a local improvement district may be organized and the settlers may contribute to them by direct taxation, but under the system that has prevailed so far, the establishment of a school district or a local improvement district does not mean relief to the provincial treasury. Every group of settlers coming into the Territories may be taken to mean the establishment of a new school district and local improvement district, which in turn means a direct charge upon the provincial government just as their settlement means a direct contribution of the Dominion treasury. The local government is consequently not in the same position to derive revenue from the influx of settlers that the Dominion government is, and therefore it cannot afford to spend money in attracting settlers. The Dominion government for a number of years has expended about a million dollars a year to secure an influx of immigrants, and no provincial government would be in a position to make such an expenditure because there is no source from which, according to our system of confederation, the provincial government could acquire a compensating amount in revenue. The influx of settlers means increased revenue to the Dominion, irrespective of the value of the land. The Dominion government can well afford to spend large sums in attracting the attention of prospective immigrants and in providing for the security of life and property throughout these Territories, which has a very important bearing upon the question of immigration and which at present entails an expenditure of about half a million dollars per year. As a pure matter of business, as the plainest and simplest business transaction, if we expect to have inducements held out to people to settle on our vacant lands, and if we expect to have law and order maintained, there is no question but that we have better grounds for looking to the Dominion authorities than to the provincial authorities. If we do not reach that conclusion by any other process we might very well reach it by looking at the conditions in the various provinces. British Columbia has a very large land area which is under the control and administration of the province, but so far as I know, within recent years British Columbia has not spent a dollar in attracting immigration to that province. The province of Ontario has a vast area of vacant land, and I do not know that Ontario has spent a dollar in attracting immigrants within recent years. The same may be said of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, all of which provinces own their own lands. The reason for this is that the provinces cannot afford to do so; there is not enough in it for these provincial governments. The interests of the entire Dominion depend upon the successful filling up of these prairies with desirable settlers and neither the Dominion nor any interest in the Dominion can afford to place the responsibility in hands other than those best fitted by circumstances to discharge that responsibility. It is not by reason of any greater business ability, or any greater honesty, but because the Dominion gets $40 revenue per family while the provincial government is billed with $20 say, annually of additional expense for each family. Another feature of the case is this. The leader of the opposition has said, and said truly, that the influx of settlers increases the value of the land and that the increased value of the land is of benefit to the province. But, we cannot have an influx of settlers unless we take means to secure it, and the success of the immigration policy is due mainly to the fact that the settlers have been able to get free lands. We send immigration agents to different parts of the world; we supply them with literature and they give information to the best of their ability, and there are no doubt good crops in that country. These factors are a consideration in securing immigration, but the main consideration is the free grant of land. It is the Dominion which can afford to give the land away and not the province. The increase in the value of the land which benefits the province and the people already in it, comes from the general influx of immigrants which is attracted, not by the lands which directly receive the increase of value by the coming in of the

settlers, but by reason of the land which is given away. The tendency of the provincial government naturally would be to direct settlement so as to increase the value of the land already occupied, just as the tendency of the Dominion government is to secure settlers on the lands which they have to give away. The process of increasing the value of lands can be carried on independently to a limited degree, but as any man who has ever lived in that country must know, it is the spread of settlement over the still vacant areas that is really the main cause of the increase of land values, If for any reason attention is withdrawn from this effort to spread settlers over the yet unoccupied territory, the tendency to increase in the value of land now occupied, would be retarded to the extent to which the effort was relaxed.

I think the experience of the past few years has shown clearly, in the first place, that the results in regard to the settlement of the lands in the Territories have been satisfactory. Those results to the whole Dominion have been so very definite and so very satisfactory, that we cannot afford—it would not be sound public policy —to change a system which has resulted so satisfactorily, in the face of the experience which we have in regard to the provinces which have the ownership of their lands. It may be said, and it is quite true, that a government sitting here in Ottawa might at some future time reverse the present policy of free lands in the Territories. If that were done, it would reverse the argument which I have made here to-day. Certainly the government that was in power until 1896 did not have the policy of the land for the people which has prevailed since; but I believe that the people of this country, through the experience of the past few years, have arrived at a definite understanding that the policy of free lands is the policy for the well-being of this Dominion, and I can scarcely believe that even a change of government would bring about a change of that policy. The people of the Dominion at large have become so well aware of the benefits resulting from the rapid settlement of the Northwest through the giving of its lands free to settlers, that I cannot imagine any Dominion government reversing that policy. But a provincial government cramped for money, as all our provincial governments are, deriving no direct revenue from the influx of settlers, but carrying an increased burden by reason of every ship load of immigrants that arrived would be likely to adopt a policy of administration of the lands for revenue, which would be injurious in the ultimate end of the province itself, and still more to the whole Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. The experience of the province of Ontario is the very reverse of that. In that province the land is not only sold at a very small figure, at one time as low as twenty cents an acre, but there are free grants as well.

Mr. OLIVER. That was not the point I raised. The point was that the government of Ontario has not made expenditures for the purpose of promoting immigration in order to settle up those lands.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, it has an agent at Liverpool now, and has had for years.

Mr. OLIVER. Even if the hon. gentlemen hold that the province of Ontario has an immigration service, the facts show that that service does not produce the results that have been produced by the Dominion service, and I take for granted that there is some reason for that inherent in the case, and not in any lack of desire on the part of the Ontario government to secure the settlement of the lands. It cannot afford to go to the expense that the Dominion government can.

Mr. SPROULE. The great reason why Ontario does not get the bulk of the immigrants whom it otherwise would get is the fact that so much prairie land has been opened up for settlement, on which people prefer to go and get immediate returns rather than go on timber land and clear it up. I want to put myself on record as being in favour of the provinces having their lands. We have only one instance in the Dominion of a province not owning its land, that is, Manitoba, and we have had complaints from that province ever since it has been a province, and applications for the right to control its lands. In view of that experience, it seems to me that we should avoid committing the same blunder in connection with the new provinces which we are establishing. The hon. gentleman says the Dominion has a greater interest in securing settlers than the province has. I do not think it has, and I do not see why it should have. It is said that the province would not have as much interest as the Dominion, because it would not have free grant lands ; but all the land in the Northwest is not free grant. While a portion of it is free, as is the case in Ontario, we still reserve a portion that may be sold to recoup the public treasury for the outlay. The Dominion is following very much the same system as is being followed by some of the provinces. We gave the province of Manitoba a portion of the swamp lands ; it applied for more, and complained because we withheld what we did. If it is a grievance to the people of Manitoba that the Dominion withheld the public lands, it must be equally so to the people of the Northwest Territories. I see by a return which has been brought down that there are 938,813,210 acres of land in the Territories not yet taken up. A large portion of that is not fit for settlement ; but as settlement goes on and improvements take place, and

drainage is made throughout the country, this land which is to-day not fit for settlement will much of it become fit for settlement. Who will make the improvements? The settlers. Whom do the settlers belong to? The province in which the lands are located, and if the province makes the improvements in those lands which are not settled to-day and increases them in value, will the province not claim to be entitled to the increased value resulting from its expenditure and labour? Will that not be regarded as a very important grievance in the future? I think it will be. The land for which we give these new provinces a return we estimate at the value of $1.50 an acre. Much of this land, if held back, may increase to $8, $10 or $12 an acre. Will the province be satisfied with the moiety of the return which they get to-day? I do not think they will. They will be applying for a larger subsidy in lieu of that land, or for the land which ought to belong to them; because the British North America Act, I submit, contemplated that every acre of public land in each province should belong to the province when it came into the confederation. The hon. gentleman says the present system is very satisfactory, but they have never been able to test any other system, because it is the only one that has been in effect.

How long will they remain satisfied when they are set apart as provinces of their own and have an opportunity of testing the other system, such as Manitoba has had for several years? Every year they will be coming back and complaining that while they were treated with apparent liberality, there was really no liberality at all and what belonged to them was withheld. They will point out to the increased value of these lands given to them by their labour, which increased value inures only to the benefit of the federal government, and they will continually be demanding a readjustment of the financial arrangement. We have heard some members of the Northwest say that the people are perfectly satisfied, but if so, why are they sending petitions and resolutions against these land clauses? Years ago I put myself on record with regard to this very question when I claimed that the province of Manitoba should be given its own land, and I take the same position to-day.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BLAIN. The discussion of clause No. 20 has brought out certain statements that, I think, do not do justice to the province of Ontario. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has ventured to say that this province has not been spending a dollar towards the location of settlers in the northern district. The hon. gentleman is not well informed on that point. If he will study the history of provincial government in Ontario, he will learn that year after year that government has been spending a considerable amount of money surveying new districts and locating settlers. I have here a report on the province prepared by the direction of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, and published in 1903, containing a great deal of valuable information, and showing that the government of the province have devoted a good deal of attention to settling our northern districts. This shows that the agricultural lands explored in the several districts of northern Ontario are as follows:

Agricultural lands explored.

	Acres.
Nipissing	1,920,000
Algoma	11,200,000
Thunder Bay	2,560,000
Rainy River	384,000

I do not say that all this land is suitable for agriculture, but if we are to believe this report—and I suppose it cannot be questioned—a considerable portion of it is farming land. We know that during the discussion on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill in this House last session and the session before much stress was laid by hon. members on the other side of the House upon the fact that a large and valuable clay belt, heretofore unknown, existed in the northern part of Ontario comprising many millions of acres of valuable land. There have been located and sold in New Ontario, during 1901, according to the returns of the Crown land agents, farms of some 100 to 160 acres each to the number of 2,541, amounting to 330,000 acres, and representing a population of nearly 10,000 souls. These official figures, however, do not fully represent the total influx of people into New Ontario. Let me give a comparison of the increase of population in the northern part of this province:

	1891.	1901.	Increase
Muskoka and Parry Sound	6,919	45,356	38,437
Nipissing	1,791	36,552	34,761
Algoma	7,018	63,669	56,651
Total	15,728	145,577	129,849

So my hon. friend will see that the province of Ontario has not altogether neglected the settlement of the northern districts. Then it is to be borne in mind that the provincial government are constructing a railway, largely at the cost of the province, from North Bay northward to the Timiskaming district, which will open up a large area for settlement. Concerning the Timiskaming country, let me read a short extract from this report:

The Timiskaming country forms the south-eastern extremity of the great clay belt, the existence of which was established by the extensive explorations undertaken by the provincial

government in 1901. Beginning at this point it stretches in a northeasterly direction with a slight break to the Height of Land across the district of Nipissing and Algoma and into Thunder Bay district, comprising a total area of some 24,500 square miles or 15,680,000 acres. This almost unbroken stretch of good farming land is nearly three-quarters as great in extent as the whole settled portion of the province south of Lake Nipissing and the French and Mattawa rivers.

Now, let me give the railway mileage in that country :

Railway Mileage.

	Miles.
Muskoka and Parry Sound..	184
Algoma..	537
Thunder bay and Rainy river.. ..	873
Nipissing	210
Total..	1,804

In 1891 there were only 12 miles of railway in that northern section of the province. I do not venture to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway system was constructed by the provincial government, but the province of Ontario had something to do with the construction of that railway, and the people of that province contributed largely towards the expense. And one of the purposes they had in view was the opening up of the northern section of the province. The production of iron ore for 1902 was 359,288 tons, most of which was smeltered in Ontario. Mining operations were commenced at Sudbury in 1886, and the district now furnishes about half the world's supply of nickel. So it will be seen that the provincial government have been giving some attention to the mining interests of northern Ontario. The copper-nickel matte is at present shipped to the United States, where the final stages of the processes of extraction and refining are carried on. That policy I do not agree with. I am in favour of a policy that will cause these final operations to be carried on in Canada. I hope the time will come when this mineral will be completely refined in Canada and the wages earned by Canadians. This is a policy that should receive the support, not only of the government of Ontario, but of this government as well. In 1902 11,890,000 pounds of nickel were produced, valued in the matte and before being exported for refining at $2,210,961. And in the same year, 1902, 4,932 tons of copper were produced, valued in the form of matte at $680,283.

Now, I would like to say something of what has been done by the provincial government for the settlement of that part of the province. I may say that it has been a disappointment to the people of the province of Ontario that a larger number of the sons and daughters of the province do not go to northern Ontario rather than to the west. One of the reasons of that is that the policy of the Ontario government—and I do not wish to refer to this in a party political sense—has not altogether been in the interest of the people of the province. Let me give you an example. In 1901 the legislature of the province passed an Act to provide for the appropriation of certain lands to be given to the volunteers who had served in South Africa and to those who had served on the frontier in the Fenian Raids of 1866. One reason urged in favour of this policy was that, of the men returning from South Africa, many would want to take up farming pursuits, and would be more likely to settle in the northern part of Ontario if the provincial government were liberal with them. But there is a clause here over which a great deal of comment has arisen by the people of Ontario, and which, I venture to say, is one of the chief reasons why a large number of the voters in the northern part of Ontario voted against the government in power in the province at that time. Clause 9 reads thus :

> Every location of Crown land under this Act shall be subject to the reservation of the pine timber.

That is, they were willing to give the land to the volunteer, but they reserve to the provincial government the pine timber ; in other words, the volunteer could go and settle upon the farm, and he could clear the pine timber that he needed to construct his house or outbuildings ; but if he ventured to put an axe to any portion of the pine timber upon his own farm, to sell then he had to pay to the provincial government timber dues. Thus a large number of volunteers complained bitterly, and a contention arose in the province of Ontario upon this question. There was a division in the House, but the government of the day insisted that in their opinion the better way to settle that northern country was to reserve the pine timber. However, when this question was tested before the electors in the northern part of the province they declared that that kind of policy was not in the best interests of the people, and was not calculated to invite settlers to locate in the northern part of the province. It is a policy which will now, I suppose, be made right, a policy that will of necessity be made right in the near future, because the people of all shades of politics in the province will be in favour of a liberal policy to the settler, so that he shall have the right to cut pine timber to sell if he wishes, and put his money in the bank and thereby help to make his home prosperous and happy. We must keep in view the fact that to-day the province of Ontario has an agent in the old country, and has had for some time, Mr. Byrne, who is stationed at Liverpool. The Ontario government has also had for the last year a special agent for the purpose of bringing out hundreds of men to engage in agricultural pursuits, it has been expending a large amount of money in this way for the purpose of settling up the northern part of the province. Let me also point out that

the policy of the provincial government is to give free grants of lands. To hear some of our hon. friends from the west, one would almost think that the people of the province of Ontario were not given free farms in the northern parts of the province to settle. Let me read from the regulations under the 'Free Grants and Homesteads Act:'

Persons desiring to take the benefit of the Free Grants Act must apply to the Crown lands agent for the district in which they intend to settle. The agent will give them information as to what land is open for settlement, and will furnish them with printed forms of affidavits which are necessary to be made by the applicants.

On being properly located by a Crown lands agent and on performing of settlement duties, a single man over eighteen, or a married man, without children under eighteen residing with him, or the female head of a family having children under eighteen residing with her, is entitled to a free grant of one hundred acres. If the hundred acres selected consists of a considerable portion of rock, swamp or waste land, the Commissioner of Crown Lands may make an allowance for such waste land, and may increase the quantity of land located to any number of acres not exceeding two hundred acres. The male head of a family having a child or children under eighteen residing with him or her may be located for two hundred acres as a free grant. And such male head of a family is permitted to purchase another hundred acres at fifty cents per acre cash at the time of location.

So you see there is some inducement for people to come from the old country and elsewhere, and for the surplus population of Ontario and the other older provinces of Canada, to locate in the northern section of Ontario. I do not understand why the government of the two provinces that are to be created on the 1st day of July next—if these Bills get through the House before the 1st of July next, there seems to be some little doubt about that at the rate they are going; however, when the two provinces are inaugurated and each sends twenty-five representatives to their legislature for the purpose of taking care of their provincial interests, these men will represent every section of those two great provinces, they will understand the local conditions, they will understand the requirements of the people who are residing there and who are coming in to settle; and when they meet together in their provincial legislatures I am of the opinion that if the lands were given to the provinces, these 25 men in each legislature would be well able to administer them in the interests of the people; and if, after due consideration, they decided that the best policy was to give the lands free to the settlers, or if they adopted that policy and it was found after experience that a small charge should be placed upon the land, then it would be for them to do as they wish; and if these representatives did not adopt a policy in the best interests of the people, the electors would take care of them when they went back for re-election. So they would have the matter entirely in their own hands, they would have an opportunity of developing the country and appropriating their lands in the way they considered best. Men can go into those provinces now and receive free grant lands; but in five years from to-day it may be considered prudent that the new settler should contribute a small amount per acre for his land. I do not think that would be a very harsh provision, the proceeds would go towards helping the settlers. This would bring in a considerable amount of money to the provincial treasury, and if they did not have the land they would have the money. I think it was stated the other day by the Minister of the Interior that the new provinces would require an enormous amount of money to build their roads and other purposes, and it would be for them to say whether it would not be good policy to derive some revenue from the lands. If these lands were given to the provinces, as I think they should be, they would still form part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada, they would be given to the sons and daughters of the people who live in older Canada, men who are going from other parts to help develop that country. I do not think that the federal government at Ottawa is in the better position to administer and control these lands, and to adopt the best policy for the settlement of that country. I am rather inclined to think that a provincial government would be in a better position to administer the lands for the best interests of the country. Therefore I am not in favour of clause 20 of this Bill. I submit that in my humble opinion the policy of giving the lands to the provinces as they were given in Ontario and Quebec, would offer a stronger inducement to people to go out and settle there. I think it would be one of the very best policies that could be adopted by this government for the further settlement of that western country.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. If it be true, as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Blain) states, that it is possible we may be discussing this Bill until the 1st day of July, there is one feature of this Bill that I think we might spend a good deal of the intervening time in considering, and which affords one reason why the Dominion should own the lands in the Northwest instead of handing them over to the provinces. As you know, Mr. Chairman, there is a large extent of territory in both of those to-be-provinces of what is called arid lands; but these lands, when they are properly irrigated become the most fertile and productive lands we have in the Northwest. It is true also that in the neighbouring state of Montana, there is a large amount of the same kind of land. Now in order to carry out this irrigation scheme it is necesasry to have a sufficient amount of water to irrigate these lands. It so happens that there are two of

the most important rivers which have their sources in the United States, one of these is the St. Mary and the other is the Milk river. Both these rivers have their sources in the United States and run into our territory, and from these rivers we derive the water which will be required to irrigate those lands.

Now, when we started to do this, and to draw water from the Milk river which runs for over 200 miles in our territory and then finds its way back again into the United States, the American government found fault with us for doing this and difficulties arose. I wish now to draw your attention particularly to this fact, because in my opinion it is one of the most important features connected with this Bill. When the American government found out that we undertook to draw water from this river they said it should not be done. They sent delegates down here to the Dominion government to protest against our doing anything of the kind and said that they owned these waters themselves inasmuch as the source of this river was in the United States. If we had the provinces owning the so-called arid lands, and they undertook to draw water from these rivers about which there is dispute, we would not be able to handle the difficulty in the same manner as we would if it was owned by the Dominion of Canada alone. How does the matter stand? When they found that we were going to take water from the Milk river they protested against it and said that they had a prior claim themselves, because they had undertaken to draw water from the sources of these rivers. Then they proposed another scheme, that they should dam the water of St. Mary lake and Milk lake and then by increasing the water hold it there, draw it through the Milk river through our territory and get a large quantity of water to supply the valleys of the Milk river in Montana with water. When they tried to arrange that matter with our officers the scheme fell through. Then the secretary of the interior of the United States took the matter up along with the present president of the United States, and intimated that he would pursue a more vigorous policy, and that they would guard their own interests. The result is that $1,000,000 was set apart by the United States government in order that they might dam the waters of these two lakes in the United States, and then if no arrangements could be made with the Canadian government whereby they could take the water through the Milk river and into the United States in Montana, they would take the water and divert it from our rivers entirely, bringing it into one of their own streams, the Cut Bank creek, and then into another the Maria river, and then dig a canal and take it through the lower waters of the Milk river to supply their own territory with water, depriving us of our supply. Now you see here is the very important feature of this matter and it is necessary that we should guard against any difficulty of that kind. They now propose that Mr. Grunskie, a reclamation engineer shall inspect the sources of these rivers, inspect our irrigation arrangements in Canada and then report to the United States government who shall see what terms they shall mete out to us. We are all anxious—I am, and I believe every one is —that we should live on friendly terms with the United States, but you know, and the House knows, that the United States has not always treated us in the most friendly manner possible. You must bear in mind that they purchased the Alaskan territory, not because they wanted that territory, not because they had any necessity for it themselves, but because they wanted to deprive us of as large a portion of the seashore on the Pacific as they possibly could and prevent us having any harbours on that coast if they could avoid it. We have not treated the United States in that manner I can assure you. When they had their civil war we sent at least 30,000 of our men over there who fought for the freedom of the United States under the Stars and Stripes, and to-day the bones of hundreds of our brave sons lie bleaching on the plains of Tennessee and Kentucky, where they died fighting for the cause of the Union. And when the American government wanted to bring armed troops through our territory from Detroit to Buffalo we allowed them to go over our old Great Western Railway without any trouble whatever. On the other hand, when we had our little difficulty in the Northwest and wanted to take armed troops up through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, how did they treat us? They said: No, we will not allow you to take armed troops through our canals. The consequence was we had to debark our troops, convey them across the portage, and embark them again causing great inconvenience, expense and delay. That is the way we have treated the United States. Now you know how the American government is trying to treat us. If they propose to treat us in the same manner in this case as they have done on previous occasions, I think it is time to look about and to see if it is not advisable that the Dominion government should own these lands, so that if difficulties of this kind arise as they are almost certain to, we would be in a position to handle them without any trouble, and instead of the United States government having to treat with two or three provinces in the Northwest it would be able to treat directly with the Dominion government and we shall see that our rights are properly protected and that no undue advantage is taken of us by the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior if he can give us

any idea of the acreage of unsold land in these two new provinces? In the return we have the acreage in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia, some 122,309,000. Has he any information to give us on that subject?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the Minister of the Interior will allow me. If my hon. friend will look at sessional paper 97 on page 3 he will find there the information he requires. He will find that in Alberta there are 38,160,964 acres.

Mr. SPROULE. I have that. But are the three provinces all included in the two new provinces?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any portion of Athabaska?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. How much?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All of Athabaska.

Mr. SPROULE. There is none of Franklin or Mackenzie, which is 155,600 more; that would be approximately 277,000,000 acres of land in the two provinces that is still unsold. Does not the minister see that we have recognized that the beneficial ownership of that land is recognized by us—as being vested in this because we agree to pay them practically a certain interest upon $37,500,000, which is at the rate of $1.50 per acre on 25,000,000 acres. We take 25,000,000 acres out of nearly 278,000,000 acres and say we value that at $1.50 an acre, and we are now going to pay you on that annually 1 per cent until the population reaches 400,000, or $375,000 a year; thereafter until the population reaches 800,000 we will pay you at the rate of 1½ per cent or $562,000 a year; thereafter until the population reaches 1,200,000, two per cent or $750,000 a year, afterwards three per cent or $1,112,500 a year, and an addition annually for five years of one-quarter of one per cent for building purposes, or $94,500 a year. We are practically giving them at the maximum, a fraction over three per cent of the money that would be realized by the sale of 25,000,000 acres of that land at $1.50 per acre. I suppose the people of the west will in time come to say to us: You have taken 25,000,000 acres but there are 125,000,000 acres left; we ought to have some interest and some rights in that land but you have allowed us nothing for it; you only gave us a very small interest upon 25,000,000 acres valued at $1.50 per acre, and most of which would sell to-day at from $3 to $5 per acre. I assume that the people of the west will not long be satisfied with this financial arrangement, nor will they regard the federal government as having done full justice to them. I take it that in the near future they will set up other claims against us. I see herein another return that each province is supposed to contain 75,000,000 acres of arable land and grazing land—I wonder if that is grazing land or grazing and agricultural land combined, because there is no distinction made between them in the return. At all events it would indicate that there are to-day 150,000,000 acres of good land there and if we deduct 25,000,000 acres from that, it would appear that we have taken 125,000,000 acres from the provinces and given them nothing in return. I have no doubt that will be their claim after a while. From whatever standpoint you view it, it seems to me we are only building up arguments for the people of these two provinces to appeal to us on in the near future, either for additional financial aid or for some compensation in lieu of the land.

Mr. BARKER. It appears to me that this clause 20, dealing with the lands, is an example of that which runs throughout the whole of the Bill. The government seem to have been concerned to find some means to do, not what the interest of the province or of the Dominion requires, so much as what party exigencies demand. We find that from the beginning to end of this whole measure; history is knocked endways, dates are upset and everything is done to fit in alleged facts to certain intentions of the government. I would like to call attention to what I think is really before us. In my opinion it was the intention of the British North America Acts, 1867 and 1871, that when any portion of the Territories became so far developed as to justify provincial status, it was not merely the privilege but it was the duty of this parliament to confer such status upon that portion of the territory. It was not only our duty to do that but we were not at liberty to add anything which could hamper new provinces in the enjoyment of such provincial rights. What do we find here? We find south of the 55th parallel of latitude, three districts, Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia, all of a somewhat similar nature and developed very much in the same degree. They would constitute, so far as area is concerned, a compact province of reasonable dimensions; a little larger than Ontario and not quite so large as Quebec. The government, instead of granting the wishes of these districts and constituting out of them a new province, chooses for its own purpose apparently—because I cannot see any other purpose in it—to add to these provinces a territory that is yet undeveloped, that requires perhaps the nursing and administration of the Dominion. It adds that territory to these three developed districts, cuts the whole area in two parts and says: You have got in each province something that requires fos-

tering and care, and therefore we will not give you the control of your lands. The government thus set up a condition of things to palliate their desire to withhold from the provinces the reasonable control of their own lands. I have not heard from any hon. gentleman opposite one word of explanation why these new provinces should be obliged to take in undeveloped Athabaska, a territory of over 200,000 square miles in which we are told there are only 242 white people. Why should that territory be added to this developed territory which is itself entitled to provincial status, unless it be to enable the government to say: Oh, you cannot have your lands, we must develop these undeveloped portions. If there had been no such desire on the part of the government I doubt if we should have heard a word as to withholding from the three older districts the administration of their own lands. What other excuse has been given? We heard from the Prime Minister that in the interests of immigration it was essential that the Dominion should retain control of the lands because the new provinces might act adversely to the interests of the Dominion as a whole in that regard. That was an extraordinary reason to come from the Prime Minister. Section 95 of the British North America Act provides for such a case and in a way which leaves no room whatever for any question on the part of the Dominion. That section provides:

> In each province the legislature may make laws in relation to agriculture in the province, and to immigration into the province; and it is hereby declared that the parliament of Canada may, from time to time, make laws in relation to agriculture in all or any of the provinces and to immigration into all or any of the provinces——

So, stopping there for a moment, you will see that even if we gave all this territory to these new provinces, it would not deprive this parliament of its power to legislate as regards agriculture and immigration. The province could legislate and we could legislate. So that we could take care of the Dominion interest. But the clause goes further:

> ——and any law of the legislature of a province relative to agriculture or to immigration shall have effect in and for the province, as long and as far only as it is not repugnant to any Act of the parliament of Canada.

So that the very reason that was given by the First Minister for removing from the control of the province the administration of its lands is provided for in the British North America Act. That was the one reason given in all this debate that seemed to have anything in it to justify the withdrawal from the province of the control of its lands; and section 95 seems to have been most thoughtfully provided for the purpose of meeting such a case. If there is any other reason why this new province should not have the control of its lands we would like to hear it, because the reason that has been given is absolutely without foundation. The Minister of the Interior, who is familiar with this clause, could perhaps tell us some other reason than that given by the First Minister; for it seems to me, after reading section 95 of the British North America Act, that there is no reason whatever in what the First Minister has told us. Until the Minister of the Interior gives us some other reason it seems to be our duty, in constituting this new province, to give the province full control over its lands.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think the hon. member for Hamilton is very innocent if he does not see what the real reason of this legislation in regard to the public lands is. The real object of this Bill is to carry out a contract by which the government seeks to impose an unpopular school system on the two provinces of the west. To do that, in the first place, they interfere with the boundaries of the provinces. Athabaska is taken in in order that the two legislatures may be constituted with a certain political complexion; in the next place, the schedule of constituencies, as outlined, has a very distinct object, and that is to secure two legislatures, if at all possible, that will endorse this obnoxious school legislation; and, in the third place, the government are keeping control of the lands for the political power which it gives them in the elections which are to come off in those provinces. That is the object of this legislation, especially with regard to the lands. The government, with their agents, will be masters of the situation. They will have land agents administering the land laws, and these agents can intimidate the settlers just as they wish. These land agents will be political agents and nothing else; they will be there in the interest of the government. Their whole energies in the forthcoming provincial elections, if they are ever held, of which I have some doubt, will be devoted to the object of electing two legislatures that will pass such school legislation which, once passed, will be fastened on those provinces for all time. Any one can realize what the power of the government will be in those provinces, with the full control of these lands. They will have the granting of patents to the settlers; and especially the large foreign element which is in a portion of the constituency of the Minister of the Interior, can be handled by the land agents, as they are called, but the political agents, as I would call them, of the government. In that way there will be two legislatures elected that will try to fasten this obnoxious school system on these two provinces. That, to my mind, is the main object of this Bill, and that is the reason the government propose to retain control of the lands. Why are not the men of the Northwest making the fight they did in the old

days to have the lands reserved for the people of that country? Why are they abandoning the old claim of the Territories to have the possession of their own lands? For years they stumped the Northwest in support of the demand that the provinces, when created, should have the complete ownership of their lands, and not only the lands, but the mines. Now they propose to surrender all these to this government. I pointed out the other day that the people of the Northwest should control the lands if for no other purpose than to control the supplies of fuel, which are essential to the development of the country. But as it is, the coal lands, as all others, will be in the hands of this government, who will be free to alienate them and hand them over to corporations of all kinds, so that the people of the Northwest, instead of getting cheap fuel, will have to pay extortionate prices for it. That is not what the people of the west desire. They have expressed themselves on this subject time after time, and in the mouths of gentlemen who to-night are silent on this question, and who, I believe, are ignoring the instructions given to them by the voters of the two new provinces. We even heard the Minister of the Interior in the old days claiming that the settlers of the west ought to own their own lands. Now the song is: We want the Dominion to own them in order that it may develop our country. I do not see that that argument fits the case at all. On the contrary, the policy of those hon. gentlemen from the west to-day is against the interests of that country. That policy is dictated solely by a political reason, and I think they will hear from the west before this debate is through.

Mr. OLIVER. We have heard.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. In what way?

Mr. OLIVER. From Edmonton.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Some sessions ago the hon. gentleman wanted the lands for the people. At that time he was speaking the sentiments of the people, but he certainly is not to-day. His sole object now is to help the Liberal party, and he and his colleagues on that side from the Northwest are willing to rob the people of that country of their undeniable right to own and control their own land.

Mr. SCOTT. What did Edmonton say?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It said it wanted the control of the lands by the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I think these hon. gentlemen will find that when the people are given the opportunity, they will say they want what should belong to them. If a man has a farm, he wants to keep that for himself; and just as sure as we are here, an agitation will begin in the west and grow and grow until the people get control of their own land. They will insist on being put in the same position as the other provinces and not be treated as wards, incapable of self-government, incapable of making their own school laws and administering their own public lands. This whole Bill it intended for the one express purpose, and that is to fasten this vexatious school legislation on the people. In order to do that, the government are treating the people as wards, not competent to make their own laws on education, or administer their own lands, or have a voice in the fixing of the boundaries of their own provinces. In the same way also Manitoba is being punished for its course on the school question. Everything that is taking place in connection with this Bill, has its origin in the school policy and has for its object the forcing of that obnoxious policy on the people. Are not the people in the west capable of administering their own lands just as well as this Dominion government? In my opinion they could administer them much better and create out of them a great reserve fund which would save them from taxation for years. But if this Bill passes, they will have to resort to municipal taxation of all kinds to enable them to carry on their own affairs and will be dependent on this government for whatever income they may get. What we should do instead is give these provinces a fair start and then let them manage for themselves. The First Minister declared that he was completing the freedom of the Northwest. Well, there never was a province so hampered as these two are going to be. They are to be cribbed, cabined and confined in every sense of the term, and by men who have always posed as the advocates of their rights. If the people had control of their own public lands, they might find in them a means of freeing themselves from the tyranny of the railway companies or from any railway monopoly. I am not in favour myself of giving land bonuses to railways, but a solution of the great transportation problem might be found in the control by the provinces of their own lands. But under this Bill, these lands are to be administered by the Dominion.

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition reneated this afternoon some remarks which he had made on several previous occasions. He appears very much concerned because he thinks a doubt has been expressed on this side that should these new provinces be given possession of their lands, they might some day make a mistake. Well, it is the hon. gentleman himself who has made a mistake. He has attributed that doubt to the wrong partner. It is held by his own follower, the hon. gentleman from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and not by any one on this side. Last year the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) told the House that every legis-

lature in Canada was corrupt and turning handsprings with the public resources, and he gave that as reason why new provincial legislatures should be endowed with public resources. We cannot expect that versatile gentleman, however, to keep in his mind one day what he said the day previous or to be guided by any fixed principle; and when he talks about some ulterior, dark, hidden political purpose animating the present government, no one in this House really takes him seriously. Had he taken the trouble to look up the records, he would have found that there have been other governments in this country which have dealt with this same matter of public lands. More than twenty years ago, there was a Conservative government in this country, led by the late Sir John Macdonald, and that government dealt with the public lands in a new province. Does the hon. member for South York think that the late Sir John Macdonald had any ulterior, political motive in the policy he then pursued?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He may have had.

Mr. SCOTT. I have here a portion of the record on that subject, contained in the journals of Manitoba for 1884. I find here the report of the subcommittee of the Ottawa government, which reads as follows:

After having very fully discussed with the delegates all the points embraced in the said memo and the other matters referred to, report as follows:

That following the order of the memo of instructions the delegates urged with great earnestness:

1st. The right of the province to the control, management and sale of the public lands within its limits, for the public uses thereof, and the mines, minerals, wood and 'timber thereon, or an equivalent therefor, and to receive from the Dominion government payment for the lands already disposed of by them within the province less cost of surveys and management.' And they, the subcommittee, have given to all the views advanced by the delegates in support of this claim the fullest consideration, and with every desire to meet their wishes as far as possible, in the general interests of the Dominion cannot advise Council to recommend to parliament to grant this request.

The lands of Manitoba hold a very different position in relation to the Dominion government, from the lands of the other provinces.

This applies with equal force to the lands of the Northwest Territories.

Shortly after the union of the old provinces, the government formed from that union purchased at a large price in cash, all the rights, titles and interests of the Hudson Bay Company in and to the territory out of which the province of Manitoba has been formed. It incurred further a very large expenditure to obtain and hold this territory in peaceable possession, and at a still further cost which is continuous and perpetual, is extinguishing Indian titles and maintaining the Indians, so that the Dominion government has a very large pecuniary interest in the soil which does not exist in respect to any other of the confederated provinces.

Further on I find the following:

Parliament pledged its faith to the world that a large portion of those lands should be set apart for free homesteads to all coming settlers, and another portion to be held in trust for the education of their children.

This was a statement of the government of Sir John Macdonald that parliament was not free to transfer these lands to the local government of any province without attaching to them the condition that the free homesteading policy should be continued:

No transfer could, therefore, be made, without exacting from the province the most ample securities that this pledged policy should be maintained; hence in so far as the free lands extend there would be no monetary advantage to the province, whilst a transfer would most assuredly seriously embarrass all the costly immigration operations which the Dominion government is making mainly in behalf of Manitoba and the Territories.

The great attraction which the Canadian government now offers, the impressive fact to the mind of the men contemplating immigration is that a well known and recognized government holds unfettered in its own hand the lands which it offers free, and that that government has its agencies and organizations for directing, receiving, transporting and placing the immigrant upon the homestead which he may select. And if the immigration operations of the Dominion, which involve so large a cost, is to have continued success and to be of advantage to Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, your subcommittee deem it to be of the utmost importance that the Dominion government shall retain and control the lands which it has proclaimed free to all comers. Were there other considerations of sufficient force to induce them to recommend this transfer to Manitoba, and as a consequence and by precedent the surrender to the provinces to be created from the Northwest Territory, all the lands within their boundaries, then they would advise that the provinces holding the lands should conduct their own immigration operations at their own expense.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. From what is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. SCOTT. From the journals of the assembly of Manitoba for 1884.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman read what follows—what the people said in answer to that?

Mr. SCOTT. I think I have read sufficient.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Well, if the hon. gentleman will give me the page, we will have some one else read it.

Mr. SCOTT. It is page 142 of the journals of the provincial assembly of Manitoba, 1884. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) dispute that the portion I have read conveys the real meaning of the report of that subcommittee?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want the answer to it that the people of Manitoba gave.

Mr. SCOTT. Was the action of the government of 1884 not in accordance with that report? Of course it was, and the lands were withheld from the province of Manitoba. I do not say that I agree with every sentiment expressed in this report. But our friends opposite are extremely suspicious of the intention of the present government in dealing with this subject in the same way as their predecessors dealt with it. Are the suspicions of hon. gentlemen opposite based on their experience of twenty years ago? The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) made some reference for the fourth or fifth time, to the idea that the government here is going to the United States for a precedent. And he spoke for the fourth or fifth time of the British practice with regard to lands and put the question: What would have been the result with regard to the northern half of the North American continent if the British practice of many years ago had not been changed. The obvious answer is that the British Crown would have lost British North America as she lost the thirteen American colonies. But it seems to me that the cases put by the leader of the opposition are not parallel, and, if my hon. friend will look further into the matter, I think he will agree with that view. What did the United States do? Immediately they obtained their independence, the first thing they did was to provide for control of all lands throughout the United States by the central government. I think that is sufficient proof that the cases are not parallel.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) to say that the United States government held control of all the lands?

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that to be the case, with the exception of perhaps the state of Texas.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Outside of the original states.

Mr. SPROULE. Did the United States government hold the lands in the state of Michigan?

Mr. SCOTT. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) states that they held it outside of the original states.

Mr. SPROULE. Let me understand. Was Michigan one of the original states?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. SPROULE. Because, I lived in Michigan for a time, and I never heard or knew anything of the United States government, holding the lands. When a man got land he got it from the local agent of the state government.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly the states west of the Mississippi river do not have control of their own land. In those states the lands are controlled by the federal government. I was going on to say that if I could get satisfaction as to how our local governments were going to carry on their business without the amount of money paid in lieu of the lands—even if the lands were to be transferred absolutely, without string on them—certainly with the string suggested by the leader of the opposition and stated to be necessary by the report I have just read, that the provincial government must maintain the free homestead policy, the local government's difficulty in obtaining revenues would be greater,—I, for my part, would have less objection to the local government assuming the responsibility of administering these lands.

Mr. SPROULE. The report the hon. gentleman read laid down the principle in regard to the Manitoba lands, that the government were bound to the world to give free homesteads. That would take away half the land, but we would hold the other half. Could not the province do exactly the same thing, giving every alternate section as a free homestead and reserving the others for sale?

Mr. SCOTT. Will the hon. gentleman tell me that after giving away the even numbered sections as free homesteads the local government will get enough out of the odd numbered sections to enable them to carry on their business? Parliament has had these lands in its control for thirty-five years and its experience so far is that, with the free settlement policy, it has not made a cent out of the lands, in fact it is about $1,000,000 behind. I have a calculation to show the amount that these new provinces will receive in the next thirty-five years under the arrangement proposed by the government. In the first place it is proposed in the resolution that the sum of $937,500 is to be paid to the two provinces as a special grant from the land fund for public buildings within the next five years. Then, within the same period the two governments will receive as ordinary land subsidy, $3,750,000. And if, at the end of five years it is found that the population of each province has increased to 400,000 souls, which is altogether likely, in the succeeding five years the two provinces will receive a total of $5,625,000 from the lands. I calculate that, at the end of that period of five years the population of each province will be 800,000, in which case, in the next period, they will receive $7,500,000 for the two provinces. If, at the end of that period, the population has increased to 1,200,000, the payments will amount, within the next period of five years, to $11,125,000. Then in the fifth period the amount will be equal, $11,125,000. In the sixth period the same, in the seventh period the same, bringing us

up to the end of the thirty-fifth year with a total amount of $59,301,250, roughly $60,000,000 in the thirty-five years. I venture to say that the provinces, even if they obtained the land unreservedly and carried out the free homesteading intention to a reasonable extent, and the settlement policy which is in force at the present time, could not hope to obtain such an amount of money in that period. We heard the leader of the opposition say the other day that his suggestion to hand the lands over to the provinces with a restriction as to prices, was only an alternative suggestion,—that it was only in the event of there being danger in doing otherwise that he would ask the people of the province to consent to accept the lands and give an agreement to continue the free homestead policy with regard to the even numbered sections and the low-settlement-price policy with regard to the odd numbered sections. Well, Sir, it struck me as peculiar that the hon. gentleman was willing to invade provincial autonomy to that extent, and that he should be unwilling to do the same thing with regard to schools. Now, I say in all sincerity that I think the people would much more readily agree to the limitation upon their autonomy that is being put upon them in relation to the subject of education, than they would be willing to agree to such a limitation of their autonomy as the leader of the opposition has suggested with regard to their substantial resources.

Mr. SPROULE. They would like freedom in both.

Mr. SCOTT. The verdict of Edmonton was not to that effect, as I have pointed out. If there was any reason to prevent hon. gentlemen going to Edmonton to lay down their school policy, that reason could not apply with regard to the land policy, because the interests of Roman Catholics and Protestants must be precisely identical with regard to the lands. The sentiment of the people of the Northwest is that the school question which we have discussed is a very immaterial matter. The letter that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) read the other evening, and which he said came from a prominent Liberal in his district, is a proof that the people of the Northwest Territories consider the school issue as being an immaterial matter, they consider the land question as far more important. If there is any difference of opinion in the Northwest Territories, the matter of the land is looked upon as a very much more serious one than the matter of the schools. There was no reason in the world why the hon. gentlemen should not have gone up to Edmonton and presented their land policy. Some hon. gentlemen rather jeered when I mentioned Edmonton. What objection have they against the verdict of the people of Edmonton? Is it not a fact that the leader of the opposition, before the Minister of the Interior was appointed, got up himself and suggested that the district of Edmonton was a proper district in which to ask for a verdict of the people of the Northwest Territories upon the question of autonomy?

Mr. SPROULE. In the language of the boy on the street, that is too thin.

Mr. FOSTER. I have been listening ever since this debate commenced two months ago to try if possible to get at the reasons why members from the Northwest, including the present Minister of the Interior, were not in favour of the provinces having their own public lands; and so far as I can see now one of the chief reasons has been defined by the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Scott). They would like to have the lands, they would like to have the whole outfit for the provinces, but they do not like to assume the responsibilities. They want to be men full grown, but they don't quite know whether they could walk if they were left alone. They would like to have the full birthright, but the little mess of pottage which is handed out to them just now is so enticing that they would rather lap that up and let the future take care of itself. Now the financial policy and the land policy are closely joined. The speech that has been made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat shows that if it was not for the financial difficulty he would like to take the lands, and the west would like to have their lands, would like to be full-blooded in that respect, have all their rights, but they don't quite see how they could raise the money for the present and current expenses of the provincial governments. My objection to the matter as it stands is on two grounds, first, because these terms are not arranged on any ground of principle. There is no well grounded principle upon which the whole financial system with reference to these two provinces has been reared. The other ground of objection is that there is no finality to it. I think every member on either side of this House, must feel that there is no finality in this arrangement. Neither province will be satisfied if it does not have what really belongs to it. When either province is fully organized what will it have? It will have no control over its timber lands, it will have no control over its mineral lands, it will have no control over its prairie lands, it will have no control over its agricultural lands, it will have no control over its irrigable lands, it will have no control over its grazing lands. What is there but the mere skeleton of a province, in so far as regards the vast possessions which are yet undeveloped in each one of these territories? Not over a single acre or foot of all the soil which is yet unalienated will either of these provinces have any rights at all, so far as these rights are concerned in ownership. What have they, then? They have the name of

a province, they have the municipal work of a province to legislate for, they have the small provincial functions of road building and bridge building, the duties and responsibilities which belong to the ordinary routine management. They have that. But there is not a foot of their soil, not an acre of their resources outside of what are possessed now by the inhabitants of that country, not one acre of this, not one foot of that will belong to them. So I say it is against human nature to suppose that these two provinces will be satisfied with this settlement. From the very moment they begin to be provinces they will commence an agitation which dissatisfaction will arouse, and which dissatisfaction will push further each year, and it will be reinforced by their necessities which will constantly grow. So I say this feeling will grow as the provinces grow, it will be accentuated by their necessities ; as their population increases demands upon them will become greater. They will feel more and more that in the first place they were defrauded of their full heritage, that they have not got what actually belonged to them, that consequently they are not a full and independent province, and they will not rest until they get these rights. As my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. R. L. Borden) well observed, the longer the thing goes on the greater the dilemma, and the more the difficulty there will be. Therefore I say these provinces will not be satisfied, because they will feel from the first that they have not power over their own belongings.

Suppose you take the converse of it and the argument is shown with greater strength. Suppose a proposition were made in this House to-day to take over the lands of the other provinces of the Dominion to administer them and assume all the cost of administration and take all the profits of administration. Is there a single province in the Dominion which would look upon a proposition like that as being fair, which would admit it for a single moment. The argument is not a bit stronger by reason of their being now already full-fledged provinces and in possession of their lands, than it is with reference to the new provinces from which you would withhold what every old province has and possesses in its own right, from which you withhold what the British North America Act considers to be and contemplates as the possession of a province. Simply because you hold the lands at the present time and refuse to give them up the argument is not a bit stronger in the one case than it is in the other and the injustice of it will be equally felt. Every year that these provinces are provinces, while this condition of things with refenence to their lands prevails they will feel more and more that they are marked off from their sister provinces, that they have not the resources and not the powers and consequently not the full rights which their sister provinces have. These feelings will become seeds of dissatisfaction which will grow and spread and ripen into the harvest of desire and of a constant agitation until the desire be realized that they shall have their own birthright and their own lands. As I said before you can hardly approach the question of lands without approaching the financial question as well and that is the crux of the whole matter. As my hon. friend has said, they would like to have their lands but they do not see how they are to get their money. As far as that is concerned it seems to me there must be some way in which that difficulty could be met. Taking all the information which I got from the Minister of the Interior and from the return which was brought down it seems that the grain growing, irrigating, ranching and general farming lands in the areas of the two provinces which are to be formed will amount to 294,000,000 acres, in round numbers. No one can say just how much of that will be agricultural land, just how much will be good grazing land, just how much will be land which proper irrigation will make very valuable and very desirable, but the whole of it is returned as above. The total area, as I said, is 294,000,000 acres, deducting the water acreage. Alienated lands have been returned as 65,000,000 and if you subtract the 65,000,000 from the 294,000,000 it will give you about 228,000,000 or 228,500,000 of lands belonging to one or other of these categories. As I said before, it would not probably be wise to prophesy just how much of that would be excellently good land, how much worthless, and how much would come between the two ; but judging from our experience in the Northwest Territories and as our knowledge has progressed it is possible that we may ourselves be surprised to discover what a very large proportion of these lands are really serviceable lands, suitable for agricultural, farming and grazing purposes. If that be true—and I think we are not pushing the matter too far to take that as fairly true—you will have an acreage of 228,000,000 of this serviceable or fairly serviceable land. That is an immense patrimony. Suppose you leave the odd-numbered sections still to be used for immigration purposes, for settlement purposes as an inducement to the outside world for speedier, better and more rapid settlement, suppose you leave that to be deducted from the amount which still remains, you have still the immense acreage of 114,000,000 or 115,000,000 acres of land which would be at your disposal. No one thinks or suggests that these are lands that you could put into the market and sell now, but let us take the history of the past which should throw some light on the history of the future. Twenty years ago in that western country along the main line

of the Canadain Pacific Railway and up there where there were no lines, but where to-day there are lines stretching parallel and crosswise at the present time there was great doubt if large proportions of these lands were good agricultural lands. Within twenty years out of those areas which are well known now, but were not then so well known, the proportion of really good land has risen very high indeed, and the proportion of really unserviceable land has diminished almost to a minimum quantity so that in these large areas now better explored and better known there is very little of what you might call waste land; the greater part of it is land which is valuable for what it will actually produce and which becomes more valuable as railway and transport facilities are brought every year nearer to it. You have to take the same possible progression of things in connection with the northern part of the old provisional districts and the new provisional district which you have taken in and as year after year passes, in the course of fifteen, twenty or twenty-five years, how much of that land of which I have spoken, lying farther to the north in the old provisional districts and in the one to the north of the Saskatchewan will become absolutely as good and as valuable, treated generally as the same quantity of lands farther to the south ? You will say there are arid belts in the northern portion and so there were said to be arid belts in the southern portion. There is no doubt that there are, but the arid belts that were thought so serious a few years ago in the southern portion do not have any great depressing influence on us now when we forecast the future of that country. Whether the seasons have changed, whether agriculture has done its work in to a certain extent changing conditions there, we cannot tell the reason, but these are the facts of the case, that the area of what was thought to be unserviceable or arid land has gradually and constantly receded and the area of what is serviceable and useful has gradually and continually grown. I think that probably the same change and the same course of events which has taken place with reference to the southern portion of it will take place with reference to the northern portion of it, so that the whole trend of my argument is that we have not by any means exhausted the serviceable land, and in the areas which are to be put in these two great provinces if you allow the same progress and development to go on in the future as in the past with accelerated rapidity as will be the case twenty or twenty-five years, we will see not only the area of serviceable land largely extended, but the area of transport facilities equally as largely extended and consequently the value of the lands will become greatly enhanced.

There is the patrimony which, I think, ought to belong to these provinces ; there is the patrimony which to-day you are selling for $37,500,000, and you are selling it for $37,500,000, why ? Simply because you do not see how you are going to finance your province through unless you take the ready cash and give up your patrimony. Is there not another way ? I have no doubt there is. Suppose a business corporation had 228,000,000 acres of that land, would it be an impossible thing for that corporation to set off a certain proportion and to raise money upon these lands for actual current purposes from year to year, and hold the power of redemption of these lands, and hold the power of the management and of the sale of these lands as well ? That is not a difficult thing. My hon. friend has said that within a certain number of years that would make away with a certain number of millions of dollars. Would it be a difficult thing by way of their lands, a certain proportion of them as security, to raise that money which is necessary for the provinces in the initial period ? It is not a difficult thing for business people to do, and why should it be a difficult thing for a legislature ? But, Sir, there is another way in which it might be done, and I throw this out for what it is worth. The Dominion of Canada is proposing to pay in lieu of lands and as compensation for these lands ; it is proposing to pay, outside of all the other sums which it gives to each province, one per cent for a certain number of years on $37,500,000, and so on upwards. That is, for a certain number of years they will get $375,000 a year out of the Dominion treasury ; after that, and when the population comes up to a certain figure, they will be paid each year from the Dominion treasury $562,500, after that for another certain period $750,000, and after that they will be paid for all time $1,125,000 per year. Would it be a difficult thing, in the interest of both the Dominion and of those provinces, that the Dominion should undertake to advance that amount of money for that length of time—just exactly the amount it is proposed to give now—and that it should hold in trust as security for that money a certain number of acres of the lands of these provinces set off in certain divisions ? Suppose, for argument's sake, you were to set off 25,000,000 acres of land for one of the provinces out of your 228,000,000 ; set off 25,000,000 acres of fairly serviceable lands, and suppose that you should hold these lands without having any necessity placed upon you to sell from year to year under present conditions and at the present price ; suppose that you could hold these lands, selling as the price suited you (the price coming up to a good fair amount alongside of your settled portions), selling a certain number of acres of these lands each year, as much as you deem prudent and wise, but not by necessity forced to sell them, and so on, for a period of ten or fifteen years ; do you not think that the rise in the price of the lands from $1.50 an

acre, which is now the upset price, would become so much greater that it would be worth while to make some arrangement by which you could husband these lands until they became more valuable, and at the same time provide for your current expenditure during that time? And in the end, when your lands did become valuable, you would have the patrimony which would last, not only for your necessities of ten or fifteen years, but would be an endowment which would largely meet your necessities for all time to come. Take, for instance, a calculation—you may vary it according to your practical view—But I take this as not being far out of the way: Suppose you were to set aside 25,000,000 acres of land and keep them for ten years. Am I right or wrong in saying that that 25,000,000 acres of land, after the progress of ten years, with your railway building, your increased settlement, your homesteading, your development; am I wrong in saying that those lands would rise to the value on an even basis of $6 per acre?

Mr. LAMONT. Might I ask the hon. gentleman just what that would include? Would it include the even-numbered sections as well as the odd-numbered sections?

Mr. FOSTER. It is a matter of arrangement.

Mr. LAMONT. Would the hon. gentleman allow settlement on these 25,000,000 acres?

Mr. FOSTER. I should think it would be a wise thing to provide that settlers would percolate through the part you set aside and get their 160-acre free homesteads, and thereby become the absolutely necessary purchasers for the lands you held close by.

Mr. LAMONT. Has not the great grievance of the Northwest settlers been that they could only settle on the even-numbered sections, and is not the fact that they have been debarred from the odd-numbered sections a great hardship on the settlers?

Mr. FOSTER. They could buy the adjoining sections, and they are buying them now in innumerable instances. Much of that land now belongs to railway companies and other companies. But suppose a reasonable government were looking at it, they do not want to retard settlement, they do not want to charge the settler who comes there more than is reasonable, but if they have the acreage set apart and it fringes on to the homesteads that are taken by the settlers that come in, does the settler to-day in the Northwest, if he can get good land next to his homestead at $5 or $6 or $7 per acre, does he thinks he is paying too much for it? Hundreds and thousands of them are paying for it to-day, and they are glad to get it at that. I am just opening out what may be a possibility in the way of financing this matter, which would be good for both the Dominion and the provinces. But not to keep you too long; suppose at the end of ten years the land became virtually worth $6 an acre, there would be an endowment of $150,000,000, which, at 3½ per cent, would give a yearly income to you of $5,000,000. Under your present arrangement after your population gets to 1,200,000 you get $1,125,000 per year, no more and no less. There is a finality then. All your years of progress in the future bring you nothing more than that unless you sit in your seats to-day and say: We will take care of that when the time comes; we will look for better terms.

Mr. FIELDING. Why stop your land value at ten years, why not carry it on to one hundred years?

Mr. FOSTER. I am going to carry it on; I will satisfy my hon. friend in that respect, I say you have to carry on this in a reasonable way. You cannot set your 25,000,000 acres off and say you will not sell a single acre of it, but you can be careful to sell it as a reasonable price and if you can sell what you do sell, and as little as is necessary for $5 or $6 per acre, you will have the remainder of it to sell later on at an enhanced price. Suppose that you kept it for fifteen years. With the tide of progress and development going on continuously, and accelerated as it will be, is it too much to say that your land at that time will be worth $8 per acre, intrinsically worth it? If you saved a portion of it, and a considerable portion, unsold for twenty years, you would have land which would be certainly worth $10 an acre, intrinsically worth it.. If you had 15,000,000 acres left, you would have at the increased price a still larger endowment upon which you could draw for all time to come. Now, you can pick flaws in that arrangement if you please; you can settle down on the plan which you have thought out and are going to put through, or which you have not thought out still are going to put through. But it is not outside of fair financial ability and of fair practical arrangement with reference to the best interests of that country to take some such measures as that, and to raise for your present necessities, either on the security of your land, which it would pay you to do, or on some such arrangement as I have outlined with the Dominion government, what you require, and to keep your patrimony intact as a large endowment for your future needs. That would accomplish two things. The Dominion government would be lending a helping hand at the present. It would get back everything it had advanced. The government of each province would be getting what was necessary for it during the time of its adolescence, its infancy, so to speak, and it would be saving that patrimony for an enhanced endowment for the future, when it could

well afford to pay back the capital which had been advanced to it, with the small interest rate that would carry it, and it would be the better off by hundreds of millions of dollars, and not merely by tens of millions. That is not very good statesmanship, it seems to me, which starts in to-day with a plan which will tide you over the present, but which has to come to its final block sooner or later. Do you mean to say that when you get 1,200,000 people or 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 in each of those provinces, you are going to get along without your lands and a subsidy of $1,000,000 a year in lieu of your lands? What are you going to do when you get to that point? There is only one of two things that you must do; you must either come to direct taxation of the people there, or come back to this Dominion, and say to it: You put us off with a paltry 25,000,000 acres of land out of all this rich patrimony, and you allow only $1.50 per acre on it to set up housekeeping with; we come back to you now, and say it was unfair; we want our full birthright. So much for that. I listened with a great deal of attention to the Premier's criticism of the old confederation methods of settling the finances of the provinces. He criticised them. He always does criticise whatever the fathers of confederation have done. He leaves it to be inferred that if he had been a father of confederation and had lived at that time, he would have done differently. He entered into a somewhat elaborate criticism of the financial methods on which the old provinces were framed. He said: You make one set of authorities the gatherers of the money, and you make another set, the provinces, the spenders, and the spenders who do not gather it do not feel any responsibility, and consequently they are not held in check. And to-day, if there is one menace that fronts this Dominion of Canada, it is the menace of financial terms which seemingly can never be finally settled; which arises from the fact that every province has gone into competition with the Dominion in matters which it never should have taken up. Take the subsidizing of railways, for instances. For that purpose it has lavishly run into debt and lavishly expended; and when the time for payment comes, it sets its face Ottawawards, and says: We want the financial terms of this confederation opened up again. They have been opened up again and again. That is what the Prime Minister inveighed against; that is what he characterized; that is what he deplored. Well, Sir, he had a brand new slate—there was not a mark upon it. He was making too great provinces, the greatest that ever were made in this Dominion. He had only one responsibility, and no ties or bonds in arranging the financial terms of these two great provinces of the west on a better basis, such as would please himself and avoid the rocks and shoals of the old financial arrangements made by the fathers of confederation, and what is the result? He has done two things; he has violated the very system which was adopted previously in arranging the financial terms of this Dominion with these provinces. He has, on the other hand, laid down no principle and adopted no financial arrangement which has avoided the very rocks and shoals of which he spoke, and which he deprecated should have been left by the fathers of confederation. Where has he been consistent with the old terms in the matter of legislative allowance? If you take population into account, the legislative allowance is not on the same level with the legislative allowance given to the older provinces. If you take the debt allowance, there is no parity between them. If you take the subsidy based on the population allowance, the others stopped at a population of 400,000. On what principle should these have a population allowance of 800,000? And so, all through, he has not improved upon the principle, but he has violated the spirit and the letter of each of the arrangements with the old provinces. What has happened? Two things have happened. The first is that all the older provinces have already commenced their march towards Ottawa to ask for a revision of the financial terms. They say: Our expenses are increasing; we have exploited all we well can for the purpose of revenue; we want more money; you have been lavish with these new provinces, and we want you to revise our terms and give us at least the equal of what you give to them. How can the Premier after this say to the province of New Brunswick and the province of Nova Scotia, your eighty cents per head stops when you reach 400,000, when you say to Alberta and Saskatchewan your eighty cents per head does not stop until you reach 800,000. Why should not the limit be placed at 800,000 for the other provinces as well as for the these two? That is the kind of reasoning which will be relied upon; and when all the provinces join together and march upon Ottawa and demand a revision, who is to withstand that demand? Not the gentlemen who are in power to-day. Of that I feel quite certain. They will make terms at once, for party and political reasons if for no other, and there will be a vast increase in the expenditures of this Dominion in the way of subsidies to the older provinces, while on the other hand there will be no finality with regard to the west. It is as impossible as it would be to make water run up hill, to limit those two great provinces, after having kept all their land, to a million a year of revenue; if a million dollars per year, compared with their needs are not at all sufficient. And so I say that you have no finality in your arrangement with the new provinces and that you are giving to the old provinces just cause for demanding a revision. I do not suppose

that I have all the wisdom in the world, and whilst I have outlined these few suggestions as to what I think might have been done. I dare say there are gentlemen on each side of the House who will find weak spots in them ; but there is a way by which the early years of these provinces could be tided over and they could be set out on their great life race with a much more magnificent provision for their yearly expenditures than they now get under these Bills, and that is by endowing them with the lands. With reference to immigration I was sorry to hear the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—I know he did not mean it in his heart—express the view that every man who came as a settler to the Northwest was really a load on the province. You should not say that out loud. You may think it in your own heart, but keep it behind doors, because it is not politic to say to these settlers : Every one of you is a burden to us ; you make us pay out $20 a year, and we would not have to pay that if you had not come. I do not believe that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) really thinks that but he should not say it.

Mr. SCOTT. Has my hon. friend ever glanced over the communications from the Northwest government to this government within recent years ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes I have, and I have listened to my hon. friend reading the minutes of council of 1884. I do not suppose he has any great reverence for the authorities he read. These are all nice things for an argument ; they may be useful in a debating school ; they may be pitched at an opponent so as to give warrant for saying to him : I have floored you. But after all can we not come down to the principle which should guide us. I have not argued this question from a party point of view. There is nothing in my argument which I intended to be taken in that spirit. What I want is that we should do the very best we can by these great provinces. I want them to have for all the years of their future the best provisions we can give them. With regard to that immigrant, I think he is of infinitely more use to your new provinces than to the Dominion. True he pays his customs tax ; and if he be liberal in his eating and drinking and smoking, he pays some excise taxes too. But how small a proportion that is to the yearly toil he is putting into his land as a citizen of your province, adding to it two-fold, four-fold, twenty-fold, becoming a citizen who is a member of your society, who keeps up your schools and your churches, who does for himself and his family what is absolutely necessary to make a country great, who makes of himself and his family, reputable, honourable, moral, religious and progressive citizens. If that immigrant is worth $8 a year to the Dominion from a money point of view, he is worth, from all the best points of view, eighty times that to the province in which he builds his home, raises his family and rears citizens for the state. So we must not look at the question merely from the point of view of dollars and cents. But there is enough in it in dollars and cents to make the Dominion government still do its duty in the matter of immigration, even though these lands are given over to the provinces. I would not say that the Dominion government should not continue its immigration work in a reasonable and moderate way. I believe that every year from this out less will have to be spent to bring immigrants to Canada, and not many years will pass before this extraordinary expenditure may all be stopped. The men and women who will be your immigration agents will be those who have gone out to that country, who have made themselves homes there and who have spread the news of what they have done to the great outside portions of the world from which they came. Every year there will be less necessity for this immense expenditure until within a comparatively short period we will be where the United States is to-day, and instead of spending a dollar to get people to come to the country we will have to spend money to regulate the stream of immigration. There is no reason for the Dominion government giving up its efforts in the way of immigraton ; and the argument of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has not affected me in the least, regarding the likelihood of the local governments not encouraging immigration. Why should not the local governments want to get settlers into that country ? In order to build up the country you must have settlers. And these provinces propose to go ahead and therefore will be in sympathy with all well ordered immigration. Surely the people living in the atmosphere of the Northwest, who have been born and brought up there, or have lived there a number of years and are right on the spot, will know better what kind of immigrants they want, where to place them, and how to deal with them, than we who come here from all ends of the Dominion, and the majority of whom have never lived in the Northwest. It is impossible for a man born and brought up in Nova Scotia, and who has never seen the western prairies, to form any adequate idea of that country. A man requires to have visited it often or to have lived there, or to have been born and have grown up there, to appreciate it properly. Why should there be any clash between the Dominion and a well ordered province, in directing the stream of immigration. There could not be, because men are sensible and reasonable in the west as well as here. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) gave a very good legal reason why, if it were absolutely necessary, there should not be conflicting laws with reference to immigration. We have not heard a really good argument

why these provinces should be deprived of the great land possessions which lie within their borders, either as regards financial terms or immigration.

But, judge yourself what pride, what hope, what energy would be given to the great province of Alberta or Saskatchewan if it knew it had these millions of fertile acres, that it was the manager of them, that it was the trustee for its future citizens, and that out of that immense acreage, so vast and so rich a heritage, it could provide for all the wants of a great future and could administer its own. What a different feeling that would be from that which will arise when they look at the lands, at the timber, at the minerals and are compelled to say: We have nothing to do with these; they are here in our midst, and our police regulations, our municipal laws, our provincial administration conserves them and to a large extent adds to their value; but they do not belong to us, we are not permitted to have them or administer them. There is something in the pride of a country as in the pride of a man. The settler who goes to northern Ontario and takes up 160 acres of land, is told: You may have this land, but of all the timber standing up on it you shall not have one stick except what you need to build your house and barn. And he feels: This is not my farm; I have the surface soil, but what grows upon it does not belong to me. And is he satisfied? No, he is not and will not be. He has not the pride of a man who owns what he uses. The same pride and the same energy that ownership inspires would give more intense life to the province that has its complete birthright. Now, my remarks have been crude; and they may meet with favour or they may not. But such as they are, Mr. Chairman, you and hon. members on the other side of the House are perfectly welcome to them.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has taken some credit to himself—and I think he is entitled to it—for not having made a partisan speech. I wish I could congratulate him on making a speech that would tend to good understanding and goodwill throughout the Dominion. I think there can be only one conclusion reached by those who have heard the remarks of the hon. member, and that is, that he was most anxious to create dissatisfaction between the new provinces with the terms that have been granted them, and likewise to create dissatisfaction in the old provinces for the same reason.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) may say that I was anxious to do that, and I could say there was not the least trace of that anxiety in my mind. I wanted to show what were the absolute results of the policy that is being carried out. But I had no desire to sow dissension in Edmonton.

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps I have made a mistake in suggesting the hon. gentleman's motive.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman may say that my remarks will have that effect. but certainly that was not what I had in mind.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I wished to say; and I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) for giving me the right words. I think it will be agreed that that must be the effect of his remarks, so far as they have effect. I thought that the most regrettable feature of the argument was that which laid great stress on the assumption that the people of the west were deprived of their control of the timber, lands and minerals because these things were held in the ownership of the Dominion. The people of the west are citizens of the Dominion, and the ownership of these lands by the Dominion is not less ownership by the west than if that ownership rested with the provincial government. I think it is a pity that, in the stress of argument in this House, such ideas should be advanced, especially in the forceful, energetic and logical way which the hon. member (Mr. Foster) has at command. It would be most unfortunate if the people of the west should be educated into the idea that in any way they were not citizens of the Dominion, sharing in all the liberties, all the rights, all the properties of the Dominion, as they certainly do. It matters not so much whether these properties are administered by the provincial or by the Dominion government, so they be well administered, so the policy and administration is in the best interest of all the provinces. In this case it seems to me what is in the interest of the country must be in the interest of the province, and what is in the interest of the province must be in the interest of the country.

I have one criticism to offer on the point of view taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). That point of view is the same that has been taken so persistently by our friends on the other side of the House. They insist on treating this question of ownership of the lands and dealing with the lands as a matter of revenue rather than of as a matter of development. Now, in my estimation that is where they are absolutely at variance with the whole spirit of the west. The spirit of the west is that, whether these lands are given away or sold, or whatever shall be done with them, the object and aim shall be the development of those resources, the bringing of those resources into active use; the main object is not to derive a sum of money for their sale.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will permit me I would like to ask a question. I understood distinctly from his predecessor (Mr. Sifton) that the policy of this government was to make a revenue

from these lands. Argument was made and the policy distinctly announced by the ex-Minister of the Interior in the session of 1903. He said: We have 25,000,000 acres of land which will be readily disposed of, and we can sell them within ten years at $3 per acre, and in that way we can reimburse the country for more than its expenditure in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not dispute the statement, but I do dispute the inference. If the leader of the opposition will make a comparison between the statement said to have been made by the ex-Minister of the Interior in regard to the sale of these lands at a low fixed price and the suggestion made a few minutes ago by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the lands should be treated on the same principle as our school lands which are held for the purpose of squeezing the last cent of value out of them, he will realize the difference between the two policies and systems of administration; the difference between the idea held by the people out west and the idea so persistently advanced by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in this discussion. In one case the idea was that these lands should pass out of the hands of the Dominion and into the hands of the settlers. I think that idea was specifically stated in the remarks of the Minister of the Interior; certainly, it was the intention; and, inasmuch as that hon. gentleman mentioned a fixed price, whether that price should be adhered to or not, it was clear that the idea was absolutely contrary to the idea suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a word? When the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) sold for $1.50 an acre, part in money and part in scrip, a very large acreage to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, did he do it with the idea that the land should pass at the cheapest rate possible from the hands of the government into the hands of the settler? Let my hon. friend say from the information that he has whether one single acre of this land which passed for $1.50 of money and scrip to that land company, has gone into the hands of the actual settler at less then from $5 to $10 per acre. There is a practical proof of what my hon. friend's predecessor thought with reference to it. Add to that the proposition explained by my hon. friend that 50,000,000 acres could be set apart and sold in order to reimburse the cost of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and you have both the proposition and actual thing carried out, and both are against my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not gather that the sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company is at all against the proposition I laid down. The sale was made to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company at a certain price per acre, as the hon. gentleman has said, a low fixed price per acre, on condition of the lands being settled. The company which got the lands at that low price were under contract, it was a condition of purchase, that they should place settlers upon the lands, and neither he nor I have any means of knowing to what expense the company was compelled to go in securing these settlers and placing them on those lands. The essential point is to get settlers on the land, and that is a point which our hon. friends opposite seem to miss. The land as land has no value, it is worth nothing, it is the use of the land that gives the value, it is the requirement of that land by the people that gives it value. That land may stand from now till doomsday, as it has stood from the creation until now, without being of any value unless settlers go upon it and make it of value by producing wealth out of it.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend must not carry that argument too far, because the instance I cited is directly against them. The land does have value given to it by the work of the labourer. The land has a value before the labourer has put his spade into a single foot of its soil. The land that was sold for $1 or $1.50 per acre had no settlers upon it, the land that was retailed out by the go-between company had no labourer's spade or plough put into it when it had increased in value from $1.50 up to $5 or $10, but it was the prospective idea that by-and-by the real worker would come in and would raise enough from it to enable him to pay the $10 that came to the go-between. But my hon. friend has no basis, financial or otherwise for saying that there is no value in the land until the settler goes to work on it, there is.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course I do not wish to enter into an academic discussion with my hon. friend at this moment on the question between us. He must know that that particular land was not worth anything until it came into the possession of the worker. The value that it had was because of somebody having worked the land and having demonstrated that it could be worked to advantage. The ultimate increase in the value of the land does depend, not necessarily on that particular piece of land being worked, but on the possibility of its production being demonstrated by the work on land there or thereabouts, and the demand for that land that comes by reason of the presence of the settlers. The company who bought that land had to go to the expense of advertising it and of bringing settlers there. I do not know, and he does not know what the expense was, and there is where our hon. friends opposite altogether miss the point of how the value of land comes about. Our lands lay there for many years after they came under

the control of the Dominion of Canada, after we had railroads built through the country, and instead of increasing in value, if such a thing were possible they decreased in value. But they at last began to increase. We on this side of the House say it was because of the policy of the government, because of the administration of the Minister of the Interior ; they may give any other reason they like, but the fact was that the land did not increase in value until settlers came in to settle upon it. When they hold that the land was a value in itself, I say they are mistaking the point altogether. The land only has a value in so far as it is in demand by settlers. When my hon. friend made his careful calculation as to setting apart certain tracts of land, and the Dominion government advancinig money on the security of that land, he based the success of his project on the idea that the country would continue to prosper, that settlement would continue to increase, that the price of land would continue to rise. Now that supposition is all based on the success of the administration in securing progressive settlement upon the land, and if circumstances arise in which that increase of value does not continue, then his whole calculation falls to the ground. The first thing is to have such a policy and such an administration as will bring settlers into the country, as will give value to the land, as will give revenue to the Dominion, and will do all those desirable things that my hon. friend depicted as occurring if the land were in the hands of the provincial authorities. The thing is to get the settler, and the question of who administers the land is a small consideration. It is a small matter whether it is the Dominion or the province, but we say that the Dominion is in a better position to administer the lands satisfactorily and well than is the province. My hon. friend spoke of the time when these provinces would have a population of millions, and he declared that when that time came they would have their faces set towards Ottawa, and come here demanding inicreased subsidies. Otherwise they would have to resort to direct taxation, or else they would not have the funds with which to carry on the provincial government. There is a possibility such as he has spoken of. But when a few minutes after, he suggested that I was under a mistake in saying that the increase of settlement would increase the burdens of the provincial government, and went on to point out that the settler who goes into the province is a benefit to the provincial government and not a burden, that he is not a source of expenditure to the provincial government, I ask him respectfully, how he reconciles his two arguments. If so large a population is going to put the provincial government behind financially, then certainly my statement is borne out that the increase of settlement does increase the burden of provincial government. As my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has pointed out, every communication that has come from the Norhwest government to this Dominion asking for an increased subsidy from year to year has pointed out, and properly so, that the increase became necessary on account of increased settlement.

Now, I want to say a word in regard to the objections that have been persisted in by some of our hon. friends on the other side to the inclusion of the district of Athabaska in these two new provinces. Do these gentlemen not know that the province of Manitoba, this pet province of theirs, is, as we are told by the papers, on the verge of rebellion ? The government is about to resign and demand a dissolution, because that province has not had the territory to its north included within its boundaries ; and the reason that it makes these demands, the reason for the excitement in that province, is because these provinces of the west have been given the increase of territory that the province of Manitoba desires, and which every authority of our friends on the opposite side in that province declares it is entitled to and should have and cannot get along without. If the government of Manitoba is honest and sincere in its declaration that the province of Manitoba is entitled to an addition to its northern boundary—and who is there to say it is not—surely these two provinces are equally entitled to the inclusion of this territory of Athabaska. I shall not go over what has been gone over so often as to the certainties of development of that part of the district of Athabaska, which will form part of the province of Alberta. There is no reason from any point of view why that country should not be included in the new province. There is every reason, from every point of view, why it should be included in the new province.

As to the causes of offence which the other provinces have against the Dominion for the terms that have been made with these new provinces, I will take the liberty of thinking at any rate that our hon. friends who argue so eloquently, who have argued so eloquently and forcefully, for the control by these new provinces of their lands for the sake of revenue from those lands, are rather anxious to save the Dominion treasury from the payment of the subsidy which this agreement gives those provinces than to give the provinces control of their lands. I think that if the matter is discussed to a finish that will be found to be the principal trouble. As far as we in the west are concerned, we know perfectly well, we are practical people, and we know that we cannot eat our cake and have it, we know that we cannot sell our lands and give them away, and we believe that so long as the government of the Dominion pursues the policy of using the lands for purposes of settlement rather than for purposes of revenue, it is a very much better arrange-

ment for us that we should get a cash subsidy and have the Dominion still administer these lands in this way than that we should depend on the lands for our revenue, and thereby be driven to administer them, as our friends on the other side seem to persist they should be administered, for purposes of revenue. We had that principle in the west too long, and we do not want it any more.

Mr. BENNETT. I happened to be in the Northwest a couple of years ago, when the leader of the opposition held a series of public meetings throughout that country, and I must say that this question of the ownership of public lands attracted a great deal of attention at the different meetings, and if at these meetings the arguments advanced by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and those advanced by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in this House had been presented, I think that my friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would have scored rather heavily on the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). As I understand it, and I have listened very carefully to the Minister of the Interior, he bases the claim that the Dominion should still hold the lands on two important points. The first one is the policy that more money was gained by the Dominion as a whole than by these provinces from the introduction of settlers into that country. Now, if that is a good argument, it is not one that was relied upon by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), for this reason, that a settler in the Northwest, if you are going to look only at what you get out of him in the way of customs duties, would be no more valuable than a settler in Ontario. I have here an atlas published by the Department of the Interior, 'Geography of the Dominion of Canada,' which deals largely with Western Canada. Out of sixty odd pages, nearly all are devoted to the Northwest country, and not a plea is advanced asking people to come into the old provinces other than the west. This is rather a reflection on the province of Ontario, because hon. gentlemen opposite will remember that when the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill was before the House one of the greatest pleas that was advanced for the taking up of that measure by this parliament was the fact that we had in Ontario a vast area known as the clay belt, which was one of the greatest assets in the whole Dominion, and the ministers from Ontario upheld their position by continually referring to that great asset of Ontario, and yet the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) apparently in this atlas pays little or no attention to that, so that his view was that the asset which the country desired was not a settler from whom to draw customs duties, but rather it was that a settler should come into the country, become part of the country, raise grain and other products, send these out of the country and in return bring back the money and spend that money among our own people, and I think that is the great basis of success, not only of this province, but of the whole Dominion, or any part or portion of it. The next point the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) took was on the question of immigration, that immigration could be more successfully handled and induced by the department over which he presides than by provincial departments. It would be very easy for any province to imitate the methods which the Department of the Interior has employed to induce that immigration. In the first place, I think that if they had left politics out of this matter to a great extent it would have been much better. One of the greatest experiments for inducing settlers to come to this country from England was the sending of a number of settlers from Manitoba and the Northwest to the old country who lectured at different points and endeavoured to persuade the people that this was a desirable field for immigration. I have no fault to find with that; I think it was an admirable plan. These were men speaking from actual experience, and I believe no better system could have been pursued in the old country than that. It was asserted at that time that these lecturers were chiefly recruited from the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite. Be that as it may, I think that if the provinces had the handling of a similar line of scheme they could do it better than the Dominion, but the fact is, as pointed out by the hon. member for North Toronto, settlement has gone in there and the government could not have prevented it. This administration have had, according to this atlas, about a dozen immigration agents in the United States; I notice the names here of some gentlemen who were known to me personally. These were stationed at Spokane and at one point and another in the United States. We all know that years ago settlers went from Ontario to the Dakotas, and settled there and in Minnesota, and the reports they made induced other settlers to go from Ontario to these states. I know that from the township of Tiny, in Simcoe county, where there is a large French Canadian settlement, a large number of men, twenty-five or thirty years ago, went to these states, and by reason of the fact that they were successful, they led others of their friends in the same direction.

How much more difficult is it to attract immigrants from Ontario and the older provinces into our Territories, than to induce them to come from the Dakotas and the adjoining states. There was only an imaginary boundary between Canada and the United States; these American farmers knew they had been successful in the States where conditions similar to those in Canada existed; they knew their lands in the United States could be sold at a high price and they knew that the terms on which they

could acquire lands in Canada were easy. The greatest factor which has tended to the development of the Northwest has been the trips made through the country by newspaper men who disseminated their experience through the United States press. No fair man will deny that more has been done by this agency which cost us nothing, than by all the immigration agents this government has placed in the United States. I quote some samples of the literature published in the American press :

A special correspondent of the Chicago 'Tribune,' writing from Rosthern, Saskatchewan, Northwest Territories, on July of last year says:

The American invasion of Canada is no more a figure of speech. The tide of emigration now setting in to the Northwest Territories is a movement of population comparable only to the great wave which for four generations swept into the United States from the Atlantic to the Rockies. The United States became for the first time a country of emigrants as well as immigrants, and is giving her northern neighbours experienced farmers, intelligent, trained in western agriculture, good citizens, thrifty, progressive sons of the men who turned the rock prairies into an agricultural empire, and now seek new homes with a patrimony and experience which their fathers lacked.—Chicago 'Tribune.'

A new nation is being born under our very face and eyes. Things are shaping faster in Canada than most of us here in the United States realize ; indeed, faster than Canada herself realizes. The Northwest of Canada is rapidly filling up with a new life from eastern Canada and from our own Northwest. Farmers in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, and the Dakotas are selling their valuable farms and are moving with their families, implements and live stock, up into this great harvest field, and are receiving a most generous welcome.—'Saturday Evening Post' Philadelphia, Pa.

The editors of the 'American Agriculturist,' recently made a 4,000 mile tour through Manitoba, Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The report of what they saw, after referring to the adaptability of western Canada for the growing of small grains and to the excellence of the stock, says :

Among the settlers are many from the United States. Such rapid development as we saw is only possible in a country blessed with a fertile soil and a prosperous people. The future of western Canada is full of promise. Rapid and substantial development is certain. When the newer part of the United States was settled, it had much to contend with. There were no railroads, consequently no markets. With the settlers in Canada everything is different. Railroads have preceded them, furnishing at once a market and means of securing the comforts of modern farm life.—'American Agriculturist.'

This information and this advertising of Canada in the newspapers of the United States has tended greatly to help the cause of immigration into our Territories. It has been argued by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and others, that if these lands had been given to the provinces they had peculiar advantages to administer them wisely, and, they would have had the opportunity to apportion them to railroads by way of bonuses if they so desired. There are cases in which the provinces can better deal with these assets than can the Dominion. In the district of Nipissing in the province of Ontario there are large deposits of nickel and copper, which I believe will become of vast value to the province and to the Dominion at large, when by salutary laws the export of nickel in its raw state is prohibited.

Another case, which may by analogy turn out in the Northwest is the fact that the Dominion government—I am not now referring to either political party—neglected to place an export duty on logs, resulting in the closing of the saw-mills on the Georgian bay and Lake Huron. Millions and millions of Canadian logs kept the Michigan mills busy at the expense of Canadian mills, and mill owners after failing to impress their ideas on the Dominion government, appealed to the government of Ontario. The government of Ontario bowed to public opinion in the matter and did what the Dominion government failed to do, to the great advantage of the province and to the great advantage of the Dominion at large. Indeed so successful has been the result of this policy that no political party would dare to interfere with it to-day. I believe that the administration of the lands in the Northwest could be much better conducted by the local ministers of the Crown who are on the spot, than by the mere agents of the Dominion ministers who are of necessity twenty-five hundred miles away from the scene of operations. For all these reasons I believe that the administration of the lands should be handed to the provinces, and I believe further that if the provinces are to be tied down to a fixed annual payment, some day, perhaps in the not distant future, these provinces will be coming back to us asking for better terms. I believe that if the Minister of the Interior advanced before public meetings in the west the argument which he has advanced in this House to-night he would not touch a very responsive chord in the hearts of the settlers in the Northwest, who, I believe, are of the opinion that the provinces should have control of their lands, and not the Dominion government as this Bill proposes.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has proposed one method at any rate under which it might be possible for the new provinces to realize to some degree the actual value of their public resources. I consider that the figures quoted by the hon. gentleman were not in any way too roseate. The member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) made a very hopeful estimate of what the population of these new provinces might be in the near future, and if that estimate be correct it is not only possible but probable that the figures given by the hon. member (Mr.

Foster) would be soon realized by the provinces should the public lands remain in their possession. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has shown further, that there is a way by which ample means would be placed at the disposal of the local administration without entrenching on their capital in the way of public lands. The Minister of the Interior in his reply did not attempt to criticise the figures given by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). In fact he admitted there was a great deal in them when he stated that the effect of that speech would be to create dissatisfaction with the financial terms among the people of the west. That statement clearly proves to this House that the Minister of the Interior thinks that the people of the west will be satisfied that the suggestions made by the member for North Toronto are well within the bounds of probability.

The minister says the object of the sale of lands in the west should be to develop the country rather than to derive a revenue, and he has deprecated the policy which he says the members of the opposition would adopt, of squeezing the last cent of value that could be got out of the land, as he claims has been done in the disposal of the school lands. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) very well called his attention to the sale of homestead lands to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company a short time ago at $1 an acre. Surely the fact remains that in that particular case every cent is being squeezed out of the people who want to buy these lands. There is this bad feature about it also, that the proceeds of this squeezing goes into the hands of a private company, and not into the hands of the Dominion or provincial authorities ; and yet it seems to me that the Minister of the Interior approves of the policy which was initiated at that time, of selling a vast tract of land to a private company, with the intention of making that company an immigration agent on a large scale. I hold that if this policy is continued, as we may anticipate will be the case if the Minister of the Interior so highly approves of it, it will have a most pernicious effect upon the immigration into the Northwest. I have already seen, in the part of the country with which I am familiar, the result which the possession of these lands held for speculation by the land companies is having upon immigration. There are a number of homesteads in that part of the country, but it is impossible for the ordinary settler to get a homestead from the government. As a general rule, however, one of the land companies will be able to offer him for sale one of its pieces of land, and in some way or another procure for him the right of homesteading a piece of government land alongside of it. That is a matter of common report all over that country, and persons have told me of it from their own personal experience. I wish to say a word or two with reference to the arguments put forward by the Minister of the Interior in regard to the Dominion government having a greater interest in the establishment of settlers in the Northwest than the provincial government has. Talking of governments alone, I think that is perfectly true ; but I think the deduction he draws from that statement is altogether wrong. It appears to me that the Immigration Department will continue to be maintained on its present very elaborate basis ; but if you had in addition the province directly interested in the lands, you would have it also working for immigration. We have already had an explanation of the way the provincial government of Ontario is working for immigration on its own account. Reading the report of the Minister of the Interior the other day, I noticed that the Dominion Department of Immigration was claiming credit for putting a large number of farm hands into the province of Ontario during the year. I was told that the provincial authorities rather objected to that claim on the part of the Dominion authorities, considering that they had had a very large share in obtaining those immigrants. At any rate, the efforts of the Ontario government must have been successful to a very large extent ; and I hold that it is better to have both the Dominion and the provincial governments interested in procuring immigration, for the more immigration agents we have the better for the country. I wish to put on record an argument which was used by the Northwest government when it was requesting the grant of provincial autonomy from the Dominion government and was requesting at the same time that full ownership of the public domain should be vested in the province. As this deals to a certain extent with the legal aspect of the question, I wish to see it upon Hansard :

> The right and title to the public domain is in the Crown, but in the colonies directly established by Great Britain the beneficiary interest in the revenues arising from the sale or other disposal of the public domain has been surrendered by the Crown for the benefit of the people residing in such colonies. The Union Act of 1840 specifically provided that the territorial and other revenues then at the disposal of the Crown should be placed in future at the disposal of the province of Canada then being formed. Similar dispositions were made, either by statute or by the exercise of the royal prerogative, in favour of the other colonies in British North America. The British North America Act continued these arrangements for the benefit of the provinces forming the confederation, and the sections of the Bill under reference provide for the extension of the principle to the province of which it purports to provide for the formation.
>
> It may be noted that there has been no legislation or exercise of the royal prerogative transferring to Canada or otherwise, any right to enjoy the beneficiary interest in the territorial revenues of the Northwest Territories. The

fifth section of Rupert's Land Act of 1868, like the Order in Council of June 23, 1870, for which it is the authority, goes no further than to provide that upon the admission of Rupert's Land into the Dominion, it shall be lawful for the parliament of Canada . . . to make, ordain and establish within the land and territory so admitted . . . all such laws, institutions and ordinances, and to constitute such courts and officers, as may be necessary for the peace, order and good government of Her Majesty's subjects and others therein. The words of the Order in Council dealing with the admission into the union of that part of the Northwest Territories formerly known as the Northwestern Territory are more sparing as to number but appear to convey a somewhat wider extent of power, as they not only provide for the 'good government' of the territory, but also for its 'future welfare' at the hands of Canada. With the exception of the grant made to the Hudson Bay Company by the imperial Order in Council of June 23, 1870, section 30 of 'An Act to amend and continue the Acts thirty-two and thirty-three Victoria, chapter three, and to establish and provide for the government of the province of Manitoba,' confirmed by the British North America Act, 1871, appears to be the only authority under which any portion of the rights of the Crown in Rupert's Land or the Northwestern Territory has ever been alienated.

The Act last referred to is the Act under the authority of which the parliament of Canada has from time to time made 'provision for the administration, peace, order and good government' of the Northwest Territories, being a territory not for the time being included in any province, and it is also the Act under which parliament will provide for the constitution and administration of any province which may be established, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order and good government of such province.

The difference between legislative jurisdiction and proprietary rights was clearly laid down by Lord Herschell in the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Fisheries case, but it may be admitted that the necessities of administration, and the duties and obligations of government and legislation as regards these Territories, assumed by parliament, together with the established imperial practice in such cases, would probably, though not necessarily, carry with them the privilege of appropriating the territorial and other revenues of the Territories for the purposes of maintaining good government and furthering the ends of legislation. Upon the formation within the Territories of the promised political institutions bearing analogy to those which exist in the several provinces of the Dominion, it is submitted that whatever interest Canada may have had or exercised in respect of the territorial revenues will devolve upon the new province. As Great Britain has divested herself, for the benefit of her colonies, of all her proprietary rights in the public domain within those colonies so, it is thought, Canada should do with respect to any claim that may be referred on behalf of the Dominion to the beneficiary interest in the public domain within that part of the Northwest Territories to be included in any province to be established.

I desire to put that short argument on record. It is expressed in much clearer and more concise terms than I could possibly hope to do it. I do not wish to take up the time of the House further than to say that in my opinion the members from the Northwest Territories on the government side must accept their full share of responsibility for all time to come for the policy of this government in retaining the public lands of these Territories. Without their support, that policy could not have been forced through the House. No doubt these hon. gentlemen consider they are acting for the best, but I hope they will seriously consider the arguments which have been advanced this evening and endeavour to have this clause in the Bill changed and the public lands given to the new provinces.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I would like to take up a few minutes explaining the basis on which I reason out this matter from a practical standpoint. As nearly as I could estimate, the area of the two provinces will be about 300 million acres or perhaps slightly more than that. We know that the northern and eastern part of Athabaska and the northeastern part of the old Saskatchewan district will never be fit for actual settlement. I think it is a very liberal estimate to say that we have 200,000,000 acres of agricultural land in those two provinces. Now, since the Dominion government continues the policy of giving free grants to settlers or homesteaders, we actually in the provinces get half the land. We get the even-numbered sections just as thoroughly, just as completely as if we got all the land and were to continue the policy of giving free homesteads. That leaves then 100,000,000 acres of odd-numbered sections which will be retained by the Dominion government. We must remember that the odd-numbered sections 11 to 29 already belong to us by a previous arrangement. These are the schools lands. That will make 11,000,000 acres of that land which clearly belongs to the province, in spite of anything we can do at present. That leaves to the Dominion government really 89,000,000 acres, that is 89,000,000 of odd-numbered sections. But there have been alienated to railway and colonization companies some 30,000,000 acres of these odd-numbered sections; that leaves a balance of 59,000,000 acres.

Mr. SPROULE. This return which I hold in my hand only gives 25,000,000 of acres alienated, namely, Alberta, 13,000,000; Saskatchewan, 12,000,000.

Mr. P. TALBOT. In addition to that a large amount was given to colonization companies, so that you may take 30,000,000 acres as about correct. That will leave 59,000,000 acres in the hands of the Dominion government for the two provinces. So that when we made that calculation of 25,000,000 acres for each province, we were not very far astray. If hon. gentlemen opposite will look into this matter carefully,

they will come to the conclusion that there has been a fair arrangement both for the provinces and the Dominion government. Our revenue will be at least equal to that of the other provinces in the Dominion, and I think it is fair to all parties.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess that the figures given by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) rather surprise me. In the statement brought down by the government giving the quantity of land vested in the Crown in these proposed provinces I find the following :

Lands vested in the Crown in the proposed provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan respectively :
Alberta, 129,556,903 ; Saskatchewan, 120,880,366.

These are certainly very far in excess of the figures mentioned by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Your estimate is 250,000,000, and I was estimating the whole at 300,000,000. The hon. member for North York estimated that there are 228,000,000 of agricultural land. I put it at 200,000,000 and I think I am more nearly correct. I claim that not more than two-thirds of the entire area is land fit for agricultural purposes.

Mr. HENDERSON. The figures I gave are the number of acres of land still vested in the Crown, not what is contained within the area of the two provinces. I am not dealing with that. I am aware that a considerable portion has been disposed of in a variety of ways, such as subsidizing railways, homesteads and so forth. That leaves us still nearly 250,000,000 acres in the two provinces. That is very far in excess of the amount given by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. P. TALBOT. The hon. gentleman will surely not say that there are 250,000,000 acres of agricultural or arable land.

Mr. HENDERSON. The statement is of lands vested in the Crown.

Mr. P. TALBOT. That portion of eastern part of Athabaska is of the same formation as the Rainy River, which is not arable land.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly not ; but, of course, we have no information at hand to-night on that point.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Any good map will give a person an idea of what are agricultural lands, and that is how I reach my conclusion.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not intend to detain the committee for more than a short time. I confess that I have been more than surprised to hear the statements of hon. members from this Northwest country. I confess that I had the opinion that the people of the Northwest wanted complete autonomy, wanted the full right of self-government including the right to administer their lands. As it was very forcibly put by Mr. Haultain in a letter addressed to the Minister of the Interior on the 31st of January, 1903 :

What the people wanted there was equal rights with all the other provinces of the Dominion and the same financial consideration that has been given to those provinces. Control of public domain in the west by the west and for the west.

Now, I am sorry to say there has not been a single member on the other side of this House coming from the west who has shown himself willing, during this debate, to stand up in defence of these provinces and to advocate the rights of the people of the west in the west. What their motive is I cannot possibly conceive. I have always understood that what the people of the west wanted was complete autonomy. In the petitions laid before this House during the present session with reference to the Bill before us, wherever reference was made to the land, in every instance, I believe I am right in saying the prayer of that petition was that the people of the west should have the right to govern their lands. I do not recall a single instance where the people petitioned that the Dominion government should administer the lands belonging to the Crown in that country.

Now, I do not believe that the people of the west will be satisfied with this kind of legislation. I believe we are simply creating a grievance that will have to be removed some day, otherwise there will be dissatisfaction in that country for many years to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite may be perfectly sincere, but I cannot for the life of me believe that members from the west supporting the government reflect to-day the feeling of that country. But then they tell us : See the verdict in Edmonton. Have we had a verdict from Edmonton with respect to the land question or the school question ? I say we have not. Edmonton is a very large district and I apprehend that a large proportion of the people, probably one-half or three-quarters did not know that there was an election going on. The statement that they expressed an opinion is absolutely absurd. They had no opportunity to vote, nor do I believe they had the opportunity of knowing that the question was being submitted to them who their representative should be. When these hon. gentlemen say : Look at the verdict from Edmonton ; I say : Look at the verdict from Western Assiniboia. If I mistake not, Western Assiniboia was asked to pronounce a verdict on this question before Edmonton was. And their answer was : Stay away, don't come here, for the verdict will be against you. That is a section of the country where the people could be con-

sulted. I do not think that there is anything in the statement that because Edmonton votes for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to be Minister of the Interior, we are to accept that as an evidence that everything was satisfactory that the people wanted a dual system of schools, that they do not want to have ownership of their own lands, and that they are satisfied to remain simply like the Indians in that section, wards of the government, ready to remain under the tutelage, care and protection of the Dominion government. Notwithstanding all the discussions that have taken place, I have not changed my mind one whit. I have not heard one argument to convince me that the people of the west do not want to have the lands within their boundaries, but would prefer that those lands should be retained and administered by the Dominion. I say that involves a grievance that never will be removed until this parliament—or some other parliament ; I do not know whether this parliament would have the power or not —undoes the mischief that we are now doing in taking away from these people what, I believe, of right belongs to them. Now, why deal with these provinces in a way different from the way in which other provinces are dealt with ? The older provinces were allowed to retain their lands. And it was a matter of pride with them. The younger western country may well point to the older provinces and ask of the Dominion : Why place us on a different basis from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and Ontario ? Why deprive us of what belongs to us as a free people ? Or, take especially the case of the province of Quebec. In 1898 that province was given a very large addition to its Territories—I think something about 75,000,000 acres. Did any hon. gentleman on that side of the House ever suggest at that time that the province of Quebec should not be given the lands contained within the boundaries prescribed by the Act of parliament ? Not at all. The province of Quebec got that land added to its territory. The Act of parliament transferred everything that was in that area—lands, timber, minerals, water-power ; everything. Yet the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan are to be refused what the province of Quebec was given only some seven years ago. To my mind the treatment of one province by one method and of another province by another method will create dissatisfaction and constitute a grievance that will not be remedied for many years.

Now, I cannot imagine why the Minister of the Interior should believe that the people in these new provinces are better satisfied to have a financial consideration and to do without the lands. If the Minister of the Interior has carefully considered this matter he will have observed that a large consideration is to be given to the provinces besides that given as payment for the lands which the Dominion retains or takes back from the provinces. There is an allowance of $50,000 to each province for governmental purposes. There is an allowance of 80c per head of the population according to the census which is to be taken at intervals of five years—this will be a very considerable subsidy. Then here is an additional allowance on account of the provinces having no debt, amounting to something over $400,000 to each province. These are very large financial considerations out of which they can make a revenue for themselves. And I feel that the provinces would be very much better satisfied indeed than to have an additional $1,000,000 handed over, which, in any case, will not be immediately, but after the population has reached, if I remember well, a maximum of 1,200,000.

Even an increased subsidy of $1,200,000 I do not believe will satisfy the people of that northwestern country. It will be a burning question year after year amongst those people. They are a high-minded people, many of them have gone in from the old province of Ontario, from the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, many of them have come from the United States and from the British Isles, from Germany and other European countries, and they will say, why is this thus ? Why are we treated as serfs ? Some of them have come from Russia and other European countries, and they will say, we lived a long time in serfdom, we came to a free country, and we are not allowed to call our own our own, we are not allowed to call this country our own. We come here and settle in this country, and we are told it belongs to the people of Quebec, it belongs to the people of Ontario, it belongs to Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Are you going to make a happy and contented people in that way ? Don't you think you would conduce a great deal more to the prosperity and happiness of that people if you were to hand over to them, or rather allow them to retain what already belongs to them, or will belong to them when we create the provinces ? When we create these new provinces, as a matter of course, automatically the land belongs to them.

We buy it back as a Dominion by paying a consideration for it. Why should the older provinces be called upon to put up a large sum of money, to tax themselves to buy back a large country simply for the purpose of giving it away—giving it away for whose benefit ? Giving it away in order to provide free homesteads. Now there are two sides to this question, there is the Northwest side and there is the side of the older provinces. For all time to come —because we assume that this law is to remain upon the statute-book—the older provinces of this country will have to tax themselves practically for eleven-twelfths of this entire payment that is given for the lands

of those two provinces ; for all time to come the older provinces will have to tax themselves practically for eleven-twelfths of that sum in order that we may have lands to give away to people who go into that western country. Now what return are we going to get for it ? I am not sure but there will be a grievance in the older provinces as well as in the new. They will say, what benefit is it to us ? We are told we are going to get an immense revenue from that western country, that people will come in, and every man that comes in will be worth so much, and will contribute to the revenues of the country and make good what we tax ourselves to pay. Now I would not rely very much upon that. If the Minister of Finance is going to increase the revenues in this country so as to get money to buy this immense territory of 3,000,000 acres, he will be obliged to cripple every industry in this country by reducing taxation down to a revenue basis in order to get money to do it ; and the result will be that the old provinces of the country where industrial pursuits are carried on, will be handicapped for all time to come, and the next Minister of Finance will not be able to give this country a policy which will carry it on successfully, and give us that prosperity which we all hope will continue for many years to come. Now this is a big question. It is not simply to be looked at from the little picayune idea of whether it will be the Liberal party or the Conservative party that is going to control the vote in the Northwest, whether we are going to be able, through the land agents of the Dominion government, to go to the electors who have not yet secured patents for their lands, and tell them: Now, if you vote right you will get your patent, if you do not, dear knows when you will. Now that is a mighty small consideration if it is going to cripple the commercial industry of this country for all time to come. I think we had better broaden out our ideas ; and I hope that the Minister of the Interior, now that he occupies this high and honourable position, will throw away these picayune politics and take hold of this matter as a statesman, and be guided by statesmanship rather than by politics in dealing with the affairs of that great country.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is understood by agreement that this clause is not to be pressed to a vote to-night, and as we have been told that an amendment is likely to the moved, I propose that we proceed to consider the clause respecting the Hudson Bay Company, which was held over the other night, but which I believe is not likely to be further debated.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the agreement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 22 is struck out, and the following is substituted therefor :

22. Nothing in this Act shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights or properties of the Hudson Bay Company as contained in the conditions under which that company surrendered Rupert's Land to the Crown, and all rights, privileges and properties conferred on the Canadian government by the said conditions shall, in so far as they relate to matters within the legislative authority of the province, belong to and be vested in the government of the said province.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What are these rights of the Hudson Bay Company which you wish to protect ?

Mr. FIELDING. If there is any further information desired, we will have to postpone this discussion.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the lands of the Hudson Bay Company be subject to taxation by the local government ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am advised they are subject to taxation now.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES REPRESENTATION.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 156) to amend the Northwest Territories Representation Act. He said : I promised to introduce a Bill at the request of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to amend the Representation Act. It is based practically upon the lines of the Bill introduced last year by Mr. Casgrain, then member for Montmorency. In this Bill I have added a provision to cover a difficulty that the member for Calgary pointed out with respect to the question of the residence of a voter in the polling subdivision in which he is supposed to vote.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

VACANCY IN NORTH OXFORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention having been called by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), in his place, to the fact of the demise of the Hon. James Sutherland, member for the electoral district of North Oxford, I have, in accordance with section 8, chapter 13, of the Revised Statutes of Canada, issued my warrant to the Clerk of the

Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

THE PORTFOLIO OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Yesterday the question was asked as to when the vacancy in the Public Works Department would be filled, and I think the minister who was in charge asked that that question be repeated to-day.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I see by the statement just made by His Honour the Speaker, that the seat of North Oxford is now vacant; and the portfolio of Public Works is also vacant. I am not in a position to make any statement to-day, but I shall have pleasure in doing so at an early day.

VETERANS OF 1866 AND 1870.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to call the attention of my right hon. friend to a matter of some urgency, and that is the request that was made a few days ago by the veterans of 1866 and 1870 for a grant of land from the government in recognition of their services. As my right hon. friend is aware, and the matter has been brought to my notice, the provincial legislature of Quebec is going to prorogue very shortly, and many of those interested in the petition which was presented a few days ago to the government are anxious to obtain some kind of answer from this government before that prorogation takes place, because upon that answer will largely depend the steps they intend to take with the government of Quebec. My right hon. friend will remember that when these gentlemen, who are deserving of the highest consideration, went before the Quebec government they were told by the provincial Prime Minister that their request would more properly be addressed to the federal government. Consequently, they are waiting with some anxiety for the answer of the government here in order that, before prorogation, they may, if necessary, bring the matter once more to the notice of the provincial government, and that the provincial government may, if necessary, obtain legislation for the purpose of satisfying the petitioners. I have received several letters in reference to this matter, and have been requested to call the attention of the government to the request of these claimants, and to ask for as prompt an answer as possible.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I think it is obvious to any one, and my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will agree with me, that if the veterans of 1866 and 1870 have a claim against anybody, it is the Dominion government, although I do not say that the veterans, from their point of view, have not done well to address themselves to the provincial government. Mr. Gouin, the provincial premier, I do not think went further in his answer than to say that they should first of all address themselves to the Dominion government. This they have done, and the matter is now under consideration. But I must say, and my hon. friend will not be surprised, that up to this moment the government has had no time to take that matter in hand and give it the attention which it will require before we can come to a conclusion. The matter is under consideration, and without making any pledge, I will say that I will give an answer during the present session. When the answer will be given, I am sorry to say that I can give no indication to-day to my hon. friend, but certainly it will be given during the present session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may add that this matter has been mentioned to me by some gentlemen residing in the province of Ontario who were on military service in 1866 and, possibly, in 1870; and I would like to make on their behalf the same claim for federal aid that has been made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for the veterans of the province of Quebec.

THE DEFAULTING LAND AGENT, NIXON.

Mr. FOSTER. I brought a matter to the attention of the Minister of the Interior six or seven days ago, one in regard to which it should not have taken him a very long time to furnish the information. It is a matter which is a little urgent and pressing, and I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to it. The new Minister of the Interior is not as punctual in getting in here at three o'clock as some of the older ministers, for instance, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, and that is the only period when we can well refer to the matter without delaying proceedings. If the First Minister will mention it to him, I will bring the matter up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection. If the Minister of the Interior does not come in before the House rises to-day the hon. gentleman will have his answer, because it is ready.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 22,

Nothing in this Act shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights of properties of the Hudson Bay Company acquired, held or existing under and by virtue of the conditions of the deed under which that company surrendered Rupert's Land to the Crown.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved that the following be substituted in lieu of section 22 :

Nothing in this Act shall in any way prejudice or affect the rights or properties of the Hudson Bay Company as contained in the conditions under which that company surrendered Rupert's Land to the Crown, and all rights, privileges and properties conferred on the Canadian government by the said conditions, shall, in so far as they relate to matters within the legislative authority of the province, belong to and be vested in the government of the said province.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I asked the hon. Minister of Justice last night why it was necessary to protect these rights. To my mind, if they have rights, they are protected by the original agreement and why should we go out of our way to protect these rights in this clause and especially in the clause succeeding ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) is aware that when the imperial government acquired this property from the Hudson Bay Company they acquired it subject to certain conditions which are mentioned in the title. The property was vested in the Queen in the right of the imperial parliament, and was handed over to the Dominion government subject to the same conditions as those under which the property passed from the company. The only condition of the original surrender which this section is intended to cover is the condition repeated in section 11 of the Order in Council under which the property was handed over to the Dominion and which reads as follows :

The company is to be at liberty to carry on its trade without hindrance in its corporate capacity, and no exceptional tax is to be placed on the company's land, trade or servants, nor any import duties on goods introduced by them previous to the surrender of 1870.

That last question of the import duties has ceased to be of any effect. It was merely applicable to goods imported into the country previous to the surrender of 1870.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Are not these rights protected by the original agreement without any restatement in this Act ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That may be my hon. friend's view. I do not think it is the correct view and it was not the view taken at the time that Manitoba was admitted into the Dominion as a province. This provision is adopted from the Manitoba Act.

Section as amended, agreed to.

On section 23,

The powers hereby granted to the said province shall be exercised subject to the provisions of section 16 of the contract set forth in the schedule to chapter 1 of the statutes of 1881, being an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I urge the same objection in this case with even more force. Why should we go out of our way to protect the exemption the Canadian Pacific Railway has in its original contract ? This may also have been in the Manitoba Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, it is not there.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Whatever rights the Canadian Pacific Railway has under the contract made with the Dominion government are set out in an Act of parliament and there is no reason why we should re-enact this legislation. It is almost emphasizing its claim. This claim, in a way, has been in the courts and the matter has caused a great deal of dissatisfaction to the people in the west. This may be reinforcing the claim and we may be abandoning something that is of interest to the public by re-enacting this clause. Whatever rights the Canadian Pacific Railway has are set out in black and white in a solemn contract which has been made an Act of parliament and they ought to rest there and not be brought into this Act. On the contrary it ought to be the duty of the government to ascertain exactly what the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway are in regard to these exemptions, and if they are burdensome, as they appear to be burdensome to the people of the North-west Territories, it should negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the surrender of any rights which it may have as to exemptions. We all know, because we have heard from the west year after year, about the grievance that exists there in regard to these exemptions. There is the Canadian Pacific Railway, the wealthiest corporation in this country. It is paying large dividends on its stock. It is making handsome profits every year. It is the richest corporation we have in Canada. The company has great possessions in the shape of lands in the west on which it pays no taxes. The poor settler in the west is paying his taxes while the Canadian Pacific Railway pays no taxes. Grant that the Canadian Pacific Railway has a right ; if that right could be commuted and if these lands could be immediately made subject to taxation an effort should be made to abolish this exemption. In the province of Ontario we know what tax exemptions are. They are an enormous burden on the people who have to pay taxes. In the city of Toronto there are millions and millions of dollars worth of property of the most valuable kind which is increasing in value every day and which is yet untaxed. It is relieved from taxation by reason of exemptions granted years and years ago. We have had some of these exemptions removed. We have given a great deal of attention to the question of exemption from taxation in the province of Ontario.

Gradually we are removing these exemptions. More and more we are asking the people who are exempt to pay their taxes. Take, for instance, the situation here in Ottawa; the citizens of Ottawa find it a great grievance to have so much Dominion property exempted from taxation and the government, recognizing that condition of affairs, is making liberal concessions to the people of Ottawa in the way of the improvement of the city and in other ways. In this way the Dominion is contributing to municipal taxation. We were told in the House the other day that Wellington street in front of these grounds is to be paved at the expense of the Dominion authorities. I say much more ought the poor settler of the west to have this grievance removed whereby he is to-day paying the municipal taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, one of the richest corporations in the country, and whose land which was at one time valued at $1 an acre is to-day worth $5 an acre upwards. If that is the case some effort should be made in the interest of the settlers of the west to remove this exemption and above all things we should not by this Bill re-enact the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway whatever they are. Leave their rights to look after themselves. The Canadian Pacific Railway can look after them in the courts. I do not think it is in the public interest that this clause should be introduced into the Bill and I would ask the government not only to withdraw this clause but to take into its serious consideration the necessity of negotiating with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the commutation of its rights in this respect, so that the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the west shall pay their proper share of the municipal taxation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is not at all directed against this clause. He has ended his argument as he commenced it, by stating that the government should enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway in order to obtain from them a commutation of their rights, improvidently granted to them, I admit, but which were granted at the time that they were organized into a company for this national undertaking. I do not dispute there may be something in that. Some day or other I have no doubt this line of action may have to be taken into consideration and acted upon. I am conscious for my part that as the country advances this burden will become intolerable to the people of the new provinces, and even to the Dominion government itself, because it is not only the provinces which have been restrained, the Dominion government has been restrained also. But if that be so, if you are to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, that is an admission that they have acquired a right, that they have a vested right by legislation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We do not admit anything in the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend pretend that when we have passed a law—and I agree with my hon. friend that it was not proper legislation—but there it is and under it the Canadian Pacific Railway have obtained certain rights to which they are entitled. What is the contention of my hon. friend? Does he pretend that we should withdraw this clause and give to the new provinces the power to legislate and to tax the Canadian Pacific Railway? Let me call the attention of my hon. friend once more to the clause of the statute in that respect:

> The Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations, and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein.

Well, Sir, it is evident to me that the Dominion government not only undertook for themselves never to tax the stock and property of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but they undertook also to see and to make themselves answerable to the company that the same exclusion shall be imposed on any province which may hereafter be created, and we could not excise this clause not only without breaking faith with the Canadian Pacific Railway but without making ourselves liable for any loss they might incur by being subjected to taxation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want to bring the matter before the right hon. gentleman in another way. Here is a copy of a petition which has been presented to this House:

> Whereas in the division of the Northwest Territories into two provinces, arrangements are made for a perpetual exemption from taxation of the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway.
>
> And whereas, such legislation is contrary to public policy and sound legislation, and inasmuch as such legislation binds the freedom of people yet unborn and forever limits the scope of legislation in matters which are by right the sole business of the people who now live or will live in the said provinces.
>
> And whereas such legislation cannot be morally passed by men who are elected for a maximum of five years and are then trustees for the people.
>
> And whereas, this unjust privilege has already been enjoyed by the company for nearly a whole generation, and inasmuch as one generation cannot morally dictate the terms upon which another generation may live, and use the earth, any such privilege granted them in the past must be continually renewed in order to keep it alive.
>
> It therefore follows that this legislation is a fresh exemption and is practically an injustice.
>
> We therefore pray that this exemption clause be struck out and the provinces be allowed to

tax the property of this and all other corporations just as are the other provinces.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

That may be a rather far-fetched resolution but it points to a grievance. Hon. gentlemen say the King's government must be carried on. So it must, but the King's government must also deal with the grievances, to give better and improved laws to the people, and now that this grievance does exist I say it is the duty of the government to remedy it. They may be bound by the clause in the original charter just read, they may be bound to put this clause in the Bill but they are also bound in some way to secure commutation of this right that the Canadian Pacific Railway have acquired. The Canadian Pacific Railway had other rights in the original charter; they had the right to prevent the running of lines to the American boundary; they had also certain rights which they surrendered in the negotiations in connection with the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway, but the grievances in connection with the law which prohibit the building of lines and the grievances which existed in regard to the freight rates which were commuted at the time of the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway were not equal to the grievances which exist now in regard to this exemption from municipal taxation. We are asking settlers to come to Canada, to take up lands, to go to the great wheat fields of the Northwest, to settle there, establish themselves on farms and bring up their families and in order to give the poor man a fair show—and every man is entitled to a fair show—I say that some steps should be taken by this parliament to commute these rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to exemption, and while the hon. gentleman may say that he is obeying the law he may state what is true, but he has a duty to discharge to the people of the west and I am surprised that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) does not speak for the people of the west in this matter, and that all the members from the west are not aiding in it. I hope he will join with me because in other days he did join with me on the floor of this House in pointing out how widespread and serious this grievance was to the poor settlers in the west. I am not proposing any confiscation here to-day, but I am asking the members from the west to join with me in pressing upon the government to secure in some way commutation of this right to exemption now enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway which we acknowledge to-day by this clause. I say it is not progressive legislation. We are actually committing, as I believe, a wrong. We may be respecting a right of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but we are permitting a wrong against the settlers of the west. The Canadian Pacific Railway is well able to pay this taxation. It is a rich company, it is increasing its service every year, it is expanding and, as one of its directors said the other day, there is no other railway company in the world whose credit is so good and which can borrow money so cheaply as the Canadian Pacific Railway. If that is the case why should the richest corporation in Canada, the company in receipt of the largest revenue and which has the greatest prospects in the world, have this exemption which the poor man has not? It may have been improvident legislation when it was made originally, but it is worse than improvident to allow it to continue if there is some way of securing its removal, and I believe there is a way for securing its removal; that is by negotiation with the Canadian Pacific Railway just as Sir John Macdonald cancelled the right to prevent lines running to the American boundary and the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) cancelled their rights in regard to certain freight rates, when he made his arrangement with them for the building of the Crow's Nest Pass Railway. Now let him come forward and let him negotiate and in some way remove this grievance, a most substantial grievance as it has proved to be to the settlers of the west. In the province of Manitoba the Canadian Pacific Railway pays municipal taxes on their lands, but they do not in the west, and yet for some of their lands in the west they are getting $10 and $20 an acre, and as soon as the lands are sold they are of course liable to municipal taxes. But as long as the Canadian Pacific Railway hold them they pay no taxes on them, and I say to the right hon. gentleman and to the members from the west that I hope they will join with me in urging upon the government to do something to remove this grievance and not to re-enact it as they propose to do by this clause in the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has changed his front and very properly so. The ground he took at first was that we should have clause 23 of this Bill excised altogether; now he says that it would not be possible to do so without being guilty of a breach of faith with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He quite understands that that would be altogether reprehensible; we cannot do that. We have to abide by agreements whether they are good or bad. My hon. friend says we are committing a great wrong to the settlers of the Northwest Territories. We are committing no wrong towards the settlers but a great wrong was committed towards them twenty years ago when this Bill was passed against the protest of the party to which I belong. We pointed out then the very thing which is pointed out by my hon. friend, the great mistake, the very great mistake of passing such legislation.

Our protest was unheeded, the contract became law, and if it is law it must remain law until another law can be substituted for it, but not in the manner suggested by my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I must say to my hon. friend that there are two classes of exemptions in this Bill. There is exemption in respect to the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway and there is also exemption of their lands. The exemption on their lands is in process of extinguishment; that exemption is to last only twenty years, and it is in process of extinguishment now. We have had a judicial decision on that and in the course of twenty years that exemption will become extinct.

But the exemptions of the stations and the station grounds, the workshops, buildings, rolling stock, capital stock, road-bed, &c., are there, and there for ever. My hon. friend says this is a grievance which ought to be remedied. There is only one of two ways in which it can be remedied; that is, by the government negotiating and agreeing to pay a certain sum to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or by this parliament passing a law to expropriate the exemption. I do not say that we may not have to come to that. I dare say that it is possible and more than possible that we may have to come to that eventually. But that question has nothing at all to do with the present legislation; it stands quite apart from this legislation. We have been petitioned by the legislature of the Northwest Territories to grant them provincial autonomy; we are in process of doing so; but they must take it such as it is, with all the exemptions created by law. So long as we comply with their request, we can only give them what it is in our power to give them.

Mr. HAGGART. I expressed my opinion on this question pretty fully the other day. My contention is that the Dominion government had no power to enter into an arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which it bound itself, when a province was to be created out of the territory, to see that the company's property was exempt from taxation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that agreement null and void?

Mr. HAGGART. That agreement, so far as it refers to a province, is null and void. That is my contention. As to the moral obligation, that is another thing. Although the government may not be legally bound by the agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they may be morally bound, which is quite another thing. This parliament has no power to limit the constitutional rights of a province in regard to legislation by inserting any such clause. It may be good as a notice that there is such an agreement; but the province, when it chooses to legislate on the subject, can legislate itself out of any imposition of that

kind. You have not full power to create a province under the Act of 1871. You are bound by the provisions of the British North America Act. By no Bill of ours can we limit the power of the province. The hon. Minister of Justice steers pretty clear of that question. He is in a quandary between the powers he has claimed under the Act of 1871, and the limitations and proscriptions of the Act of 1867. He brings them into force in the Autonomy Bill by a statement that all the powers granted to the province by the British North America Act shall be given to this particular province, except those which are expressly excluded by the Act. My contention is that the bargain that was made between the Dominion government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company by which the government bound themselves when a province was being constituted out of the Territories to limit the powers of the province, was ultra vires of the Dominion parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to ponder over the argument we have just heard from the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart). If I understood aright the argument of the hon. member for South York, it was that we shall enter into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to compensate it for the exemption given to them in 1881.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, if we negotiate with them, they will say it is necessary. My hon. friend has no great faith in corporations—I do not think he has much faith in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—and he knows that they will ask for all they can get. So if we go to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to negotiate for relief from the exemption which was given them in 1881 from taxation by this Dominion and by the provinces also, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will answer us at once: We have a double exemption, the exemption from taxation by the Dominion and we value that at so much, say $1,000,000 or $2,000,000; we also have exemption from taxation by the province, and we value that at say $2,000,000 more. But my hon. friend from South Lanark says the company have no exemption from taxation so far as the province is concerned, and therefore if we negotiate with the company, we would pay them for what they have not. We had better wait, then, until it is decided judicially whether the contention of the hon. member for Lanark is right or not. Until such time as the courts decide, if they so decide, that the provisions so far as the province is concerned are null and void, we shall have so much less to pay to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than we would to-day if we entered into negotiations with them. So my hon. friend

will agree that we have acted wisely in inserting this clause in the Bill. If the contention of my hon. friend from Lanark is right, I have no doubt what will be the action of the new legislature of Alberta. My hon. friend says that this clause by which we continue the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway property from taxation is absolutely null and void, that it is not worth the paper on which it is written. If that be so, the legislature of the province of Alberta will next session pass an Act to tax the property of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and then the question will have to be determined by the courts. If the courts decide that the statute passed in 1881 was ultra vires of this parliament and that we could not impose any such exemption of taxation on the new province, then, when we come to negotiate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, we shall have to negotiate with regard to taxation only so far as the Dominion is concerned, and not at all so far as the province is concerned. Is that not full justification of our policy and is not my hon. friend satisfied that in this, as in many other instances, he has been speaking before going into the subject and is altogether too quick in jumping at conclusions ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it not evident now that I spoke most timely and that good has come out of the discussion, because the First Minister has expressed himself as largely governed by the opinion of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and that hon. gentleman is of the opinion that the claim of the Canadian Pacific Railway is not worth anything ? But the First Minister is putting into this Bill a clause that is ultra vires, if the contention of the hon. member for Lanark is well founded. In the old days the right hon. gentleman denounced the Canadian Pacific Railway contract as a most improvident bargain and he appealed to the people : Put me in power and I will remedy your grievance. He sang two songs then but he is only singing one now. He is only singing the song of the improvident bargain now, but I would ask him to sing the other one and remedy the grievance. According to the British North America Act each province has the right to impose direct taxation within the province in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes. The province of Ontario is to-day exercising that right with regard to the railways in that province, and the legislatures of these new provinces will be able to tax the Canadian Pacific Railway notwithstanding these exemptions. That is a right which this parliament cannot take away from the province. Within the exclusive powers of provincial legislature there is also by subsection 1 of clause 92 :

> The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this Act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant Governor.

That being the case and the jurisdiction of municipalities being a matter within provincial control, no act of ours, no contract or statute, can affect that jurisdiction ; and if the right hon. gentleman persists with this legislation, the best the two provinces can do, as soon as they are organized, will be to pass such legislation as will compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to pay taxes. And if the new provinces cannot reach the Canadian Pacific Railway by means of municipal taxation, they can reach that company under the clause giving the provinces the right to impose direct taxation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Everything said by my hon. friend is a vindication of the government. The construction of the hon. member for Lanark may be right but there are others who think he is wrong. It is a question on which I offer no opinion. It is one of those mysterious questions of law which had best be left to the judges to decide. But in the meantime there are two sides to it. There are some who pretend that the Act of 1881 is good and valid, and there are others who, like my hon. friend from Lanark, take the opposite view. If it is right and valid, we have to comply with it ; but if it is null and void, so much the better.

Mr. SCOTT. As a taxpayer in the proposed province of Saskatchewan, I would be delighted if the hon. member for Lanark and the hon. member for South York were right in their contention that this legislation will be found to be ultra vires and that the provinces will have the power, regardless of this legislation and the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, to tax the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the facts, as we have them so far, are against that contention. We all know that our courts are governed to a considerable extent by precedent and unfortunately we have a precedent against us in this very matter. A portion of the Northwest Territories was added to the province of Manitoba in 1881 and a similar provision to this was put in the Bill adding that area to Manitoba. Litigation ensued and a few weeks ago a decision was handed down by the Supreme Court of Canada, which is entirely against the contention of my hon. friends. A municipality in the added portion of Manitoba levied taxes upon the Canadian Pacific Railway. The Canadian Pacific Railway protested and a suit was carried through the courts in Manitoba. The judgment in Manitoba was in favour of the company and has been upheld by the Supreme Court of Canada. The hon. member for South York is perfectly right however in his contention that this is a very serious matter for the new provinces. On the second reading of the Bill, I explained that it was the detail which gave the greatest amount of difficulty. As the matter stood in January last, the situation has become changed in some degree by the Supreme Court judgment

given in the meantime—it was my very pronounced opinion that it would have been advisable that this subject of autonomy should be left pending until the tax matter was in a more determined stage. Practically three months have been spent by this House in discussing what is called a limitation on the autonomy granted the new provinces; and with all deference to my hon. friends opposite, the matter they have held this House talking about all this time does not compare in importance with the limitation of autonomy contained in this section 23 of the Bill. If we left the people of the Territories absolutely free with regard to education, they would retain the system they have there at present. Ninety-nine out of every hundred are entirely satisfied with the present system of separate schools. But this tax limitation does make a difference and a very material difference. This is a real and substantial limitation which is placed on their autonomy.

Mr. OLIVER. By the late government.

Mr. SCOTT. By the late government. It must be one of the hon. member for South York's handsprings which the Conservative government turned for this corporation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When did I say that?

Mr. SCOTT. Not very long ago.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Of what government?

Mr. SCOTT. Of every legislature in this country. The hon. gentleman lectures members from the Northwest Territories about principles and compromises. I would suggest that he should abstain from compromising his common sense so frequently as he does in this House. He gave as a reason why independent legislatures should be created and endowed with resources, that all legislatures were corrupt and turning handsprings at the bidding of corporations. I am inclined to agree with him that section 23 is unnecessary. That section says:

> The powers hereby granted to the said provinces shall be exercised subject to the provisions of section 16 of the contract set forth in the schedule to chapter 1 of the statute of 1881, being an Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

If that clause were not in the Bill at all, the relations between the provincial government and the Canadian Pacific Railway would still be fixed by the statute of this parliament embodying the Canadian Pacific Railway contract. I may say that I am very pleased indeed to hear the words of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) indicating that it is the intention of this government, and that it will be the duty of this parliament, as soon as possible, to cancel the rights possessed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this connection by means of either the ordinary powers of expropriation or——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) make that statement this afternoon?

Mr. SCOTT. I understood him to make that statement this afternoon. Certainly he made that statement on the 21st of February in introducing these measures, and I understood him to repeat this afternoon his intimation that it would be the duty of parliament to revoke in some way these rights which the corporation holds under the contract. If there is any necessity for putting section 23 in the Bills, there is an equal reason for putting something additional in the Bills to give some tangible intimation to the people of these provinces and the people of Canada that that is the intention of parliament. I wish to suggest to the government the addition of a few words. I would move that the section be amended by adding the following words:

> Provided that the foregoing shall not prejudice the right of the parliament of Canada, by expropriation or otherwise to obtain the relinquishment by said company of the company's rights under section 16 of the contract aforesaid.

I am not a lawyer. I have myself drafted these words and if the government and the House assent to the principle of my suggestion it may be found necessary to recast what I have suggested.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not had an opportunity to consider this amendment, and therefore am not able to advise about it. But, at first sight, I would suggest that it is unnecessary. Just now, we are giving effect to a contract entered into with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and it seems to me that if we did not enact the clause we should be guilty of a violation of every canon of decency and good faith. The right of this company to exemption of taxation in the Northwest and in that part of Manitoba which formed part of the Northwest Territories in 1881 is based on section 16 of the contract between the syndicate, now represented by the company, and the Crown, represented by the government of that day. The contract is dated 21st October, 1880, and forms part of the statute 44 Victoria, Chapter 1. This section 16 to which we are practically giving effect to-day is as follows:

> The Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations and station grounds, work shops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereafter to be established, or by any municipal corporation therein; and lands of the company, in the Northwest Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also

be free from such taxation for 20 years after the grant thereof from the Crown.

This provision, of course, was ratified and approved of by parliament by means of the statute to which I have just referred. No property of the company within the limits I have described has been subject to taxation from the time the railway was constructed up to the present. That contract, in my opinion, created a solemn obligation on the part of the Crown, ratified by parliament; and I submit that nothing can be done, justly, by this parliament to impair that solemn obligation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought there was another statute which expressly provided——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am just coming to that. I would like the committee to take note of the fact that the section I have quoted provides expressly for the case we are now dealing with, that is to say, the formation of the Northwest Territories into a province. Now, this exemption is to extend to any province thereafter—that is after the section has been passed—to be established. The Act to which the leader of the opposition has referred, I presume, is 44 Victoria, Chapter 14, which provides for the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba. Subsection (b) of section 2 of that Act provides as follows:

(b) The said increased limit and the territory thereby added to the province of Manitoba shall be subject to all such provisions as may have been or shall hereafter be enacted, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway and the lands to be granted in aid thereof.

So that this parliament has given legislative sanction to the obligation we assumed under the original contract. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) suggested that this matter was up for consideration incidentally in the Supreme Court in connection with a number of cases of municipalities, two in the Northwest Territories and one in Manitoba. These cases were to test the validity of by-laws taxing for school purposes the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's lands. In that case the argument was put forward that if Manitoba chose to commit a breach of this agreement by taxing these lands, there was no power to prevent this. Thus there was a direct test of the validity of this enactment. The point was dealt with by Mr. Justice Nesbitt who said in delivering judgment:

In the case of the tax levied in the Northwest Territories, to give effect to the contention of the appellants would, in reality, be to hold that the contract did not exempt the land while in the Northwest Territories, but to make it subject to taxation and to be exempt only when the contingency of provincial autonomy occurred, if it ever did occur within twenty years from the issue of the patents. Such a construction is so opposed to good sense and good faith and so foreign to the object of the contract that apparently it never occurred to any one until after the opening of the argument of the case before the court in Manitoba. In my view the company's lands to be earned by building the railway were exempted for twenty years from the issue of the patent, from any Dominion taxation, or from provincial or muncipal taxation, by any bodies subsequently obtaining provincial or municipal authorities in respect of such lands.

There is the opinion of a distinguished judge of the Supreme Court on this very point. And, in the face of the statute and of this construction put upon the statute, I conceive that it would be an absolute impossibility for us to do otherwise than to give effect to the provision of the contract I have referred to. As to the question whether we shall negotiate with the company to obtain a release from them of the rights under the agreement, that is a matter of policy and one that I have nothing to do with now. What I have to do with is to give effect to a solemn parliamentary contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, in the case to which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has made an allusion, Mr. Justice Nesbitt in the portion of the judgment dealing with the exemption in the province of Manitoba based his judgment to some extent at least on the ground that Manitoba had not attempted to repeal the provision.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not the point I referred to at all, I referred to the Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I refer to Manitoba, I was distinguishing it from the Northwest Territories. I do not know that there would be any special distinction between the case of Manitoba and this territory added to Manitoba, and the case of the Northwest Territories. In considering this section it is necessary to distinguish absolutely between the question of legislative power and the duty of observing a contract made between the Crown and a company—they are two absolutely distinct things. Let me illustrate that in this way. The Crown made a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which has been ratified by Act of this parliament. The making of that contract does not take away from this parliament its legislative power; parliament may to-morrow destroy the effect of that contract by means of a statute, but it would be absolutely wrong, improper and even immoral to do so. So far as the legislatures of the new provinces are concerned, the matter is pretty much in the same position. I do not know whether the section which has beeen inserted in this Bill is intended as a constitutional limitation which deprives the new province of a certain power which it would otherwise have, or whether it is intended, as my hon. friend from La-

nark (Mr. Haggart) has suggested just now, as a notice to the province that the Crown had entered into a contract which must be observed, or which ought to be observed, by the legislature of the province in dealing with that question. Let us not forget that it is the same Crown which is represented by the executive of Canada and by the executive of the new province ; it is the same Crown, which in respect of Dominion matters acts by the advice of the Dominion executive, while in respect of the new province it acts by the advice of the provincial executive ; but it is the same Crown, there is only one Crown in this country. Then let us for one moment see what would be the position if this power were handed over to the legislature of the new province in so far as section 16, of the contract deals with taxation by the province or taxation within the province. The position would be no worse from the standpoint of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company than it is to-day, assuming that we handed over to the new province that power. Thereafter, as I would understand it, this parliament would still retain the legislative power of dealing with the contract so far as the Dominion is concerned, and the legislature of the province would receive, by virtue of this statute, the power to deal with that particular provision of the contract in so far as provincial and municipal taxation is concerned. The Dominion would be bound by every canon and standard of good faith to observe the contract, and the province would be equally bound by every canon and standard of good faith to observe the same contract. That is the position as it occurs to me.

Mr. SCOTT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that his opinion is that the province would have rights of expropriation ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They would have the right of expropriation, that would necessarily follow of course if the assumption which I made in dealing with the question were a correct assumption. I said that I was not quite sure whether this would operate as a constitutional limitation, in which case the provincial legislature would have no power to deal with the matter at all—that is, if we have the power to restrict the legislature in that regard—or whether it was intended as simply a notice to the legislature that the Crown had entered into a contract which ought to be observed by the new legislature. If I did not make myself clear, let me repeat for a moment what I said in order that I may do so. This parliament has the power to deal with the subject matter of section 16 of the C.P.R. contract so far as it relates to Dominion taxation, and we would not be willing to deal with it otherwise then upon terms absolutely fair to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that is, we ought not to expropriate without compensation. If the legislative power were confided to the new province it would stand exactly in the same position. The Crown is represented in the province and the Crown is represented in the Dominion. The Crown made a contract, the Dominion parliament can deal with it so far as the Dominion is concerned, and the legislature of the province can deal with it so far as the province is concerned, if such power is conferred by this parliament in establishing the new province. Well, what is the position we are in to-day in that regard? I am as strongly in favour as any man can be of absolutely observing contracts. If we handed over the subject matter of clause 16, so far as provincial and municipal taxation is concerned, to the new province, I would regard it as absolutely essential that the province, in attempting to deal with that matter, should deal with it upon the just and fair terms which would be incumbent upon this parliament if we were dealing with it. For example, if the Prime Minister should adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia and should attempt to relieve the people of the Northwest, and indeed relieve the Dominion as a whole from this exemption, parliament could only do it upon perfectly fair terms.

In that connection let me say that possibly some of us in this country are not fully alive to what may be done in the way of taxation by the new provinces. In considering that question a little as it presents itself to-day in Manitoba, I find that the province of Manitoba has passed a statute, which is to be found in the consolidated statutes of Manitoba, 1902, volume 2, chapter 166, and which in effect provides that every railway company shall pay to the province such part of its gross earnings, not exceeding three per cent, as the lieutenant governor in Council shall determine. Under that statute the province of Manitoba has levied taxation upon the gross earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and during the year 1904 they collected from the Canadian Pacific Railway, under the terms of that statute, no less a sum than $56,450. So that although the lands and buildings and other properties of the railway are exempt from taxation, it would appear—I do not know that the question has been tested in the courts—but it would appear that notwithstanding this provision in the contract of 1881, the new provinces may, in the exercise of the same rights as those exercised by Manitoba, tax the gross earnings of the company, although they cannot tax its lands and property. Therefore the grievance in the Northwest Territories might not be found so great as has been suggested. I myself, two years ago, in the session of 1903, when the members from the Northwest were pressing strongly upon the attention of parliament the discontent

and dissatisfaction which had been created in the Northwest by this tax exemption, suggested to the Prime Minister that if that discontent and dissatisfaction prevailed to so great an extent as had been represented, and if it were likely to obstruct the flow of immigration into those Territories, it would be a reasonable thing for the government to consider forthwith the project of entering into negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the purpose of doing away with this exemption, and I was prepared to support a reasonable measure for the purpose of removing this exemption at the expense of the people of Canada as a whole, because I thought it would be in the interest of the people as a whole to do so rather than to have immigration obstructed and the development of the Northwest arrested. So far as this provision is concerned, I would like to have the view of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice—either to-day or at some convenient time, if he does not feel disposed to answer to-day, because, being of the same profession as the Minister of Justice, I realize that it is much easier sometimes to ask a question than to answer it offhand—whether he would regard this as a constitutional limitation upon the powers of the new province, or whether it might not be its true effect that the Crown, having made a contract, is bound to carry it out in good faith in so far as the Dominion as a whole is concerned; and thus while we retain the legislative power in the Dominion, so far as exemption from Dominion taxation is concerned, we are really handing over the legislative power to the new province to be exercised by it in so far as section 16 of the contract concerns provincial taxation by municipalities within the province.

To sum up once more: the Crown has made a contract and parliament ought to observe that contract. The advisers of the Crown must insist always that parliament shall observe that contract. They would be perfectly justified in resigning if parliament did not see fit to do so and any subsequent advisers of the Crown ought to pursue the same course. But, after all, under the terms of section 23, will not that remain, as far as the Dominion is concerned, a matter for consideration by the Dominion parliament in connection with any action of the Dominion executive and will it not, in so far as the province or the municipalities are concerned, remain a matter for legislative action within the province by the legislature of the province acting in connection with the provincial executive? It is a question which I have not as fully considered as I would like to have done, but it struck me in listening to the arguments which have been made upon the question and in listening to the explanation of the hon. Minister of Justice that possibly after all that might be the true result, and I do not think the result is one which may be regarded as very prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think that any statute which should be passed by the legislature of the province, except on fair terms in respect to the contract entered into by the Crown many years ago, is one which should be approved by the Dominion executive in whom, of course, rests the final decision by way of disallowance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I said on a previous occasion in connection with this debate, this is one of the two clauses of this Bill for which I am personally responsible. I would like to say that this particular clause was drafted for the purpose of imposing a constitutional limitation on the legislature of the new province. The view I took of the matter was that by virtue of section 16 of the contract we had constitutionally—I will not say bound ourselves for all time, because parliament has the power to do what is wrong—but constitutionally we bound ourselves to observe this provision in the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and we bound ourselves not only to observe it ourselves, but to see that when a province was created, which province would have jurisdiction over these Territories, it would effectually carry out that contract, and therefore, I think that we should enact a provision which would prevent the legislature—and I do not for a moment suggest that it would do such a thing—from in any way legislating in any such way as to interfere with the provisions of that contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I quite appreciate what the hon. Minister of Justice has said. Of course, I am presenting it from the standpoint that we would not necessarily suppose any greater danger of violation of the terms of the contract by the legislature of the province than that which we might apprehend from any future parliament of Canada. Therefore, I think that possibly in that view the section might have been intended to distribute the exercise of legislative power in future between the parliament of Canada on the one hand and the legislature of the province on the other hand. That, as I said before, might not be regarded as prejudicial to the interests of the company.

Mr. GALLIHER. If it is necessary to carry out the legislation passed in 1881, in so far as the Dominion parliament had power to legislate in regard to this exemption from taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to insert a clause in this Act, or in the Acts creating these provinces, such as clause 23, then, I perfectly agree with the position that the government are taking in the matter, but if it is not necessary then

I want some more light on the subject. I think it will be admitted that the Dominion parliament in 1881 had power to legislate as to this exemption up to the time that these unorganized Territories, should be created into provinces. While these were unorganized Territories, and while they were not formed into provinces the only way by which that legislation could be interfered with would be by a repeal of the statute. That, of course has not taken place up to the present time nor should it have taken place, because, in so far as the Dominion parliament in 1881 had power to legislate on the subject, I agree with the contention that it is the duty of this parliament to observe and maintain that compact. As my hon. friend beside me says it is a contract. I have not been able to give as much attention to this matter as I should have, and I may be wrong, but this question strikes me: Had the parliament of Canada, in 1881, power to legislate for these unorganized Territories beyond the time that they remained unorganized Territories and to extend the operation of that legislation to the time after they became provinces? If they had the power to do so we are right still in continuing the exemption that is proposed here, but if they had not the power to do so, if when these unorganized Territories are created into provinces they should have the right under the British North America Act to deal exclusively with the subject of taxation then this question suggests itself to me: Are we justified in making good, as I believe we would be by this provision, what might have been an excessive power exercised by the Dominion parliament at the time that this legislation was enacted in 1881? If that could be made clear to me I could quite easily see the position of the government and of those who are supporting it on the other side of the House. But, I would like to see the necessity for enacting this section 23. If we were to put something into this Bill which would destroy the rights of the Canadian Pacific Railway under the enactment of 1881 we would be doing wrong just as much as we would be doing wrong by repealing the Act, but if we leave that absolutely alone, if we are absolutely silent in these Bills creating these provinces as to the exemption clause, what is the position? If the Act passed by the parliament of Canada in 1881 was good or sufficient and they had the power to extend the exemption as they have specified that they have extended it to the time when these Territories should become provinces, then, that cannot affect it, because, even if there is a provision in the British North America Act which gives the Territories exclusive jurisdiction as to taxation after they became provinces they can only assume provincial powers subjet to the exemption created by the Act of 1881, granting that the Dominion parliament had full power to go as far as they did go. Now I may be wrong in the conclusion to which I have come, but if I am right in that conclusion I think that they should be left to whatever exemption they actually receive and actually are entitled by law to receive under the Act of 1881.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Act of 1881 does not give any exemption beyond the period during which they shall have a territorial government.

Mr. GALLIHER. The reading, as I understood it, would extend to the time also when they became provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. 'Make provision for becoming provinces'; you will have to have something new then.

Mr. GALLIHER. I did not understand it, and I do not understand it in that way.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The statement of the Minister of Justice is in substance that this is a limitation of the provinces.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not of the provinces, of the constitution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Of the powers of the provinces, and in that way it is asserting the actual jurisdiction of this parliament to do almost whatever it likes. I say this further, that apparently the Canadian Pacific Railway have no confidence in their position as regards this province when it is created, and that they are the petitioners for this clause, and I think hon. gentlemen opposite ought to tell the House whether the Canadian Pacific Railway have come to them and said: You must protect us now from this province, as we imagine our rights will cease to exist after the province is created, and if you do not we will come upon you. The hon. gentleman has been saying a great deal, and so have all the legal gentlemen in the House about the sanctity of contracts and of vested rights. Let me tell the hon. gentlemen, and especially the Minister of Justice, that the government is compelling these little provinces to assume the obligations of the Dominion. The Dominion, which entered into this contract and granted something to the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose honour is at stake, has no hesitation in imposing upon these two little provinces the discharge of the obligation they entered upon. If the minister wants to unload the obligation on the smaller party—on the provinces—he ought to make provision for the provinces assuming the obligation of the greater parliament. But he has not done so, and I do not think there are any morals in that. When hon. gentlemen are talking about morals in law and the sanctity of contracts, I asked them what is their opinion of unloading on these two new governments in the west, these new settlers, the obligations that the Dominion assumed

a great many years ago ? Have not these settlers some rights ? Have they no vested right to fair play in this country ? Are the people of the Dominion to come along to them and say : We entered into a solemn obligation with the Canadian Pacific Railway twenty-five years ago that they were to be exempted from taxation in your country, and now the time has come to erect you as provinces, and we are going to dump the load on you. Let us look into the matter from that point of view, and I say that the government cannot justify the discharge of the obligation they owe to the Canadian Pacific Railway by imposing it on these provinces, and I also bring out this view now that here is a confession in this House by the Minister of Justice of the supremacy of parliament to do anything it likes in regard to the creation of new provinces ; that we are not bound by the British North America Act. They are asserting the right to impose limitations on the provinces in regard to their municipal taxation, and they are imposing other limitations on the provinces in a way they should not. I was glad to hear the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) endorse what Manitoba is doing. It is within the competence of these new provinces to tax these railways on their income, and they have further power even—they can tax one company more than another. The cure may come in this way, that the two new provinces—and I advise them to do it at the first session—may put a tax on the earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway unless the Canadian Pacific Railway agree to surrender this advantage that they have. And let us just see what it is. Here is the original clause, which I shall read again in order to emphasize it :

> The Canadian Pacific Railway and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards, and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation, &c.

Is that fair ? Is it fair for the Dominion parliament to put this imposition on the young provinces, that this great corporation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, all its stock, all its stations, its roadbed, shall be for ever free from municipal taxation ? Is it fair, is it honourable? The provinces have some vested rights under the British North America Act, and there is a solemn contract with the provinces in that Act. Does the Minister of Justice admit that this is a solemn contract, and are there solemn rights defined in this solemn contract ? Surely this contract, the British North America Act, is as sacred as any contract ever made in this country, and if these provinces have rights, and if other people have obligations, and they seek to discharge these obligations by imposing them upon a lesser power and a lesser community, a struggling community, who are our settlers, and who are also to be the best customers and clients of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to supply them with freight and to build up their road ; is it fair to respect the contract contained in the constitution ? I put it to the Minister of Justice that there is as good a contract in this British North America Act, as between the Dominion and the provinces, as there is between the Dominion and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and when you come to choose as to which contract has the most sanctity, I say that the original contract between the Dominion and the provinces is the one that has the senior position in that regard, and I say that parliament ought to leave this clause out. There is nothing mandatory even in the contract that we shall reimpose this, or if there is anything mandatory it is that we must respect provincial rights in this case ; and if the cure is not effected in one way, it shall be in another. It is all very well to give us lawyers' opinions, as has been done in this House. Let me recall to the people and to this House an instance bearing on this. In Ontario not long ago the attention of the Attorney General was called to the existence of a certain pool-room nuisance in my own constituency. The Attorney General went into the law and said : The law is this, and I am powerless ; I can do nothing, but I am obeying the law. He said : That is the law ; just as we are told here to-day : This is the law. But a change of government took place, another Attorney General comes in, and he says : This is the law. He enforces the law, and the result is altogether different. What is the difference between these two legal opinions ? Lawyers do not always agree, in fact they differ all the time. As I said before, you can get as many opinions as you care to pay out fees ; and if that is the case, the people of the province, as their rights are defined in this solemn contract, the British North America Act, ought to be defended to-day from the imposition that is being put upon them ; and again I call the attention of the Minister of Justice, when he talks about vested rights, to the fact that the government is to-day putting on the statute-book a statute which enables the Dominion government to evade its obligation and to impose it upon these two small provinces in the west. If that is the case, I say it is not good law ; it is not the constitution ; it is not respecting sacred rights, and I trust the Prime Minister will give me some credit for, perhaps—although, not being a lawyer, because I do not profess to be one, and I thank God I am not one—but I hope he will give me credit for saying something in the interest of the settlers, and bringing to the notice of parliament a grievance that can be cured in spite of the opinions of lawyers. There is a way to cure these grievances, and they can be cured without doing injustice to anybody.

It is all very fine to cure these grievances by sending them to the courts ; but that is

not the way to cure public grievances. The cure of them is rather in negotiation and in legislation. Any amount of litigation will arise out of this Act which we are now considering and I do not know where it is to end. What we ought to try to do is to respect the rights of all and give fair-play to all. I am not proposing any confiscation against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, notwithstanding that it is a very rich and powerful corporation ; but I am urging on parliament and on the government the necessity of their doing something for the relief of the settlers of the Northwest in the matter of this exemption clause. The relief in regard to the lands is coming gradually by the sale of the lands after twenty years. But this other frightful exemption, which declares that the company shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion or any province, is the worst exemption that was ever put on the statute-book of Canada. There is no such exemption in any other contract in this Canada of ours. I challenge any one to produce an equal one. It may not have been regarded in that light at the time it was imposed. The opposition of that day did so regard it, but the government did not ; but it is to-day the most iniquitous exemption in Canada or in any province of Canada; and I do not think the hon. member for West Assiniboia should attack me for bringing that forward, even though I have not agreed with him on some things. I may have been inconsistent in some things ; but when I am pointing out the iniquity of the exemption and asking for some cure for it, I ought to have the sympathy and support of the hon. gentlemen from the west.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The hon. gentleman a moment ago admitted that he was not a lawyer. The evidence of that was so obvious in the suggestion he made that he need hardly have taken the trouble to give us the information. My hon. friend wished to know if this clause had been imposed on the government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I may tell him that I drew the clause myself, and that I consulted the Canadian Pacific Railway with reference to it and as to the form in which it should be put, because I felt that it was necessary to consider the position of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to take its interests into account. If I were dealing with the interests of a beggar on the street, I would consult him before I would endeavour to dispose of them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did the hon. gentleman, then, consult the settlers of the west ?

An hon. MEMBER. They are the beggars.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They are the beggars on the street.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is another suggestion on a par with the one the hon. gentleman made a moment ago, only in this instance the hon. gentleman acts the part of an echo. The people of the Northwest were represented, I presume, at the time this contract was made. That was the time when those who are now protesting ought to have protested. That was the time when those who suggested a moment ago to my hon. friend to make this observation ought to have been heard ; but they were not heard. Let me draw my hon. friend's attention to clause 16 in the contract, which provides that the stations and station grounds, &c., of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shall be exempt from taxation by this parliament. To that extent that clause is a contract between this parliament and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But there is more than that. That clause is in effect a contract between this parliament and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by which this parliament undertook to provide that if thereafter the Territories were erected into a province, a constitutional limit would be put upon their powers as a province with respect to the right of taxation. That is what this parliament agreed to ; that is what this contract drawn by Sir John Abbott and supported by other distinguished men of that day decided ; and there was no protest then by the men who are now protesting against this exemption.

Mr. SPROULE. If the minister will excuse me, I think there was a discussion in the Railway Committee as to whether we had or had not the power, and my remembrance is that the contention of Sir John Abbott was that we had the power in the event of erecting a province.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And parliament confirmed that opinion, and all we are doing now is to give effect to what parliament had in contemplation at that time. We are doing nothing more than that, and, so far as this load on the Northwest Territories which my hon. friend refers to is concerned, if parliament wants to rid the Territories of that incubus, if I may use the word, parliament is free to do it. Parliament has the means in its own hands, if the people of this country want to assume additional burdens to those which they already assumed in connection with that railway. But let us do one thing at a time. Let us give effect to what we contracted to do in 1881. When we have done that, the door is still wide open to us if we want to go further.

Mr. LAKE. This exemption from taxation is certainly a very serious burden on the people of the Northwest. The matter was laid before the present government some years ago, when the people of the Territories were asking for provincial autonomy, and I propose to put upon ' Hansard ' the argument with reference to this particular subject which was used by the representative of the Northwest Territories at that time. He said :

In addition to the matters dealt with in the foregoing draft Bill, I have also to direct your attention to, and to press for the removal by ancillary legislation of the exemption from taxation granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company under clause 16 of the schedule to chapter 1 of the Dominion statutes of 1881. The exemption as is well known is two-fold. First that in the words : 'The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be for ever free from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province to be hereafter established, or by any municipal corporation therein,' and, second, in that part of the clause which reads 'and the lands of the company in the Northwest Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the Crown.' The effect of these exemptions is to prohibit any province which may be established—or any municipal corporation therein—from requiring the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to assist in the administration of the country or the maintenance of 'peace, order and good government' within its bounds with respect to a part of its property for ever and with respect to another part for a limited period of time. This exemption falls hardly upon the people of the Northwest Territories in a number of ways. The nature of the land grant to the company, in that it is spread over the whole country in small blocks of one mile square alternating with those open for homesteads, causes every dollar spent by the settler in the improvement of his homestead, where it lies within the districts reserved for the selection of the land granted on account of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to enhance the value of the lands held for the company in its neighbourhood. All public expenditures made in such districts for roads, bridges and other works of a similar description improve the value of the lands still held by the company under its main line grant, the company contributing nothing on account of such lands towards the cost of the works by reason of which they are benefited.

An examination of the terms of the grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company shows that the exemption will bear with particular stress upon any province established within the area referred to in the draft Bill. The paragraph lettered 'A' of clause 9 in the schedule to the 1881 Canadian Pacific Railway Act—chapter 1 of the statutes of that year—reads (a) the said subsidy in money is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, namely :

Central Section.

Assumed at 1,350 miles—
1st—900 miles at $10,000 per mile.. .. ..$9,000,000
2nd—450 miles at $13,333 per mile.. 6,000,000
$15,000,000

Eastern Section.

Assumed at 650 miles, subsidy equal to $15,384.61 per mile.. 10,000,000

25,000,000

And the said subsidy in land is hereby divided and appropriated as follows, subject to the reserve hereinafter provided for :

Central Section.

1st—900 miles at 12,500 acres per mile.. .. ..$11,250,000
2nd—450 miles at 16,666·66 acres per mile 7,500,000
$18,750,000

Eastern Section.

Assumed at 650 miles, subsidy equal to 9,615 acres per mile 6,250,000

25,000,000

The original land grant of 25,000,000 acres has been reduced by 6,793,041 acres at a cost to Canada of $10,189,521, thus leaving the company to receive 18,206,986 acres. In other words, the amount of that apportionment of the land grant on account of the construction of the eastern section—or that part of the railway between Callender and a point east of Red River to which the road had been constructed from Selkirk by the government, all of which lies in the province of Ontario—has been exchanged for cash at the cost of the people of the Territories equally with those of every other part of Canada. Of the balance of the land grant, the company has selected some 2,500,000 acres within the province of Manitoba, leaving the balance to be selected from the lands within the Northwest Territories out of the extensive areas reserved for that purpose. This particular grant is that made on account of the construction of the central section of the railway, namely, that from Selkirk to Kamloops, which has been definitely ascertained to be a distance of 1,250 miles. This distance is divisable as follows : Manitoba, 220 miles ; Northwest Territories, 760 miles ; British Columbia, 270 miles. It is therefore apparent that a proportionate area, based upon the mileage through the province at the rate granted per mile through the prairie portion of the central section (220 miles at 12,500 acres per mile, being 2,750,000 acres) has not been taken from Manitoba lands, and that in addition to this shortage of 25,000 acres the whole of the grant earned by construction through British Columbia (at the mountain rate of 16,666·66 acres per mile) is being made, out of the lands of the Territories. Even if, under any process of reasoning, the exemption clause can be justified as regards the construction of the railway through the Territoiries, it is not thought that the Territories can in equity be required to bear this extra burden on account of the construction of the railway through the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia. If they are so required, the people of the Territories, who are individually contributing equally to the cost to Canada of the interest upon the debt created by the payment of the original bonus of $25,000,000, the payment of $10,189,321 for the repurchase of the land grant on account of the eastern, or Ontario, section of the railway, together with the annual payment of $100,000 to British Columbia for the lands conveyed to Canada under the terms of the imperial Order in Council of May 16, 1871, to aid in the construction of the railway, will be also liable to bear whatever the exemption from taxation under the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1881 may mean. By the terms of that Act the province to be established—or any municipal corporation therein—will be prohibited from taxing the company or its property in any manner or for any reason. Unless invidious comparisons are made between the Canadian Pacific and other railway companies this will mean the

involuntary relinquishment of resources to that avenue of revenue as no competing company will be liable to expend the necessarily vast sums of money required unless it has prospects of obtaining similar exemption from taxation at the hands of the province.

The necessity for the extraordinary burden upon the people of the west is not obvious. Ample evidence exists to show that the railway was not in any sense built for the benefit of the Northwest. In 1865 the Honourable George Brown voiced the opinion of the government of the day when he stated in his place in the parliament of Canada during the confederation debates 'the confederation is, therefore, clearly committed to the carrying out of both these enterprises,' his reference being to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and the opening up of communications with the Northwest Territories. 'I doubt,' he proceeded to say, 'if there was a member of the conference who did not consider that the opening up of the Northwest and the improvement of our canal system were not as clearly for the advantage of the lower provinces as for the interests of Upper Canada. Indeed, one gentleman held that the lower provinces were more interested—they wished to get their products into the west—they wanted a back country as much as we did—they wanted to be the carriers for that great country—and they were, therefore to say the least, as much interested in the questions as we were.' But there is no need to go back beyond the solemn compact entered into between Canada and the colony of British Columbia in 1871.

The imperial Order in Council of May 16, 1871, respecting the province of British Columbia, sets forth as one of the terms and conditions upon which that colony consented to enter the confederation, the undertaking of the government of Canada 'to secure the commencement simultaneously within two years from the date of the union, of the construction of a railway, from the Pacific toward the Rocky Mountains, and from such point as may be selected east of the Rocky Mountains toward the Pacific, to connect the sea-board of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada; and further to secure the completion of such railway within ten years from the date of the union. The preamble to chapters 71 and 72 of the Dominion statutes of 1872 and chapter 1 of the statutes of 1881 all set forth the fact in various ways that—to quote from the last mentioned Act—'by the terms and conditions of the admission of British Columbia into the union with the Dominion of Canada, the government of the Dominion has assumed the obligation of causing a railway to be constructed connecting the seaboard of British Columbia with the railway system of Canada.

All this being so, it is difficult for the people of the Northwest Territories to understand why they should be called upon to assume any other burden than that of contributing proportionately—and no more—with the people of other parts of Canada towards the cost of carrying out the obligation assumed by Canada under the compact with British Columbia. The exemption from taxation granted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Act is undoubtedly such an added burden, and an imposition upon the people of the Northwest Territories that cannot be justified. For no reason that is conceivable, this exemption bears with greater stress upon the Territories than it does even upon Manitoba. Except those lands selected by the company under its land grant which lie in that part of Manitoba added to the original province after the contract of 1881, none of the property of the company is exempt from taxation in Manitoba. That province to-day is taxing the company under chapter 57 of the Provincial Acts of 1890.

In view of the foregoing it is submitted that parliament should be asked to take such steps as may appear advisable in order to countervail the operation of the exemption clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract within the limits of the province to be created.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. gentleman say whose statement that is?

Mr. LAKE. That is a portion of a letter sent by Mr. Haultain inclosing the draft Bill on behalf of the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories. I have heard it suggested in this House, I think, that there had been an omission on the part of the legislative assembly to ask that this exemption from taxation should be done away with, and so I consider it advisable to place on the records the statement I have just read. I think the statement shows quite clearly that a very considerable burden is imposed upon the people of the Northwest Territories by this exemption. As I understand, it was admitted just now on the other side of the House that the reason for the clause it was proposed to insert in the present Bill was to protect parliament. Now, it seems to me that this is not just. This burden was imposed upon the people of the new provinces without their consent—there can be no question about that. There was no province at the time, there was no representative body in the Territories, and there was no representation of the Territories in this parliament. Therefore, it appears to me that, as it was the Dominion itself which made the contract, it is the Dominion which is responsible to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the benefits which that company were to receive on the completion of their share of the contract. I think, therefore, that it is only fair that the Dominion, at the present time, should assume that burden itself and relieve the people of the Northwest from it. As has been pointed out in the statement which I have just read, the Northwest Territories are paying their share, along with the other people of Canada, of the money grant required to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are also finding the land grants, not only for the line constructed in the Northwest Territories, but also for a portion of that constructed in Manitoba and for the whole of the line constructed in British Columbia. I fail to see why, in addition to all this, this burden caused by the exemption from taxation should be placed upon the people of the Northwest. And it is a burden. With reference to the exemption of taxation on the land grant, I think we have a very strong claim to relief upon the Dominion

government. I believe it to be generally admitted that the intention of the contract was that there should be a twenty years' exemption. Whether the period was to run from the date of the contract or from the date on which the lands were earned does not matter now, for the period has expired in either case. If it had been intended to extend the exemption any longer the contract would have so stated. It was to be an exemption for twenty years from a certain date, now more than twenty years ago. And if the exemption is now in force on a very large portion of these lands in the Northwest Territories that is not due to any fault or any laxity on the part of the Territories themselves; it is really due to the neglect of the Dominion administration. I think that is quite clear. If the patents had been issued to the company immediately, the exemption period would have expired by this time, and the people of the Northwest would have been able to tax this land. It becomes the duty of the Dominion government, whose fault it is that the exemption still runs, to see to it that that exemption is taken away. When I went into that country upwards of twenty years ago, one of the first things I heard was that the odd-numbered sections were exempt from taxation for twenty years. I firmly believed that at the end of the twenty years we would be able to call upon the owners of the alternate sections to pay their share of the necessary expense for carrying on the local government of the country. I speak from experience as to this exemption being a burden upon the people. I live at this time in a section of the country where a considerable number of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands have been undisposed of and where there are still areas undisposed of, and all the time my taxes have been higher on that account than they would otherwise have been. For instance, I had to pay for school taxes at one time nearly twice what I should have had to pay if all these lands had been occupied by settlers, and the lands would have been occupied by settlers, I have little doubt, had not it been for the fact that they were being held at a price by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. At present I have to pay considerably more than I would have to pay if these lands had been settled on. And the same is true of the local improvement tax. Every farmer throughout that country who settles in a district which the Canadian Pacific Railway lands have not been disposed of is exposed to this great increase of taxation on account of the exemption. It has been stated that, in the course of time, owing to the sale of lands by the company, and also owing to the fact that, in any case, within fifteen or twenty years the exemption will cease, therefore this is a vanishing question. Still, I cannot see the reason why even for the next fifteen or twenty years the farmers of that country must continue to bear this additional burden. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been disposing of considerable portions of their land grants lately. But this is frequently done in such a way that we are unable to tax the lands they thus dispose of. I know of one large company which is selling Canadian Pacific Railway lands, but which claims that it is merely acting as agent for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in this service, although I think there can be little doubt that it has really taken over the lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway. They are claiming this exemption and the people in the portion of the country to which I am referring, which has only recently been settled have to bear this additional burden, although those who purchased and those who did not buy their lands from the Canadian Pacific Railway but from this large land corporation. I consider that it is in the interest of the settling up of that country that this exemption of the land grant from taxation should be swept away. If there were not an exemption the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would certainly try to dispose of these lands as quickly as they could. But so long as there is no taxation to be paid on the lands, just so long will they continuue raising the price to obtain the highest figure possible. When the Canadian Pacific Railway had a monopoly of the carrying trade in the Northwest it was to their interest, as it is still in many parts of the country, to dispose of these lands as quickly as they could. Every new settler they put upon the lands brought them an added profit in the carrying business which they did for them. Some time ago they used to sell the lands at a very low figure in order to promote settlement. But in certain parts this condition is now changing. The Canadian Pacific Railway owns lands which are tributary to some of the new railway corporations which are coming in, and it is not to the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway to sacrifice those lands when the people who buy them will do their carrying business through other railways, and naturally the Canadian Pacific Railway will retain these lands which are exempt from taxes in their possession in hope of a rise. I do not wish to suggest that the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be interfered with in any way. I consider that contract as sacred; but I do hold that it is the duty of the Dominion government to accept the obligations incurred by themselves under this contract, and not place all those obligations upon the shoulders of the people in the new provinces.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Let me point out to the right hon. gentleman and to the government how they can immediately secure the commutation of this exemption. There is always a way out of every difficulty, and I will show the right hon. gentle-

man a legal way out of this difficulty. Let me read clause 20 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act :

> The limit to the reduction of tolls by the parliament of Canada provided for by the eleventh subsection of the 17th section of 'The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879', respecting tolls, is hereby extended, so that such reduction may be to such an extent that such tolls when reduced shall not produce less than ten per cent per annum profit on the capital actually expended in the construction of the railway, instead of not less than fifteen per cent per annum profit, as provided by the said subsection; and so also that such reduction shall not be made unless the net income of the company, ascertained as decribed in said subsection, should have exceeded ten per cent per annum instead of fifteen per cent per annum as provided by the said subsection.

Now here is a provision whereby the parliament of Canada can compel the Canadian Pacific Railway to come before it and show what it has cost to build that railway, and they are entitled only to earn ten per cent on the actual cost of that railway. Parliament has had that power over the Canadian Pacific Railway ever since the contract was entered into, and the time has now arrived, indeed it arrived long ago, when the government of this country should demand a statement of the cost of the construction of that road and should tell the railway : The day has come when your rates must be reduced as provided for in the statute, and we intend to reduce them. If the Canadian Pacific Railway had been brought before parliament, supposing an Act were passed in which we said to them : You must go before the Board of Railway Commissioners and show the original cost of your railway, and be prepared to submit to this reduction—I say the Canadian Pacific would have given up this exemption clause the day they got that notice. But instead of that, instead of dealing with the whole question now as the government should deal with it, they only deal with a part of it, they strengthen the Canadian Pacific Railway in their exemption, and they refrain from taking any action in regard to the regulation of their tolls, notwithstanding that the hon. gentleman says it is a bad exemption, an improvident exemption. He agrees with me in saying that it was the worst exemption on the statute-book of Canada. He still has under this Act power to go after the Canadian Pacific Railway and bring them before him, to compel them to produce papers in connection with the cost of the railway, and to say the time has arrived for a reduction of the old rates by the parliament of Canada. Now we have that power, and if we exercised it we would get a commutation of this exemption. The hon. gentleman thinks not. Well, let him try it. He has taken jurisdiction over other companies ; combines like the tobacco trust are under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and we can compel them to do certain things. We have the Canadian Pacific Railway Company within our jurisdiction as regards their rates, and you can always make a trade in a matter of this kind, and in that way the provinces can get relief. I say this clause should not be passed to-day as it is proposed without some provision being made by which the government can get a settlement of both these questions, in one of which the Canadian Pacific Railway has the advantage and in the other the people have the advantage. Let the government settle both questions together, and if that is done the Territories will be afforded relief. Show them we have more strings to our bow than they imagine. Here is a solemn contract signed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company providing for a reduction of their rates at a certain stage of their earnings, and this government to-day can, by enforcing that condition, obtain one of two things : They can probably make it clear that there ought to be a reduction in the tolls ; or they may say : We will not enforce that reduction of tolls for five years hence provided you commute this exemption. The hon. member for Assiniboia stated just now the character of this exemption. Let me point out, on similar lines, that this exemption is what is called an unearned increment, that is to say, the people of the west are constantly increasing the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway by every dollar that they tax themselves. They tax themselves for local improvements, they build roads, the Canadian Pacific Railway contributes nothing, but the Canadian Pacific Railway takes up all this unearned increment, and the settler taxes himself for his own roads ; he not only provides for himself but for the Canadian Pacific Railway, and he doubles and trebles the value of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now that is the greatest injustice that exists in the world, the injustice that inures to the benefit of the few against the many, the injustice that is called the unearned increment. It is happening all the world over, it is happening in this case, it is happening in cities. We may not be able to reach it in the case of cities, but in some way we can reach it. The Minister of Justice has confessed to-day in this debate that he consulted the Canadian Pacific Railway. He says he did not consult the Territories, I do not know whether he even consulted the representatives of the territorial government, although from the statement that has been read to-day the territorial government has presented an unanswerable case. That statement as read by the hon. gentleman just now and put on record in the 'Hansard,' is unanswerable, because it is the statement of a great injustice being done to the people of the west, an injustice which calls for a remedy. Therefore I say a remedy ought to be given. The Minister of the Interior, who is not in the House just now, if ever he did make an outcry in this House it was about the unfair customs

taxes the people of the west had to pay to this Dominion government. He estimated last year at from $40 to $100 per family the amount that the people of the west paid in customs taxes to this government. This government says: you shall not only pay $100 per family in customs taxes but you shall pay the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway in your own country. The member for West Assiniboia says this is a great grievance. Well, if it is a great grievance it is entitled to a remedy, it can be remedied in some way. Now I will make this suggestion; that before this Act is passed the government ought to make an intimation that under this clause 20 of the contract that I have read, they will pass an Act referring this whole question to the Board of Railway Commissioners for ascertainment of the actual cost of that railway, and that under that clause they will see whether the time has not come for a reduction or regulation of the tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The interests that my hon. friend represents in this House are so wide and so varied and so much of his time is taken up making speeches that he appears to be in entire ignorance of the things that have been going on during recent sessions. He is probably in ignorance of the fact that a session or two ago it was decided to refer this very clause to the Supreme Court so that we might ascertain in what our rights are in regard to the regulation of rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway. He is probably also in ignorance of the fact that some months ago the Canadian Pacific Railway agreed to submit their rates to the supervision and control of the Board of Railway Commissioners and they are now in the same position as any other company in respect to their rates.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Under that clause a commutation of these rights to exemption might have been obtained. As it is nothing has been done. Their rates are not being regulated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are being regulated.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The jurisdiction may be in the Railway Commission, but nothing has been done. The Canadian Pacific Railway are not having their rates regulated, but they are having their exemption protected in a way in which they should not be protected in this Act. It is all very fine to say that something has been done, but it is the old story of neglecting the settler and protecting the capitalists and vested rights. It is not sound public policy that these things should be continued. I hear the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) say 'hear, hear.'

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I made no such observation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then the hon. gentleman agrees with me and he will join with me in weeping for the farmer of the west. He used to weep for the farmer in Ontario, for the widow and the orphan.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, I do not agree with such rubbish.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Justice does not give up his time, and he does not——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think you might weep a little for those who have to listen to this.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. Minister of Justice should weep for the people of the west and for this legislation, because, if there is anything that the Liberal party ought to be ashamed of, it is in the passing of this legislation binding these new provinces. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) introduced his Bill by saying that he was laying the corner stone of complete autonomy in these new provinces. Where is that autonomy? He is restricting them in the matter of schools, restricting them in the matter of municipal and provincial rights, restricting them in the matter of their boundaries, laying down a schedule of constituencies, limiting them in every way and robbing them of their lands although all the other provinces have been given their lands.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Was Manitoba given its lands?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, it asked for them, but it could not get them. The Conservative government refused them. The hon. gentleman cannot justify himself in wrong doing by pointing to the Acts of the Conservative party. The Conservative party was not an immaculate party, it was guilty of many mistakes and because it did make mistakes my hon. friend says that he may commit every mistake in the calender, that he may violate every commandment of the decalogue because Sir John Macdonald or some one else did this.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman supported them in their wrong doing. The hon. gentleman belonged to the Liberal party until that act was done, but as soon as the Conservative party was guilty of a wicked act he joined that party.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Explain.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can explain. I regret the sins of my adolescence and I am trying to redeem myself and to lead a better life, but here is the hon. Postmaster General getting up in years and to-day he is glorying in the fact that he is imitating the sins of those who preceded him. I am willing to be judged by the people of the country as between my record and conduct and that of the hon. gentleman in the past, and I say that the government to-day in passing this Act of complete autonomy for these two new provinces, in putting the

coping stone on the edifice, are doing nothing but restricting and imposing conditions on these great new provinces of the west, and again I tell them that there is that free, fresh air of liberty that glows from the west across the prairies that will not submit to this kind of legislation, that will not submit to this kind of restriction and the day is coming rapidly when all of them will have to weep for the principles which they have enunciated here to-day.

Amendment (Mr. Scott) negatived, and section agreed to.

On section 15,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Since this question was up for consideration before, I have considered the observations that were made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and by the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in respect to the question of joint stock companies, and I have concluded to substitute for the last paragraph of the amended section 1 proposed a day or two ago a new provision. The last paragraph, as I propose to amend it, will read as follows:

Every Joint Stock Company lawfully incorporated by or under the authority of any ordinance of the Northwest Territories shall be subject to the legislative authority of the province of Alberta if,—

(a) The head office or the registered office of such company is at the date upon which this Act takes effect situate in the province of Alberta; and,

(b) The powers and object of such company are such as might be conferred by the legislature of the said province and not expressly authorized to be executed in any part of the Northwest Territories beyond the limits of the said province.

The effect of this will be to declare that every joint stock company that is incorporated now by the Territories, which has for its purpose and object works which are clearly of a local character, which is merely a local undertaking, will be a joint stock company within the power of the provincial legislature to deal with. Those having powers and objects on the face of their charters extending over the whole Territories, will of course, continue to have a local existence, but they will be what they evidently would be under the law if nothing was contained in these Bills, Dominion companies and they must be dealt with by the Dominion. A joint stock company that is now incorporated in the Territories, if no provision were contained in this section, would, by the fact that the Territories are divided into two provinces, if that company had power to carry on business in both provinces, become, ipso facto, a Dominion company. The intention is to continue that company if the company desires to be treated as a local company, if its object and its powers are matters of mere local concern within the limits of one of the provinces and the province within which the head office or registered office of the company is will have jurisdiction. I use the words 'registered' office to meet the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in respect to those companies that are incorporated to do business and the head office of which is beyond the limits of the province, for instance in England.

Mr. HAGGART. Can they make the choice?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, the Act says that where the head or registered office is that will be the locus of the company.

Mr. HAGGART. I mean as between a Dominion and a local company?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They may be registered wherever they choose. They have to take out a license under the ordinance. But, I use the word 'registered' to meet the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition in respect to those companies, the head office of which is abroad beyond the limits of the province. The local ordinances provide for a foreign corporation and the word 'foreign' applies to all corporations incorporated beyond the limits of the Territories. They must have a registered office in the province so that where the registered or head office is will be the place which will determine the jurisdiction of the province.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In other words, the registered office will be the guide where the head office is out of the Territory?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is it.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker,—I beg to inform you that His Honour the Deputy Governor desires and awaits the immediate attendance of your Honourable House in the chamber of the Honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act to amend the Mounted Police Act, 1904.

An Act to amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act, 1899.

An Act to incorporate the London and Saint Clair Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Georgian Bay and Sea-board Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting Contracts for Government Works.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals.
An Act to amend the Public Works Act.
An Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903.
An Act respecting the Census and Statistics.
An Act respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.
An Act respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.
An Act respecting the Regina and Hudson Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal.
An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.
An Act respecting the Molsons Bank.
An Act to incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Company of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.
An Act respecting certain Patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.
An Act respecting a Patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.
An Act respecting certain Patents of Jean Effront.
An Act to incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Monterney Electric Gas Company, and to change its name to 'The Monterney Railway, Light and Power Company.
An Act respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.
An Act to amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Certain Staple Commodities.
An Act respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.
An Act to incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.
An Act respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.
An Act to incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.
An Act to incorporate the Annuity Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Hudson Bay and Pacific Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Timagami Railway Company, and to change its name to the Ontario Northern Timagami Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Athabaska Railway Company.
An Act for the relief of James Arthur Prior.
An Act to incorporate the Moose Jaw and Edmonton Railway Company.
An Act respecting a patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.
An Act for the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.
An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway.
An Act to incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Northern Bank.
An Act respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.
An Act to incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.
An Act respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.
An Act respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.
An Act respecting the Torono, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.
An Act respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Canadian West Life Insurance Company.
An Act respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.
An Act to incorporate the Montreal, Quebec and Southern Railway Company.
An Act respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.
An Act respecting the administration of an Act respecting the Packing and Sale of certain Staple Commodities.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 17—subsidy to province,

Mr. SPROULE. Who is to take the census in this case? Is it the province?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The decennial census is provided for by the Census Act, but the census in the intervening period will have to be taken, I suppose, by arrangement between the provincial and the Dominion governments.

Mr. FOSTER. So far as I am concerned, in discussing the land question last night I discussed the financial question, because the two seem to be intimately combined; and having said all that I would have said if I had divided my remarks into two parts, the one on lands and the other on financial terms, I do not know that it is worth while to repeat them again to-night, unless the Minister of Justice is very anxious to hear a good speech a second time. There is another reason which would induce me to repeat it, if I had a little more faith in the stiff-necked and rebellious ministry which sits opposite me. I might think it worth while to repeat it if I thought they yould take good suggestions and put them into practice; but I can quite see that having arranged their method and plan, which is to my mind an entirely fictitious one, and placed on a fictitious basis, they propose to carry it out. I get no assistance from the Northwest members, who seem rather to be indisposed to make a good and enduring provision financially for their country. They shiver on the brink of a little responsibility, and do not seem to feel that the people or the legislature will care to take up the matter in a business way and arrange for their present necessities, and at the same time conserve the resources which would suffice for future and better use. Having exhausted my store of wise and prudent counsel, I do not know that it is of any use to cast any more pearls before the government opposite. I have said my say, and I hold to my contentions.

Mr. SPROULE. On what basis do you make the maximum 800,000 of a population?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that was fixed by taking into account the conditions existing in the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the population of which was fixed at 400,000. I went through the debate which took place at confederation to see why 400,000 was selected, but I could not find any reason for it.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the maximum of Ontario and Quebec?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The population according to the census of 1861.

Mr. SPROULE. Each of these Northwest provinces will in the course of time be as populous as Ontario or Quebec, and we fix their maximum population on which they are to receive 80 cents a head at 800,000, while the maximum of Ontario and Quebec is over 1,000,000. It may be that we are making up for this difference in other ways, but the question is, will the people of these provinces be satisfied with that?

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that in the draft Bill prepared by the Northwest assembly and presented by the Northwest goveernment, if my memory is not mistaken, the limit of population upon which 80 cents per head should be drawn was placed at 400,000 for the single province which it was proposed to organize out of the territory. The demand of the territorial government was for 80 cents per head on 400,000, The concession, on the terms of the existing Bill, is eighty cents on 160,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Was the 400,000 not the minimum population?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, 250,000, and the maximum was 1,396,091. My hon. friend will observe that 1,396,091 was for the two provinces.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume that our dealing with these financial figures is without prejudice to what may be determined hereafter as regards allowing the Territories to have their land. Am I right in assuming that they will be entitled to these moneys in any case?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This has no reference at all to the payment in lieu of land. This is what we call the legislative grant and the 80 cents per head on the population. There is another provision for a grant in lieu of debt and an allowance in lieu of land.

Mr. HERRON. I think it will be found on looking back over the last five or six years and seeing the increase in the expenditure of that country, that the new provinces are not going to get, even with the whole Bill, the same money they are getting now. The amount looks large to hon. members on both sides of the House, but I do not think it is going to be nearly sufficient for the needs of the country. A few years ago we were getting about $300,000 from the Domion for the purpose of carrying on local government in the Territories. It was found that that was not nearly sufficient. The population has been increasing so rapidly that the expenditure has gone up until to-day we are spending over a million dollars a year, and even that is not found sufficient for our needs. The money we will have to spend under this Bill will not be half sufficient for our needs. True as the country becomes more settled, our annual grant will increase, but the needs of the country will increase far more rapidly, and the result will be that in the very near future, if not at the outset, the new provinces will have to resort to direct taxation, and every hon. member for the Northwest will acknowledge that direct taxation would be one of the worst things that could happen us in the way of retarding immigration. Settlers coming to our country have left other countries because of the high taxation, particularly in

the United States. It is the high taxation in that country which is bringing the bulk of American settlers to our Northwest, and consequently it would be very injurious to us to have to resort to direct taxation. But that will be the result, I believe, under this Bill.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I would like to draw attention to a source of revenue which has attracted little notice, and that is our school lands. According to estimate, we have at least eleven million or twelve million acres of school lands which in time will be sold and the money held in trust by the Dominion government and on that money we will be paid three per cent yearly, every half year. The policy has been to hold these lands until they are worth $7 to $10 an acre. We will have, therefore, ten million acres which will be eventually sold at $10 an acre, or $100,000,000, on which we will receive an annual income of three per cent, or three million dollars per year. That amount, along with what is arranged in this Bill would be sufficient for the new provinces.

Mr. HERRON. The hon. gentleman has given one of the best reasons to prove why this government is not treating the Northwest properly in the matter of lands. If ten million acres of school lands are going to give the amount of revenue the hon. member mentions, viz.: three million dollars per year, and that almost immediately, what about the hundreds of millions of acres of land which this government is keeping from us, and in return for which it is giving but a million dollars a year?

Mr. SPROULE. I doubt whether these school lands will realize very much more than we got from the old school land grant of Ontario. In Ontario, when we add to the revenues from school lands what is required to meet the expenditure on education, education becomes a pretty expensive burden on the people. In Manitoba they have been trying from time to time to get the use of the capital of the school lands fund and have frequently expressed great dissatisfaction because the Dominion government would not give more than the interest I think the Dominion government are right because they hold these lands in trust. But I am merely pointing out that the interest on the sales of these lands is very much too small for the needs of that province for educational purposes. It is quite possible that there will be a similar experience in the new provinces.

Mr. LAKE. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) said that the draft Bill presented by the Territories fixed the limit of population upon which the capitation allowance would be given, at 400,000 souls. I think he is mistaken. The clause of the draft Bill is as follows:

Section 22,

On an estimated population of 250,000 at eighty cents per head, $200,000, subject to be increased as hereinafter mentioned, that is to say: A census of the province shall be taken in every fifth year reckoning from the general decennial census of 1901 and an approximate estimate of the population shall be made at equal intervals of time between such quinquennial census and such decennial census; and whenever the population by any such census or estimate exceeds 250,000, which shall be the minimum on which the said allowance shall be calculated, the amount of the said allowance shall be increased in accordance therewith until the populaion reaches 1,396,091, after which there shall be no further increase.

In the explanation that follows, it is stated that taking into consideration the extraordinary rate of increase in the population, it would be manifestly unfair to limit this grant to a population of 400,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member (Mr. Lake) has corrected me in the statement I made as to the figures contained in the draft Bill. I find, on reference to a copy of the Bill which is before me that there is some ground for the correction, and that still there is some ground for the statement I made. The Bill in the form in which it was received at Ottawa specifically states the limit of population at 400,000 on which the payment of 80 cents per head is made. But I find in one of the later pages of the return, page 30, is a copy of a telegram dated December 16, 1900, which is as follows:

Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa.

Have just noticed that seven words at end of paragraph 22, draft Bill, were inserted through clerical error. Kindly strike them out and substitute one million, three hundred and ninety-six thousand and ninety-one, after which there shall be no further increase.

That is to say, the statement I made as to the terms of the Bill, which, I presume, was absolutely assented to by the Northwest Assembly, was a limit of 400,000. But we will admit that was a clerical error which was amended afterwards, as stated by the telegram sent to Ottawa. Therefore, we are bound to consider that that was the intention in the first place. I would merely point out again that, even accepting the correction suggested as being what was in the mind of the assembly at the time the Bill was passed, there is still a difference to the Northwest Territories in favour of the present arrangement as between 1,396,091 and 1,600,000. We are getting an advantage of $160,000 a year under the arrangement by the Autonomy Bills, as compared with even the amended provision of the Northwest government's draft Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. That will not be a very wonderful difference if you have to keep up two governments instead of one.

Mr. LAKE. I think the Minister of the Interior forgets that the autonomy draft Bill was not passed by the assembly before being submitted to this government. This was drawn up on the responsibility of the Prime Minister of the Northwest Territories and his colleagues. And his telegram, I think, followed immediately after his letter forwarding the Bill. His letter forwarding the Bill was dated 7th December, and his telegram followed immediately. So it is evident that this was a clerical error. I appreciate the statement of the Minister of the Interior that the population upon which the Territories as a whole will get the capitation allowance will, in view of the fact that there will be two provinces under this Bill, be larger than it would otherwise have been. But, after all, it must be taken into consideration that it will mean that two separate local governments will have to be carried on with a great deal of expensive machinery; and this, in my opinion, does not compensate for the increased expenditure which will be necessary.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not required to compensate for the increased expenditure which will be necessary, because provision is made to the amount of $50,000 a year for each province, as compared with $50,000 a year for one province provided for in Mr. Haultain's draft Bill.

On section 18,

Inasmuch as the said province is not in debt, it shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada, by half-yearly payments in advance, an annual sum of $405,375, being the equivalent of interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of $8,107,500.

Mr. HENDERSON. On a former occasion I made a reference to this clause 18, which clause I will read:

18. Inasmuch as he said province is not in debt, it shall be entitled to be paid and to receive from the government of Canada, by half-yearly payments in advance, interest at the rate of five per cent per annum on the sum of eight million one hundred and seven thousand five hundred dollars.

What I fear is that in after years——

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has not the clause in its present form. Having regard to my hon. friend's suggestion, we changed that so that we pay an annual sum, 'being the equivalent of' the interest, which, lawyers tell me, means the same amount of money, but on a different condition.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the Minister of Finance to say that he made the change in this clause with a view to meeting the opinion of his legal adviser, who, I presume, is the Minister of Justice in this case. Now, we in the province of Ontario have had a good deal of experience in the interpretation of a clause of this kind; and it is owing to the very great difference of opinion that exists there among legal men as to the meaning of such a clause that I draw attention to the matter now. I am very much inclined to think, notwithstanding what the Minister of Finance has said, that with his own interpretation given in a similar matter in the province of Ontario, the difficulty which I apprehended would arise, and which I think the Minister of Finance did not intend should arise, may still come up. If I understand the minister, he has no intention to go further than to pay over to the province of Alberta each year the sum of $405,375 as an allowance on account of the province having had no debt. I assume that it is not his intention at any time to pay any part of the principle sum on which this interest is calculated. I believe that is the hon. minister's intention; at any rate, I think that is the intention of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now, are we sure in the light of the experience we have had in the past that that will be the interpretation in after years put upon this clause? A favourite argument in the province of Ontario, under a very similar condition, in fact a case not nearly so strong, was that where there was interest there must be principal behind it; and if the Dominion was entitled to pay to the province of Ontario a fixed amount of interest yearly, certainly there was a capital which the province was entitled to call for. That was the case in reference to the subsidy granted to the province of Ontario in the year 1884 of $142,414, being the equivalent of 5 per cent interest on $2,848,000. Now, to put the matter plainly, I will read a letter written by the Minister of Finance, and we will ascertain whether his opinion is the same to-day as it was in the year 1900; if it is, then I think we should make some further change in this clause. The letter is somewhat lengthy, but I can read it in a very few minutes. I think it is well that hon. members should hear this letter, because it reviews the whole matter. The letter is written to the provincial treasurer of the province of Ontario, dated, Ottawa, January 12, 1900, in answer to a communication sent by the Hon. Mr. Ross to the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, writes as follows:

Ottawa, January 12, 1900.

My Dear Mr. Ross,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 29th ultimo on the subject of certain moneys placed to the credit of the province and the accounts of the Dominion.

The advantage to the province in permitting these moneys to remain to the credit of the province in the Dominion, where they yield to the province five per cent interest, are so obvious that I do not suppose you are contemplating their withdrawal. As a pure matter of

finance between the Dominion and the province. it would of course be profitable to the Dominion to pay you the money, as we could easily raise it at much lower rates.

I do not think your government have any unconditional right to demand this money from the Dominion. There are certain limitations provided by the statutes ; but no doubt if you desired to obtain the money, you could easily comply with these conditions.

In the earlier history of confederation it appears to have been contemplated that the moneys placed to the credit of the provinces in what was called the debt account should remain in that account, and the annual interest be paid to supplement the allowances for the support of the provincial governments. I find, however, that in 1874 there was a change of policy in this respect. Section 2 of chapter 17 of the statute of that year provides as follows:

The Governor in Council may in his discretion advance from time to time to any province of Canada such sums as may be required for local improvements in the province, and not exceeding in the whole the amount by which the debt of the province for which Canada is responsible then falls short of the debt with which the province was allowed to enter the union, such advances to be deemed additions to the debt of the province, with permission to the province to repay them to Canada, on such notice, in such sums and on such other conditions as the Dominion government and that of the province may agree upon, any amount so paid being deducted from the debt of the province and calculating the subsidy payable to it.

Under this statute it appears to have been intended that the moneys at the credit of the provinces could be withdrawn for the purpose of assisting in the construction of provincial public works. Considerable sums were so drawn by the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Manitoba.

By chapter 4 of the Acts of 1885 the section above quoted was re-enacted with a further limitation placed upon the action of the provincial governments by requiring the passing of the provincial statute as a basis for an application to the Dominion government for payment of these moneys.

I think that practically the Act of 1884 operates as an extension of the Acts relating to the debt account, and that, therefore, the moneys credited to Ontario by the Act stand in the same position as a balance of debt account favourable to a province under the British North America Act. This was the view apparently taken by this department in 1884, and since continued, as appears by the public accounts.

Looking at these several Acts, I am of opinion that you would not have the right to withdraw these moneys for the ordinary purposes of government, but what parliament intended that they might be withdrawn by a provincial government, with the previous sanction of the legislature, for local improvements. I have no reason to doubt that if, instead of raising the moneys for your public works by the issue of securities, you had seen fit to make application under the Acts above cited, for a portion of these moneys from the Dominion, the government of the day would have recognized this as a proper use of the moneys, and would have authorized the payment of the sum required.

If you desire now to withdraw, subject to the above conditions, any moneys standing to the credit of the province, there would not be any objection to your so doing.

Yours faithfully,
W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

To the Hon. G. W. Ross,
Premier of Ontario,
Toronto.

Now, to my mind the two clauses are practically similar, with this difference, possibly, that the case before us is a stronger case in favour of the province withdrawing the money than was the case of Ontario. It is doubtful whether this sum of $2,848,000 was a debt or not; but in any case it was practically a sum made up as the basis of a subsidy, but in the Act of parliament creating that subsidy it was called capital, and then 5 per cent of that sum was to be paid as additional subsidy. Here we declare this sum of $8,107,500 to be a principal sum, and we name the amount of interest that is to be paid on account of that principal sum, namely, $405,375. Now to my mind, as the resolution is now worded, this sum of $405,375 being specifically designated as interest under the Act of 1885, the Minister of Finance would be obliged, if the proper application was made by the province of Alberta by Act of the legislature, to pay over any portion of this sum of over $8,000,000 so long as it was required by that province for the purposes of public works. I do not think that is the intention of the Minister of Finance, but I do not think that he has yet secured a wording of the resolution that would actually prohibit the province from demanding it. Now we may say : Let us pay it to the province if they demand it, because the Dominion can borrow money at a much lower rate of interest, it would be a saving to the Dominion, and we would thenceforth require to pay a much smaller subsidy. But we know the danger of provinces exhausting their revenues in this way. It will simply result in after years in a further demand being made for an additional subsidy on account of their having lost or spent what was originally provided for them. If the minister can assure me that the wording of this will make it absolutely clear that the province of Alberta will have no right to call upon any part of the principal sum, then I have nothing further to say, because I am making no complaint with regard to the provision that is made for the province.

I am not saying it is too small or too great. I have not gone into the calculation as to whether this is the correct equivalent to the debt of the other provinces or not. I take it for granted the officials of the Finance Department have thoroughly investigated that, and that it approximately, at any rate, approaches the exact figure. But legislating, as we are here now, on a matter that is to last practically for all time to come, we

want to make sure that we are making provision for a permanent revenue for that province, and one that cannot be used for an improper purpose—I would not say for an improper purpose—but used in a way differently from that in which this parliament contemplates it should be used, so as to open the door for the legislature coming back here at a future time and asking for an increased subsidy. I fear very much that having designated this as interest, the argument will be set up that where there is interest there is principal, and that under the Act of 1885, which is in force today, the province would have the same right to demand the capital sum in this case as it was interpreted they had in the case of the province of Ontario.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the intention in the mind of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) and the intention in my own mind are precisely the same, but whether we are able to get a form of words which will correctly carry out that intention is, of course, a matter for his legal advisers and my legal advisers.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have none.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, then, I am more fortunate than my hon. friend. I have some. It is certainly intended, by the common consent of the House, that this sum shall be an annual payment to the province. A change has been made in the wording which makes it materially different, as we think, and as we are advised, from the Act respecting the province of Ontario. The difference of a few words in the statute will be such as to make the first statute entirely inapplicable to the second, and we are advised that the difference in the wording is entirely sufficient to account for one interpretation being given in the case of Ontario and another in this instance. After the discussion which took place in the House, the intention of both sides, I may say, has been that this shall be an annual payment to the province. The words employed seem to me to be sufficient for the purpose. On the day that I made this amendment at the table my hon. friend the Minister of Justice was not present, and, as I stated then, I had not the benefit of his advice. Since that time he has looked into the matter, and he concurs in the view I then expressed, that the words used are ample to carry out the intention in the mind of my hon. friend from Halton and the intention in my own mind. If there is any good reason to believe that that intention has not been carried out, I will willingly have any other words suggested that will serve the object better, but I think my hon. friend will agree that the words now used do carry out the intention which is in the mind of the committee generally.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have not read for some years the debate that occurred in 1884, but I remember reading it years ago. My recollection is that a question very similar to this came up, when Sir Richard Cartwright asked the question of Sir Leonard Tilley whether it was the intention of the Act of 1884 to pay over simply the 5 per cent yearly on the $2,848,000, or to pay over any part of the principal, and the answer of Sir Leonard Tilley was distinctly that the intention of parliament and the intention of the government at that time was to pay only the annual sum. Sir Leonard Tilley seemed to be just as firm in his opinion as my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is in his opinion now, but, notwithstanding that fact, lawyers and others, including the hon. Minister of Finance himself, afterwards interpreted the meaning of parliament at that time as different, and the hon. gentleman assented in fact to the payment over of a portion of the princial sum, or all of it, if it was called for. My objection of the wording of this clause is to the use of the word 'interest.' If the hon. minister could pay over the sum of $405,375 as an additional allowance, and make no reference whatever to interest, it would be better. As long as you leave the reference to interest you will have some person coming up ten or fifteen years afterwards and stating, as the late government in the province of Ontario did, that where there is interest there must be principal, and they would simply capitalize this sum of $405,375 and say: As you owe us that much interest you owe us the capital sum. I said before that if the hon. minister assured me that he had the matter absolutely clear I would withdraw my objection, and he seems to think that he has it absolutely clear. Whilst I withdraw my objection, I confess that I cannot agree with him in the wording of the clause. However, the hon. minister is responsible for the government and not myself, and I discharge my duty when I point out the difficulty that has arisen in a similar case.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we have really benefited by my hon. friend's earlier suggestion. I think he will find that the words as now used express his own idea.

Mr. BLAIN. I rather agree with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) that the word 'interest' should be removed from these resolutions. I accept, of course, the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), endorsed by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), that the change in the wording of the clause will remove any doubt in the minds of the people as to whether there is an amount of money deposited with the Dominion government to the credit of these two new provinces. My hon. friend from Halton has read a letter addressed by the hon. Minister of Finance to the Hon. George W. Ross. I remember very well when Mr. Ross, then premier of Ontario, contended before the electors of Ontario that the provincial government had deposited with the Dominion $2,848,000, that

they could draw it at any time to be expended in the interest of the people of the province with certain limitations. I will venture to read the letter written to the hon. Minister of Finance by Mr. Ross:

Toronto, December 29, 1899.

My Dear Sir,—The government of Ontario have appointed a royal commission for the purpose of inquiring into and reporting on the financial affairs of the province. For the purpose of assisting the commission in the prosecution of their inquiry, I am desirous of ascertaining how your department regard the sum of money ($2,848,000) which has been placed to the credit of the province by chapter 4 of the statutes of 1884.

Although we have not called on the Dominion for payment of this money, we have assumed in our accounts that it belongs to the province, and that if we had desired to use it for provincial purposes we would have been free to do so.

Kindly let me know the view which your department takes of this question.

Yours truly,

G. W. ROSS.

Hon. W. S. Fielding, M.P.,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

This is a statement over the signature of the premier of Ontario that the government of Ontario had deposited with the government at Ottawa $2,848,000, and they so stated in their financial statement to the people of Ontario at that time. Thus they were enabled, by the placing of that amount to the credit of Ontario, held by the Dominion government in trust, to put before the electors of Ontario the statement that they had a surplus of money when the fact is they had no surplus. And then it was the great question of debate in the legislature of Ontario for many years, and was a great question before the electors in that province. I believe that the Minister of Finance, and particularly the Minister of Justice, should be very careful now when they are legislating for the new provinces to remove altogether the word 'interest,' and make it so plain that the people of western Canada will not be confronted with that question as the people of Ontario have been confronted with it for so many years.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the event of the language being so construed at any time by the courts or by any government, that the province of Alberta was entitled to call upon this capital sum the province would not only be entitled possibly to call upon that capital sum but would be entitled to capitalize the annual payment at the current rate of interest. I have made a calculation. Suppose Alberta established the fact that being in receipt of an annual income of interest of $405,375 from the Dominion of Canada—and wherever there is interest there must of necessity be principal—they would certainly have just as much right to capitalize that at 3 per cent as at 5 per cent if money was not worth more than 3 per cent. and instead of taking a capital sum of $8,000,000 or rather of $8,107,500 they would practically have a capital sum of $13,512,500 rendering this Dominion liable for a much larger sum than we contemplate at the present time. It is no simple problem, and if the English language can possibly make it clear beyond a doubt I would say decidedly, make it clear. I do not want to rob those provinces of anything to which they are enitled but when we agree to give a substantial sum let us leave no doubt whatever as to the exact sum they are entitled to get. The illustration I have given of what might be the demand of the province of Alberta is simply a repetition of a calculation made by the Hon. Mr. Ross, in the province of Ontario. He contended that he had a right to capitalize his interest at 3½ per cent when money was worth 3½ per cent and showed a very much larger amount of capital in the hands of the Dominion than he was actually entitled to in the first instance, when in fact there was practically no capital. But in this instance we admit there is capital because there is interest and where there is smoke there is generally fire, according to the old saying; where there is interest we consider there must be capital, there must be something behind it, what I fear is the dangerous word 'interest.' I apprehend that even if we satisfy ourselves now, possibly ten or fifteen years hence there may be men who will take a different view of that interest.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend and I will have to leave this matter to the lawyers and if they say the words used fail to express the intention of the committee I will consent to consider an amendment. I do not think anything which Sir Leonard Tilley said years ago or anything I may say now will be of any value in interpreting this statute in the future. It must be interpreted like other statutes, according to its own words, and it is not likely that any one will refer to the debates in this House to ascertain its meaning. We must make it clear and if we have not done so let us do so. But since the hon. member from Peel (Mr. Blain) has also read the letter which I addressed to the Hon. Mr. Ross, whether that letter was wise or unwise, right or wrong, it was based on the language of the statute as it then existed. That is not the same language as we have here, and therefore we do not get any assistance by importing into the discussion that letter giving an opinion, possibly an erroneous one, based on the statute as it then existed. The statute here is in different terms and is designed for a different purpose. If my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) finds, after he consults his legal friends, that this language fails to express the intention of the committee I have no desire to adhere to the words used.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the letter written by the advice of the Department of Justice.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. Since I heard the letter read in the fine round voice of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) I am rather proud of it. I think it is rather a good state document and I think it stands the fire to-day. It was written as a business document, but after I had obtained advice as I should in important matters from the Department of Justice. The only reasons for inserting a capital sum and the interest thereon is this that in all past negotiations or arrangements between the Dominion and the provinces, you make a certain allowance in connection with what is known as the debit account and in order that you may deal fairly with a province it is necessary to know the basis on which such arrangements are made. It is a convenience in comparisons hereafter, to have the matter thus stated, but the amount allowed is not interest; it is a sum equivalent to the interest and I believe that legal gentlemen say the difference is very great.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the Act of 1884—and I am sorry I have not the statute before me—it is stated distinctly that the 5 per cent on $2,848,000 should be paid over each and every year, half-yearly, to the province as an additional subsidy.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think that is a stronger term than anything used here.

Mr. FIELDING. Am I not right in saying that in that case the sum was to be treated as capital?

Mr. HENDERSON. I believe the hon. minister is right.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not so treat it in this case.

Mr. HENDERSON. By inference we certainly do, by he fact that we are paying a sum that is declared to be interest.

Mr. FIELDING. Not interest, but the equivalent of interest.

Mr. HENDERSON. The equivalent of interest.

Mr. FIELDING. That is all the difference in the world.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the difference is not sufficient as long as the word is used there.

Mr. SCOTT. I trust the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is not arguing that this province in this respect should be placed on a different basis from the other provinces of Canada. I am not very clear on this matter myself.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me. I thought I had made myself so clear that he who runs might read. I stated distinctly that I was not attacking the allowance made to those provinces, and I was very careful in all the discussion to find no fault with the allowance. I only desired that the province should clearly and distinctly understand what it is getting and that this parliament should clearly and distinctly understand what it is giving. Now beyond that I am quite sure I have not gone, and it does not remain for the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) to charge me with trying to keep anything back from the new province which the government is disposed to give it.

Mr. SCOTT. I am still somewhat in the dark myself about this matter, but I recollect that we had a discussion concerning capital accounts a couple of years ago when it was proposed to advance a quarter million dollars to the Northwest Territories as a capital advance, and I think I recollect the statement made in the House at that time that it was possible for the other provincial governments to draw from their capital if they wished to do so. For instance there was a certain number of million dollars standing as capital account to the credit of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, and it was open to those provincial governments to draw that capital although of course afterwards they would draw less interest and certainly, speaking on behalf of a portion of the people who are to compose one of these new provinces, I wish to stand out for equal treatment. If I am mistaken about this matter well and good, but we certainly should be placed on exactly the same basis as the other provinces have been in regard to capital or debt account.

Mr. FOSTER. If my hon. friend were wise and were looking after the interests of the Northwest provinces, I think he would rather have the matter arranged so that they could not withdraw and dissipate their capital. If they had the sum of $8,000,000 which they felt they could withdraw by the million or half million each year, it would be an additional temptation to them to dissipate for present needs what should be kept for the future. I would have it understood that while they could draw the percentage of that from year to year, it should be kept as a never-failing source of income. I think it is a question whether the maritime provinces have done the best for themselves by dissipating their capital and drawing upon it for present necessities and coming to the point of finding a diminishing revenue because they have eaten up their capital. If I were from the Northwest, I should want to have it fixed that the capital from which the yearly payments arose should never be diminished, or liable to be taken for present and pressing necessities. I think it would be better for the province.

Section agreed to.

Section 19 agreed to.

On section 15,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This section is a highly technical one, and is intended to deal with a somewhat embarrassing situation which will exist in the Northwest after this Act comes into force. I have consulted the Deputy Minister of Justice, who drew this Bill, and he in turn has consulted those who represented the Northwest Territories. The section as it is now proposed to amend it, meets with the approval, I understand, of the representatives of the Northwest Territories and those who represent the Northwest government. Under these circumstances I would suggest that the clause be allowed to pass with the understanding that at any time it may be reconsidered at the suggestion of any member of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, I think, should be quite satisfactory. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) was good enough to give me at six o'clock a memo. prepared by Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, dealing with some points which had been raised on this side as to the possible construction of section 15 as proposed to be amended. I expected to have had an opportunity of looking over the memo. of the deputy minister between six and eight o'clock but was prevented by other engagements. Under the circumstances, I shall not ask the committee to wait until I have examined it. If I think any difficulty arises under the words of the amendment, I will ask the government to permit us to return to clause 15 for the purpose of moving any amendment which may be thought necessary on this side. The only important question raised on this side was whether or not section 11 of the Act of 1875 might not be continued as part of the constitution of the Territories by the very words of this section. Mr. Newcombe thinks that is not possible. I am not prepared, without considering his opinion, to say I do not concur, and therefore I shall be very glad to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SPROULE. How will the societies at present existing be affected ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are continued in their provincial existence. They can only be dissolved by the Governor in Council after the province has made provision for substitutes. These societies, being in operation, will immediately, when this Bill passes, come under the jurisdiction of the Governor in Council, and we must deal with them, in so far as their present corporate existence is concerned ; but we will deal with them in such a way as to dissolve them after the province has arranged by legislation for their continued existence within the province. The province must first arrange for other societies being substituted for the present ones.

Section agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is nothing left but the land clause, the distribution of seats and the school clause, which includes number 2. In view of the fact that we have a number of amendments, I would move that the committee rise so as to give us time to consider the present condition of the Bill and come to some conclusion about dealing with the other clauses.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the Bill be reprinted ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid that will take too much time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is not very long, and I think you could have it set up in two hours.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was going to suggest that possibly to-morrow we might take up some other measures, and in that event we might get the Bill reprinted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that will be desirable. We have had a pretty steady grind at the Bill for some time, and there will be amendments moved to all the clauses still undisposed of. It will be advisable to put the amendments in such a shape as will, with as little prolixity as possible, express the views we entertain on this side ; and a day or two devoted to a little consideration for that purpose will not be time wasted. I would suggest that some other business could in the meantime be taken up. I did intend to have made this afternoon some observations with regard to the difference between the original and the amended clause 16. However, I did not wish to make any suggestion to the government as to the course they should take, but I would think that when we take up the Bill again, we should dispose of the land clause first and then take up clause 16, unless the government specially desires to take up the school matter first and deal with the other afterwards. I am not particular except that I would like to know a little in advance what the course of the government will be in that regard.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As regards the order in which we will take up the clauses, we are quite willing to leave that to hon. gentlemen opposite to decide. I would like to keep the redistribution of seats to the last, but it is a matter of indifference to us whether we deal with the educational clause or the land clause first.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the understanding that the Bill lie over till next Monday.

Mr. FIELDING. We might agree that the Bill may not be taken up to-morrow and that will leave us free to take it up Thursday.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the House sit Thursday evening ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is probable we may not and we can always come to some understanding as to when the Bill will be proceeded with.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 17, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Bill to further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST—DISTRICT OF MACKENZIE.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 157) respecting the district of Mackenzie.

Mr. SPROULE. Explain.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All the Bills that stand in my name on the order paper, as well as the two Bills which stand in the name of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and the one Bill which stands in the name of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), are necessary legislation in view of the Autonomy Bills that have just been introduced. I might as well, with the permission of the House, explain all the Bills at the same time. By the Bill respecting the district of Mackenzie it is proposed to erect into a district, with a constitution based upon that of the district of Keewatin, the territory to the north of the new provinces and extending to the Arctic ocean.

The Bill to amend the Keewatin Act will add to the present district of Keewatin (1) those parts of the provisional districts of Saskatchewan and Athabaska which are not included in the province of Saskatchewan ; (2) the corresponding strip of the present provisional district of Mackenzie which is not to be included in the new district ; and (3) the territory lying to the east of the district of Keewatin as now constituted and extending to Hudson Bay.

The next Bill is a Bill to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. This is the same Bill which I introduced yesterday, and which I then explained. It is necessary to amend the Controverted Elections Act in order (1) to give jurisdiction to the new provincial courts when they shall be constituted ; (2) in order to provide for the transfer of pending business from the Supreme Court of the Territories to the new courts when the latter are established ; and (3) to make special provision with regard to cases which may arise under the Act affecting elections in the districts which are partly in one province and partly in the other.

The Bill to amend the Northwest Territories Act is intended to carry into effect the proposals of the Bill introduced by Mr. Casgrain in the session of 1904, and also the suggestions made by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). I explained this Bill yesterday.

The Bill respecting the Northwest Territories will provide for the appointment of a provisional liquidator for the Northwest Territories, with power to get in the properties and assets of the Territories, and to make such distribution of these, including the public records and documents, as may be immediately necessary or convenient, and also to pay out of moneys coming into his hands the liabilities of the territorial government.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 158) to amend the Keewatin Act.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 159) to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 160) with respect to the Northwest Territories.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 162) to amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—Mr. Oliver.

NORTHWEST IRRIGATION ACT, 1898.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 161) to amend the Northwest Irrigation Act, 1898.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FOSTER. We are afraid he is going to do something with the Milk river that was spoken of so sympathetically the other night.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position at the moment to give an explanation of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. You cannot introduce a Bill without an explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I will be prepared at an early date to make a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I must apologize to the Minister of the Interior. I prepared the Bill and as it deals with matters in his department I thought I would put it in his name. The Bill is merely formal and it

simply transfers the Irrigation Act to the new provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. When the Minister of Justice was so kind as to introduce the Bill he ought to be kind enough also to post his brother minister about it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is my fault. All these Bills are necessary as a result of the autonomy Bills.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CENSUS AND STATISTICS ACT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 163) to amend the Census and Statistics Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FISHER. In the Census and Statistics Act which was passed early in the session there is a clause requiring that the census for the province of Manitoba, with the provisional districts of Assiniboia, Saskatchewan and Alberta should be taken every five years. As the autonomy Bills change these provisional districts into provinces we require to amend the Census and Statistics Act so as to provide that the census of the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta shall be taken every five years.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

GOVERNMENT TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Has the government constructed, or aided in the construction of, any telephone line or telephone cables ?
2. If so, what lines have been constructed or aided, when, and upon what terms ?
3. If any lines have been constructed or aided by the government, what control is now exercised by the government over each line so aided or constructed ?
4. Under whose charges or superintendence, on behalf of the government, are such lines or cables now maintained or operated; and at what annual cost for maintenance and management ?
5. Under what departments of the government were such telephone lines or cables constructed or aided ?

Mr. BOYCE. I have arranged with the Acting Minister of Public Works to let this question drop.

Question dropped.

POSTMASTER OF THESSALON, ONTARIO.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Who is the postmaster at Thessalon, Ontario ?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. Who were his sureties ?
4. Who was the former postmaster ?
5. Why did he vacate the office ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I do not know that I have all the information my hon. friend asks for. The postmaster is J. B. Dobey, and he was appointed many years ago before this government came into office. If my hon. friend wants the exact date I will get it, but my secretary is ill to-day and I cannot state precisely the date. The postmaster resigned on the 21st of May, 1904, and was reappointed on the 16th of February, 1905. In reference to questions 2 and 3 as to when he was appointed and who were his securities, I will get my hon. friend the information later if he thinks it material.

Mr. BOYCE. What about question 5 ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He chose to resign.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that all ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was a reason.

SEIZURE OF THE SCHOONER 'AGNES DONAHOE.'

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish once more to bring to the attention of the government the case of the 'Agnes Donahoe,' a sealing vessel which was seized some time ago by the Uruguayan government. I received a letter in April last which contained some particulars that I think I have not yet communicated to the House. I need not read the whole letter but briefly the particulars are these : The 'Agnes Donahoe' was seized for alleged poaching on November 10th, 1904, by the Uruguayan authorities and taken to Montevideo where she is still held with a crew of twenty men ; the schooner was several miles from land when she was seized ; she was then under sail with all hands on board. Proceedings seem to have been taken by the Uruguayan government which made the charge that the ship was then fitted out and on her way to raid seal rookeries belonging to the government of Uruguay. They asked the captain to show his authority for sealing in the southern seas. Before going on this voyage or any voyage, the owners of the ship had endeavoured to obtain information as to whether or not any sealing license was necessary, and on the 11th day of October, 1900, they received from John Hardie, Acting Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa the following telegram :

> Sealing licenses issued only at Victoria and Vancouver under Paris award. No such licenses are necessary in Atlantic or in Pacific south of 35th degree north latitude.

The owners had a great many communications with the British Consul who thought there was no ground whatever for the

seizure by the Uruguayan authorities. The letter which I have is a little involved in the way in which it deals with the question, but another complaint which the owners make is this : They started their business in 1900 and they shipped the skins from Port Stanley, Falkland Islands, to London. At the personal request of the governor of the islands, in order as he said to protect the interests of Chili and Argentine, and in opposition to a petition signed by the people of the islands, a tax of 10 shillings per skin was imposed on all skins shipped from that port by Canadian sealers. This compelled them to give up that port and to ship from another port, and during the year 1904 Brazil accorded to them the privilege denied to them at a British port. They preferred Port Stanley, the British port, as it is cooler and the skins did not deteriorate there as they do in the port to which access is given to them by Brazil. They were informed, in fact they have a cable from London from persons there wishing to purchase sealing schooners, in which these persons in London state that they have a concession to seal at Cape Horn, and these owners—perhaps without foundation, do not know about that—suggest that the impost of 10 shillings per skin was imposed in the interests of persons in London. Of course this is rather a grave suggestion, and I only mention it because it is emphatically stated by my correspondents, who are members of a respectable firm in Halifax.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would the hon. gentleman repeat that ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He says there is an impost of ten shillings per skin if they should ship their skins from Port Stanley, and that it is imposed in the interest of persons in London who desire to go into the same trade. That is a very grave statement, and I only mention it because it comes from very respectable men, engaged in business in Halifax and personally known to myself and also no doubt known to the Minister of Finance. If necessary, I will send their names to the First Minister. That is the position of these men. They complain of an unlawful seizure. They complain that their vessel was detained for months, and the information came from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself that the vessel was detained during this very long period in order that the Uruguayan legislative body, whatever it is, might pass a law for the purpose of dealing with the case. The second complaint is that having gone into the southern seas, upon representation that no license was necessary, their vessel was seized while a long distance out at sea, on the pretense, which they declare absolutely unfounded, that she was engaged in an attempt to poach in rookeries belonging to the government of that country. The telgram which came to me last evening from Halifax is as follows :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Captain 'Agnes Donahoe' sentenced three years penal servitude mates one year, crew six months ship confiscated.

If the facts are as detailed by these men, it seems to me that no time should be lost in making the most urgent possible representations to the British government. A Canadian ship was seized on the high seas and held in custody about six months. The captain and crew were virtually detained as prisoners with the result that the ship is confiscated, the captain sentenced to three years penal servitude, the mates to one year, and the crew to six months. Under the circumstances there does not appear any justification for the course pursued by the government of Uruguay ; and it further appears that whatever representations may have been made by this government to the British government in the matter do not seem to have produced a very profound impression on the imperial authorities. It may be, as my correspondent suggests that the British government thought no further action could be taken until the decision of the courts had been obtained. But now they have the decision of the courts pronounced in a fashion which should stimulate this government and the foreign office into some degree of activity. Nothing so bad as this took place in connection with the seizures in the Behring sea ; and I sincerely trust that whatever representations may have been made in the past, they will be renewed in a still more urgent form, and it may be ascertained whether or not there is some redress.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The case to which my hon. friend has called attention is one, so far as I know, of very great hardship, but it is difficult to see what action this government could take. As I remember, the 'Agnes Donahue' was seized for a violation of the laws of Uruguay. It was alleged that she was poaching.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That she was intending to poach.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Poaching or intending to poach in territorial waters of the Republic of Uruguay. She was seized under the laws of that country, was tried by the tribunals of that country, and apparently was condemned according to its laws. I have nothing to say, and my hon. friend has said nothing, as to the proceedings of the court; but it seems a very extreme and hard sentence on the Captain that he should be condemned to three years penal servitude. There is just one point which I want to clear with regard to the responsibility of this government. My hon. friend states that the owners of this schooner applied to this government in 1900 to know whether a license was required and they were told that none was necessary south of such a degree of latitude. I do not know what answer was given, but

there seems to have been misapprehension between the owner of the schooner and the officers of the department who gave that information, because the licenses which we issue at Victoria and Vancouver are licenses under the Paris award, passed in 1794, as the result of the Arbitration treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is just what the telegram says.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This treaty probably does not affect at all the Republic of Uruguay. It is simply a treaty between the United States and Great Britain and affects solely our sealers in our relations with the United States. I do not know that we have any treaty——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He got no license.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have had representations made to us by sealers that they were condemned to pay a tax of ten shillings per pelt when they came from the southern rookeries and landed in some of those south American ports. That was not a measure of taxation, but simply a measure passed by some of our own colonies in order to protect their own rookeries. It is possible they may have had such a law in Uruguay. Apparently they had. The only thing we know is that the vessel was seized, the crew and captain were made prisoners. If I remember rightly, the crew were set free some time afterwards, but the captain and the mate were kept prisoners. We shall be only too glad to call the immediate attention of the government of Great Britain to this matter. I am in very much doubt what action we can take more than make representation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I regard it as serious because the seizure was on the high seas.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a point in controversy, but the court has not passed upon whether it was on high seas or in territorial waters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We would like the government to obtain definite information with regard to that. Suppose one of our Canadian cruisers would go fifteen or twenty miles out of sight of land and seize an American schooner upon the allegation that that schooner intended to go into Canadian waters and fish in defiance of the law, and suppose we sent the captain to penal servitude for three years, the mate for one year, and the crew six months, there would be some trouble about it. It seems to me that it is equally serious from our standpoint when such conduct as that is carried on in the southern seas by this government of Uruguay. It may turn out that the statements of fact are all wrong. I am only presenting the case to my right hon. friend in order that he may place it before the imperial government from the standpoint of the facts given by these owners. If they are mistaken, we can find it out. The courts of Uruguay may find the facts otherwise. And I suppose we have to run the risk of a finding by the courts that is not in accordance with the true facts. The mother country may say: We are bound by the decision of the courts. And the courts, of course, are bound to judge from the facts as presented to them. That is a question to be discussed afterwards. I shall be very glad indeed to know that the right hon. gentleman would take it up at once.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The subject of the first part of my hon. friend's (Mr. R. L. Borden's) remarks touching the tax levied on the seal skins at Port Stanley in the Falkland islands, I remember, was brought to my notice a year or so ago. It appeared that that tax had been levied by the colonial government, a colonial government not, perhaps of the same rank and position as the government of Canada or Australia, but nevertheless a colonial government; and they claimed that it was a matter quite within their right to decide whether it was or was not a proper tax. Though we might say it was unreasonable, still, it was claimed to be within the authority of the colonial government. It was found difficult to deal with the matter on that account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can see that there was a great deal in that, provided there was no discrimination against Canadian sealing vessels.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that any such discrimination was alleged. It was an obnoxious tax generally, and it was claimed by some to have been done in the interest of some particular parties in England. But still, that was the statement of a rival interest, and it would be somewhat difficult to enter upon negotiations on the basis of questioning the motives of the government of a sister colony.

JOSEPH NIXON, SUB-AGENT DOMINION LANDS, MACLEOD, NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. (Minister of the Interior). A few days ago the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked a question with regard to a man named Nixon at Macleod. In reply to that question I beg to say that a sub-agency of Dominion lands was opened in Macleod on the 3rd May, 1899, with Joseph Nixon as sub-agent. From the date of his appointment up to the 1st April, 1900, he was paid by commission. From the 1st April, 1900, to the 1st June, 1902, his salary was at the rate of $25 a month. From the 1st June, 1902, up to the time of his resignation on the 31st March, 1905, his salary was at the rate of $50 per month. On the 1st Octo-

ber, 1901, he was appointed caretaker of the immigration building at Macleod, and land guide for the district, at the rate of $10 per month. This sum was increased to $25 per month on the 1st May, 1904, which rate of pay continued until his resignation.

Owing to Mr. Nixon's connection with the immigration branch as caretaker of the hall and land guide, a good part of his time was employed in outside work, and he left his office in charge of his son. Some time in the month of March, 1905, information was received by the department that there were some irregularities in the conduct of the office at Macleod. The inspector of agencies was immediately wired to investigate and report. His report showed that there was a shortage of moneys which should have been returned to the agent of Dominion lands at Lethbridge to the amount of $499.-05. Mr. Nixon's son, who had been in charge of the office, left for parts unknown on the 15th March. This was the first intimation Mr. Nixon had that anything was wrong with his accounts. He immediately paid over to the agent of Dominion lands at Lethbridge the sum of $499.05, the amount found to be short by the inspector's report. He also handed in his resignation as sub-agent of Dominion lands at Lethbridge, and upon the recommendation of the inspector that sub-agency was closed.

The immigration branch of the department required the services of a man as checker of immigrants on the train between Macleod and Fernie, and on the 20th April, 1905, the commisisoner at Winnipeg was instructed to engage Mr. Nixon temporarily for this week. Had Mr. Nixon not been engaged it would have been necessary for us to secure the services of some other man. Before the date at which it was decided to employ Mr. Nixon as checker on the train, the immigration building at Macleod had been closed, therefore, Mr. Nixon's services as caretaker were no longer required. The only salary he receives now from the department is $75 per month as checker on the train between Macleod and Fernie, together with his actual travelling expenses. Up to the time the report was received in the department as to the above shortage, Mr. Nixon's services as sub-agent were satisfactory, and as no reflection was cast upon his character by the said report, it was considered that there could be no objection to the department employing him again in a different capacity.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. minister (Mr. Oliver) bring down the report of the inspector who was sent to investigate the matter and also the correspondence preceding and succeeding that inspection, so that we may have all the papers before us ? My information is a little different from that which the minister has read. I would prefer not to go into the matter until I had all the papers before me. And if the minister will hurry them, I would be glad to look them over before taking it up yet.

Mr. OLIVER. All the papers ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes—ancient and modern.

THE AUDIT ACT.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if it is the intention of the government to amend the Audit Act during this session ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We have no amendments at present in mind. If anything should arise to show that amendments are needed, we will consider it. But we have no intention of amending the Act at present.

CIRCULATION OF AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if it is the intention of the government to amend the Banking Act this session ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). A slight amendment of the Banking Act is contemplated, but not a matter of importance. A Bill has been introduced in the other chamber making an amendment, not a very important one, with respect to a particular bank. I think we had better confine our banking legislation, as far as possible, to general Acts. Instead of amending the special Act of the bank referred to, we are inclined to introduce an amendment to the general Act, serving the same purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. Will there be anything in that proposed Bill with regard to the circulation of foreign money in Canada ? There was some discussion of that point at the beginning of the session. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was not in his place at that time. But the House was informed that there would be an amendment of the Banking Act and that, in that connection, this subject would be taken into consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that no amendment of the Banking Act would be necessary for that purpose. I take it that what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) has in mind is the circulation of American silver ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. That matter is under consideration. We hope to be able to make satisfactory arrangements to displace American silver to a large extent and substitute Canadian silver.

RATES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Before the Orders of the

Day are called, I would like to make an explanation with respect to a question raised by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in connection with the freight rates on the Intercolonial. On the 27th of April my hon. friend spoke of an alleged increase in these rates. I quote from the hon. gentleman's remarks as they appear at page 4997 of the Revised 'Hansard':

Some time ago, I made the statement to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that since the Railway Commission was formed we were paying a higher rate on our goods than formerly. He stated that there had been no advance on the Intercolonial Railway.

And he then goes on to read a letter which he received from a gentleman who does business in the city of St. John. I shall not take up the time of the House by repeating that letter. Later on my hon. friend states:

He explained that the rate to Fredericton had been 58 cents per hundred pounds—a pretty round, full rate, I should say. They billed the goods to Lennoxville, and they went from Lennoxville to Fredericton. But since my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emerson), acquired the Canada Eastern Railway, the Grand Trunk have instructions to ship everything to Fredericton over the Intercolonial Railway, and the rate to be paid is 66 cents per hundred pounds. If the minister desires to verify the figures, he will find them in Grand Trunk supplementary tariff D. G. M. 4, page 10.

My hon. friend also referred to another case and went on to state as follows:

We had the misfortune to lose by fire our carriage works at Brockville. We had a contract with the Nova Scotia Steel Co. for a quantity of tire steel. It happened that a car came immediately after the fire. We could not use it at Brockville, so we instructed the railway people to give instructions to have it forwarded to Gananoque, where the tiring had to be done after the fire. The rate from the works in Nova Scotia to Brockville was 25 cents per hunderd pounds. The car arriving at Brockville was not unloaded, but was simply forwarded 30 miles to Gananoque, and when it arrived there, the rate charged was 37 cents per hundred pounds—or 12 cents per hundred pounds for the 30 mile haul from Brockville to Gananoque. We have refused to accept the car, and the question is in dispute. A few days ago we received a circular headed 'Canadian Freight Association'. It appears that nearly all the railways in Canada and the United States have joined this combine in freight rates. I see that the Intercolonial, under the direction of the Minister of Railways, is a member of this combine for fixing and settling rates.

He then goes on to read an extract from a circular which was issued by certain railways. I took this matter up with the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial, and desire now to read his answer and to have it placed on record as an explanation, not merely of the charge made that there had been an increase of freight rates on the Intercolonial, but as an explanation with respect to the tariff charge on the cars from Brockville to Gananoque. The letter I am reading is written by Mr. E. Tiffin, the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial, and is dated 11th May, 1905:

Dear Mr. Emmerson,

Referring to the revised edition of the House of Commons Debates, Thursday, April 27th, which you sent me, and that part of it having particular reference to the statements made by Mr. George Taylor, M.P., for South Leeds.

I have to say that the statement made by Mr. Taylor as to there being any advance in the Intercolonial rates to Fredericton is not correct in so far as the Intercolonian Railway is concerned. You will remember that the case to which Mr. Taylor refers is one over which a good deal of correspondence took place with the Grand Trunk, Canadian Pacific, and Messrs. A. F. Randolph & Co., of Fredericton, and I think a complete answer to Mr. Taylor's statement is contained in my letter to you of January 10th last, in which I inclosed you a copy of a letter which I had written to Messrs. A. F. Randolph & Co. on this subjtcet. and I cannot do better than send you herewith copies of the correspondence referred to, which I think will give a complete answer to Mr. Taylor's statement.

In regard to that part of Mr. Taylor's complaint in which he refers to a shipment of a car of steel shipped by the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co., which was consigned to them at Brockville, and was afterwards forwarded to Gananoque, we have nothing whatever to do with it. The property was consigned to Brockville, it was way-billed to Brockville and carried to Brockville, and after its arrival at Brockville I judge from Mr. Taylor's statement that they required the car sent on to Gananoque. This being so, it became a question entirely with the Grand Trunk as to what charges they should make from Brockville to Gananoque, and it being a local shipment purely and entirely subject to Grand Trunk control, the question of the rate of freight to be charged from Brockville to Gananoque was one in which they alone had anything to say, and if Mr. Taylor has any complaint it is against the Grand Trunk Railway and not against the Intercolonial, because on the arrival of the car at Brockville all connection that the Intercolonial had with the shipment ceased.

Again, in Mr. Taylor's remarks he states, in reference to the freight from Nova Scotia to Brockville as against Pittsburg to Brockville that the rate of 20½ cents from Pittsburg to Brockville is much less than the rate of 25 cents from Nova Scotia to Brockville, and goes on to say that the distance from Pittsburg to Brockville is less than it is from Trenton, N.S., to Brockville. This statement is not correct, because the mileage from Pittsburg to Brockville is 595 miles, while the mileage from Trenton, N.S., to Brockville is 931 miles, thereby showing that the rate from Trenton to Brockville is very much less, according to the mileage, than is the rate from Pittsburg to Brockville, inasmuch as the 25 cents rate Trenton to Brockville is equal to 54-100 of a cent per ton per mile, while the rate of 20½ cents from Pittsburg to Brockville is equal to 77-100 of a cent per ton per mile. You will see from this that the rate from Pittsburg is much higher per ton per mile than is the rate from Trenton.

In regard to Mr. Taylor's statement as to the circular issued by the Railways addressed to the shippers, I cannot do better than inclose you herewith a copy of the circular, which fully explains the necessity for its issue, and when read altogether as a circular instead of taking extracts from it, surely it is not a circular that any shipper who desires to deal fairly with the Railways can object to. In fact, it is a protection to the shipper who conducts his business in an honest, straightforward manner, as against the shipper who does not, and the circular is one which, in my opinion, cannot reasonably be found fault with.

The rest of Mr. Taylor's remarks seem to concern only the acts of Railways other than the Intercolonial, and therefore, I assume, are not matters upon which you desire that I should express an opinion.

Yours truly,

E. TIFFIN.
General Traffic Manager.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

I will read the circular letter a little later, placing them all on 'Hansard.' But I will now read the letter referred to in Mr. Tiffin's letter just read, dated 10th January, 1905, written by Mr. Tiffin to myself :

Dear Mr. Emmerson,—I beg to return you herewith the letter addressed to you by Messrs. A. F. Randolph & ,Sons, in which they attach copy of a letter they wrote me on January 4th relative to the recent advance made in the rates to Fredericton, and in reply to your request for an explanation, I cannot do better than inclose copy of my reply to Messrs. Randolph & Sons under date of January 6th.

I am certainly at a loss to understand why Mr. Randolph should make any reference to the Intercolonial sanctioning the tariffs, because in view of the letters which have passed between myself and Mr. Randolph he must have known that we vigorously opposed and did everything in our power to prevent the discrimination against Fredericton. I have written any number of letters to the Canadian Pacific, also to Mr. Loud of the Grand Trunk, in which we protested and protested most vigorously, against the unfair position in which they were placing Fredericton. At one time we thought we had the Grand Trunk won over to our views, but we were disappointed inasmuch as after Mr. Loud intimated to Mr. Wallace that he would not back up the action of the Canadian Pacific, he turned completely around and turned us down in our request for justice to Fredericton.

I cannot do better than inclose you herewith a copy of a telegram which I sent Mr. Loud on the 19th of October, also copy of my wire to him of the 28th October. These go to show that every effort was made that we could make to induce the Grand Trunk to meet our request and not permit of any advance over St. John rates to be made to Fredericton, that is, that wherever rates were current to St. John from points west of Montreal should also apply to Fredericton. We, however, failed to get the Grand Trunk to come in with our views ; had they done so, there would have been no change in the rates, and it simply goes to show the understanding between the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific as to the rates that shall be current from west of Montreal. Where we control the situation ouselves, as we do out of Fredericton on west bound business, we put in the St. John rates flat, and where we control the rates east bound, as we do out of Montreal, Quebec, &c., we made the St. John rates apply east bound ; and the whole trouble is the points west of Montreal reached by the Canadian Pacific and Grand Trunk from which we were unable to get them to adopt our suggestion and apply the St. John rates.

As stated in my letter to Randolph & Sons of the 6th of January (copy attached) I do not see what more we can do. If it is as I was advised, that in view of getting flour carried to Fredericton at the same rates as to St. John, they were willing to put up with the advance in the class rates on general merchandise, I think it is rather late in the day now for Randolph & Sons to come back at us and find fault with us for sanctioning a tariff which we did not sanction, but which, if I am correctly advised, at the meeting between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Fredericton merchants, the Fredericton merchants themselves agreed to.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) E. TIFFIN,
General Traffic Manager.

I now read from a letter dated 6th January, 1905, signed by E. Tiffin, general traffic manager, and addressed to A. F. Randolph & Sons, Fredericton, N.B., as follows :

Moncton, N.B., 6th January, 1905.

Messrs. A. F. Randolph & Sons,
Fredericton, N.B.

Dear Sirs,—I have your favour under date of the 4th of January, relative to Fredericton rates, and you will pardon me if I say that I am certainly very much surprised at its contents.

You have evidently overlooked the voluminous correspondence which we previously had on the subject of the Fredericton rates, more particularly my letter to you of November 3rd and your reply of November 7th.

I can only repeat that at the time the Fredericton rates were advanced over those of St. John, we made every effort possible with our connections, both the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railways, to bring about a result that would have been satisfactory to the Fredericton people. We failed ; both of our connections refusing to agree to our request that Fredericton should on no account be placed higher than St. John. Fredericton being a point on the Canadian Pacific as well as on this line, the Canadian Pacific being the short line have the right to name the rates, and as the traffic originates off this line we have no voice in the matter, excepting that we entered a strong protest against the injusice to Fredericton. Having done this, we could do no more.

Then, after the correspondence I had with you, I understood that the Fredericton Board of Trade, or the Fredericton merchants, had a meeting with Messrs. Bulling, Sutherland and MacInnes of the Canadian Pacific, and that the Canadian Pacific conceded to you that St. John rates on flour and grain would apply to Fredericton ; and I was advised that this concession on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway was satisfactory to the Fredericton people. I

understand that at this meeting the question of rates on class freights was discussed and that there was only one of the staple commodities, namely, sugar, and it was found not to be affected because the sugar was shipped from Halifax. I further understand that at this meeting it was fully explained that from the Canadian Pacific standpoint any change in the proposed class rates would affect them seriously, and that the Fredericton merchants or the Fredericton Board of Trade were satisfied to allow the difference in that class of rates to continue.

Now then, if this report of the meeting which was held between your people and the Canadian Pacific is true, how can you now complain of your being charged higher rates from Toronto to Fredericton than from Toronto to St. John? If you will permit me to say so, I think you made a mistake, if I am correctly informed, when you agreed to allow the discrimination to continue in so far as the class rates are concerned. As the best evidence in the world that we did not permit that discrimination to points which we actually controlled, I would say that we insisted upon the Moncton rates (which are the same as St. John) applying to all intermediate points on the old Canada Eastern. This, I understand, was objected to by the Canadian Pacific Railway, but notwithstanding their objection we carried our point. We could not, however, carry it to Fredericton because, as stated above, the Canadian Pacific Railway are the short line and therefore have the control of the rates. The Intercolonial Railway, therefore, should not be blamed for the existence of a condition which they could not control, but to prevent which they did all in their power to meet what I consider a fair and reasonable proposition, that is, that the St. John class and grain rates should apply to Fredericton.

I have looked up Mr. Wallace's letter of the 7th of November to which you refer, and while I admit that it is perhaps ambiguous, yet I do not take from it the inference that you do, that is, that had we asked our connections to make St. John rates apply to Fredericton, it would have been granted, because you must know from the previous correspondence we had that we made an urgent and imperative demand that the St. John rates should apply to Fredericton.

In view of the fact of it having been stated that your people agreed with the Canadian Pacific representatives that if you obtained the same rates on flour and grain as were current to St. John for local delivery, you would not press the question of the class rates, I do not see how I can again approach the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific with a view of having this discrimination removed, and in fact if you have agreed with the Canadian Pacific as it is stated that you have, that the class rates to Fredericton may be higher than to St. John, it seems to me that you have taken the ground from under your feet if it is the intention to apply to the Railway Commission for relief.

I would like very much to have gone to Fredericton to discuss this matter with you and with your board of trade, but as I am obliged to leave for Montreal early next week, I regret that I will not have the opportunity of doing so.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) E. TIFFIN,
General Traffic Manager.

Now, to show that a protest was made by the Intercolonial Railway, I will read the following telegram of the 19th October, 1904, signed by E. Tiffin, our traffic manager, and addressed to Mr. J. W. Loud, who is the general traffic manager of the Grand Trunk Railway at Montreal. It reads as follows:

Moncton, 19th October, 1904.

J. W. Loud, Montreal, P.Q.

I have already advised you that there was no agreement as between myself and the Canadian Pacific Railway on Fredericton rates. As the traffic originates on your line and the Canadian Pacific west of Montreal, the usual custom is that it rests with yourself and the Canadian Pacific Railway as to what the rates shall be. We protest against any advance to Fredericton over St. John rates. This is all we can do. What I would like to know now is inasmuch as you have not put in advanced flour rates, if you propose to advance them, upon what date does the advance come into effect.

(Sgd.) E. TIFFIN.

The2 other telegram between the same parties and which bears date the 28th October, 1904, reads as follows:

Moncton, 28th October, 1904.

J. W. Loud, Montreal, P.Q.,

Your telegram date re Fredericton rates. I still consider as a matter of justice and right that Fredericton rates should be on the basis of St. John and not any higher, in view of local changes made by Canadian Pacific from St. John and Fredericton; and in view also of the reduction in their flour rates to their points North of Macadam Junction, this advance to Fredericton can have no other effect than that of crippling Fredericton as a distributing centre. We still protest against the action of the Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific in regard to Fredericton rates.

E. TIFFIN.

My hon. friend made reference to a circular sent out by an association which he refers to as an association or a combine between the Canadian railways and United States railways. This association is known as the Canadian Freight Association and as I understand it is purely a Canadian organization.

Mr. SPEAKER. I presume the hon. minister intends to conclude with a motion?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am making this statement in answer to a statement made by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor). This is simply information.

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall move the adjournment of the House if he does not.

Mr. EMMERSON. With the permission of the House I simply wish to give this information. I think it is fair to the members, fair to my hon. friend and it certainly is something that is due to the business interests of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right, but the minister must recollect that there will be a right of reply. He is taking up arguments made in a previous debate by the

hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor); he is controverting these arguments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He has only read letters so far.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am merely reading letters, not arguing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not make any difference whether the hon. gentleman makes the argument himself or does it by reading letters to this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. These are simply statements of fact giving information with respect to the freight tariff of the Intercolonial Railway in answer to an inquiry made by an hon. member of this House. This circular letter reads as follows:

To shippers, consignees, agents, or whom it may concern:

The railway companies regret to say that they find the practice of false classification, false representation of the contents of packages, false report of weight, &c., continues unabated. It is therefore thought desirable that the attention of shippers should be called to the provisions of the law on the subject. Section 279, subsections two and three, of the Railway Act, 1903, are as follows:—

2. Any company or any officer or agent thereof or any person acting for or employed by the company, who, by means of false billing, false classification, false report of weight or by any other device or means, shall knowingly, wilfully, or shall willingly suffer or permit any person or persons to obtain transportation for goods at less than the required tolls then authorized and in force on the railway of the company, shall for each offence be liable to a penalty of not exceeding one thousand dollars nor less than one hundred dollars.

3. Any person or any officer or agent of any incorporated company who shall deliver goods for transportation to the company, or for whom as consignor or consignee the company shall transport goods, who shall knowingly or wilfully, by false billing, false classification, false weighing, false representation of the contents of the package or false report of weight, or by any other device or means, whether with or without the consent or connivance of the company, its agent or agents, obtain transportation for such goods at less than the regular tolls then authorized, and in force on the railway shall for each offence be liable to a penalty of not exceeding one thousand dollars nor less than one hundred dollars. The board may make regulations providing that any such person or company shall, in addition to the regular toll, be liable to pay to the company a further toll not exceeding fifty per cent of the regular charge. The company may, and when ordered by the board shall, open and examine any package, box, case or shipment for the purpose of ascertaining whether this subsection has been violated.

The practice of false classification, &c., not only deprives the railway companies or revenue to which they are justly entitled, but places shippers who do not adopt such devices, and who are averse to defying the law, at a most unfair disadvantage. The railway companies hope it is only necessary to bring this matter to the attention of shippers to have the abuse entirely discontinued.

H. R. PATRIARCHE,
Sec.-Treas. Western Lines,
Winnipeg.

JOHN EARLS,
Sec.-Treas. Eastern Lines,
Toronto.

Issued April 3rd, 1905.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there a joint tariff arrangement between the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and is that tariff arrangement under the control of the commissioners?

Mr. EMMERSON. As I am advised there is no such tariff arrangement. The Intercolonial Railway makes its own rates with respect to its own portion of the line, but it is bound to accept the joint arrangement which exists between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway on freight originating west of Montreal, the western terminus of the Intercolonial.

Mr. HAGGART. If I remember the Act that joint tariff must be approved of by the commissioners. I knew that the Intercolonial Railway tariff was not subject to the commissioners, but the joint tariff or the tariff which either of the roads could charge was subject to the approval of the commission. I cannot understand how it is that these railway companies vary outside of the tariff which is approved of by the commission.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood that the hon. minister intended to conclude with a motion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I was simply giving information to the House which was asked, and that under the rules of the House such departmental information could always be given at this stage of the proceedings of the House. I may be incorrect in that belief. I think perhaps instead of making a motion I should apologize for taking up the time of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You ought to do both.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that in order to have the proceedings of the House properly in order the hon. minister should conclude with a motion.

Mr. EMMERSON. I bow to the Speaker's ruling and I will conclude with that motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Mr. Emmerson moves that the House do now adjourn.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire from the premier through you, why it is that the members of the opposition should not be entitled to the same courtesies that ministers expect for themselves. If a

member of the opposition brings up some trivial incident a minister will squeal like a little pig and say : I did not know it was coming up. The Minister of Railways brings up a matter here affecting as he says the hon. member for Leeds and this is the first intimation I had that he was going to bring it forward. I am not going to complain, I think I shall give him a Roland for his Oliver before I sit down. The discussion he referred to took place on April 27, and was a general discussion for the benefit of railways in general. During that discussion I referred to a case in point and expressed the hope that the Railway Commission which the government have established would look into the matter. The case in point was the shipment of our goods from Gananoque to Fredericton. Until the hon. gentleman acquired the Canada Eastern Railway our rate via Lennoxville junction by the Canadian Pacific Railway, to Fredericton, was 55 cents per 100 pounds. Yet, when the Canada Eastern is acquired, the goods go to Lennoxville just the same and then over the Intercolonial Railway and we are charged 66 cents per 100 pounds. The Minister of Railways could not contradict the statement I made in reference to that. He told me he would get the information and let me know, and I thought we would have a talk about it, but instead of that for half an hour he reads these long documents and circulars which are not pertinent to the question, and he does it for the purpose of obstructing the business of the House. I challenge him or any one else in the employ of the railroad to contradict my statement. For years I shipped goods to Fredericton for 55 cents per 100 pounds, and now when they go over the Canada Eastern we are charged 66 cents.

Mr. SPROULE. He explained that they all went into a combine.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Railways referred to a carload of steel and he corroborated my statement in every particular, because the rate to Brockville was 25 cents, but when it came 30 miles further we were charged 12 cents extra or 37 cents in all. I want the matter to go before the Railway Commission so that we may know why, if the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway can haul from Nova Scotia to Brockville for 25 cents per 100 pounds, we should be charged 12 cents extra for hauling it on the same car without unloading, only 30 miles further. I did state that we received a car from Pittsburg, Pa., at 20½ cents per 100 pounds, and that I thought that was a lower rate than 37 cents from Nova Scotia to Gananoque. So it is. I was mistaken in thinking that the distance from Pennsylvania was further than from Nova Scotia, but at all events the 37 cent rate from Nova Scotia is higher in proportion. We have another case in dispute with the Grand Trunk. We got a carload of lumber the other day hauled 10 miles on the Grand Trunk Railway and 3 miles on a branch line, and they charged us $19 for hauling that car of lumber. In view of such outrageous charges the Railway Commission should at once deal with the matters which were brought to the attention of the House on the 28th of April by the report of the Agricultural Committee. The statements I made on that day were intended for the Railway Commission that they might take action with regard to the hardships that shippers are subjected to. The Minister of Railways has not given a particle of evidence to the House, that the Intercolonial is not charging 66 cents per 100 pounds for delivering goods from Gananoque at Fredericton, whereas before the Canada Eastern was acquired the rate was only 55 cents. He has not been able to deny my statement that this car of steel coming from Nova Scotia—intended for Brockville but ordered on—was billed 25 cents to Brockville and for the 30 miles west an extra 12 cents or 37 cents in all. The minister got on 'Hansard' a circular issued by the railway companies, not for the purpose of protecting shippers but for the purpose of protecting themselves, whereas the railways have their own protection in their own hands. In my opinion that circular is an insult to the shippers of this country. If you ship a parcel of goods and bill them to the railway companies at a certain weight, the railway companies have the scales and can test that weight, and my experience is that they generally charge more weight than there actually is. In the case of a carload of steel which came to us a short time ago, they tried to charge us for 1,940 pounds more freight than we actually paid for the number of pounds of steel which was weighed at both ends. We had that weight tested——

Mr. LENNOX. That's a steal.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a steal on the part of the railway people who charge more than the actual weight. The Minister of Railways presented this statement as a government statement to-day without moving the adjournment of the House, and he said he was simply making a statement of fact, but while the letters he read may be a statement of fact they are not facts, and he has not been able to contradict my assertion. I want these matters dealt with by the Railway Commission, and it is for that reason I spoke the other day so that the Railway Commission may get down to business some time and see that there is a proper classification of freight and a proper charge made under it. I do not think the Railway Commission will allow the railways to charge 12 cents for a short haul of 30 miles and 25 cents for a long haul of 1,000 miles.

Mr. CROCKET. I wish to ask the Minister of Railways if the statement is true,

that the freight rates from points west of Montreal to Fredericton, via Intercolonial, are higher now than they were before the government acquired the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly they are.

Mr. EMMERSON. To Fredericton, so far as the Intercolonial is concerned, they are not higher.

Mr. CROCKET. My question was : are the rates now higher from points west of Montreal to Fredericton via the Intercolonial and Canada Eastern than these same were before the government acquired the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are from points west, because the arrangement was made before the Canada Eastern was acquired. That is not true with respect to the period since the Canada Eastern was acquired, because this change took place just previous to the acquisition of the Canada Eastern. My statement would be misleading if I said that this occurred since the Canada Eastern was acquired.

Mr. CROCKET. This discrimination which is complained of as against Fredericton has taken place since the government acquired the Canada Eastern.

Mr. EMMERSON. No. Just previous to that the arrangement was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. We took charge of the Canada Eastern in October, I think, and the arrangement I referred to was entered into in July or August of that year.

Mr. CROCKET. It was announced that the Intercolonial Railway was to take the railroad over on the 1st of September and all arrangements were made for taking over the road at that date ; in fact the cars were all ready and the Intercolonial Railway officials were there to take the road over. It was during that time as I understand that the announcement was made that the freight rates were to be increased, and it seems strange to me that the Canada Eastern should be able to procure a lower freight rate from points west of Montreal to Fredericton—the same rate as applies to St. John —and that the Intercolonial Railway, since it has obtained control of the Fredericton connection, has not been able to get as low a rate.

Mr. EMMERSON. The rate was fixed by the western railways, when the Canada Eastern was owned by the Alexander Gibson Railway and Manufacturing Company. The rate that now exists to Fredericton over the Canada Eastern portion of the Intercolonial Railway was fixed at that time, previous to the acquisition and operation of the Canada Eastern by the Intercolonial Railway and the fact of the Intercolonial operating the road is in no way connected with the fact that the freight rates were increased ; it is due to an arrangement entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to understand definitely from the Minister of Railways if that rate was agreed upon by the Canada Eastern Railway Company before the government acquired the road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot say that, I do not know. I do not think it was, I do not think they were called upon to do it at all.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me the government had it all in their hands with the commission. The commission had control over the tariff rates of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, and if they had made an arrangement that was too high all that was necessary was to appeal to the commission and have them revise the tariff. Now if that lay with the government and they found the rates too high when they took over the Canada Eastern it was in their own hands and they could have reduced the rates. So I think they are practically responsible for it no matter who is at fault whether it was the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific or the government railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that anybody is very seriously at fault in connection with the matter. The rate has been continued through to Fredericton because of an agreement entered into between the Fredericton Board of Trade or the merchants of Fredericton and the Canadian Pacific Railway. They got certain concessions along another line whereby they were led to agree to these rates. That is the situation as I understand it. The tariffs have been filed and the Board of Trade of Fredericton could apply or application could be made by the Intercolonial Railway before the next tariffs are filed.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the shipping public ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The shipping public can file a complaint also, but the Fredericton merchants and the Fredericton Board of Trade who are agreeable to this and who have apparently consented to it are not complaining and therefore action, I presume has not been taken.

Mr. KEMP. Did I understand the Minister of Railways to say that the Gibson firm went into this arrangement previous to the time the government took over the Canada Eastern ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not state that, I said as a matter of fact I did not know whether they were a party to the arrangement or not, that it was an arrangement between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, but I was not

aware that the Canada Eastern or the Alexander Gibson Company were party to the arrangement.

Mr. KEMP. The fact of the matter, as I understand the debate, is that the rates now are higher than they were some time ago, and higher than they were previous to the time the Canada Eastern was taken over by the government. If that is the case the Intercolonial Railway must have been parties to it because no freight could go over the Canada Eastern to Fredericton from points west of Montreal unless it went over the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Whatever change was made in the rates to Fredericton was made previous to the acquisition of this road by the Intercolonial Railway, and therefore the Intercolonial Railway could not be a party to it because it did not own, operate or control the Canada Eastern at the time this arrangement was entered into.

Mr. KEMP. The Minister of Railways does not understand me. This discussion is with regard to freight originating west of Montreal. That freight has to go over the Intercolonial Railway in order to reach Fredericton by the Canada Eastern; it has to go over the Intercolonial Railway from Montreal to the junction point between that road and the Canada Eastern and therefore the Intercolonial Railway must have been a party to this advanced rate.

Mr. EMMERSON. No it was not; the Intercolonial Railway as I have stated, protested against their entering into the agreement. I have shown the telegrams from the traffic manager of the Intercolonial Railway, I have shown his statement wherein he protested and showed that he was not a party to it.

Mr. KEMP. To my mind he did not go far enough in these protests or he would have prevented the firm of Gibson & Sons from making such an arrangement.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial Railway gets no more for its portion and has not increased its rate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be but the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) is perfectly correct in this that you cannot have a through rate over four roads by reason of the concurrence of only three of these roads in the rate. There were four roads, the Canada Eastern, the Intercolonial Railway, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the Canadian Pacific Railway. You cannot get a through rate over four or three of these roads without the concurrence of all the roads interested. There is another observation to be made in that connection, that it seems a remarkable thing that the Canada Eastern, after it had actually agreed to convey its road to the government, after the terms had been arranged with the exception of some trifling details, should undertake to enter into an agreement with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway just on the eve of the sale of that road to the government. It is to me absolutely inconceivable that the Canada Eastern Railway Company would have undertaken to assent to that alteration without the concurrence of the officers of the Intercolonial Railway, because I cannot think that the Company when it was about to part with the beneficial interests in that road undertook to enter into an agreement binding for a considerable time as to these through rates. I would think that notwithstanding the somewhat lengthly explanation which the minister has made to-day, he should give a further explanation on that point and if necessary again move to adjourn the House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have stated that I do not think that the Canada Eastern was a party to this arrangement. The arrangement was entered into between the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, it inures to the advantage of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because clearly the traffic will not go by the Intercolonial Railway to Fredericton when it could go at a cheaper rate from Montreal direct to Fredericton by the Canadian Pacific Railway and certainly the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be a party to an arrangement that would work against its own interests. Therefore there is no such arrangement to-day. The Alexander Gibson Company was not a party to it, the Intercolonial Railway was not a party to it, but the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway in the carrying out of their western proposition, for what purpose I know not, have entered into an arrangement whereby the Intercolonial cannot get this western traffic from points west of Montreal and carry it at a rate as low as the Canadian Pacific have agreed to carry it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is a through rate embracing the carriage of goods over a number of different railways, does it not come within the definition of what is called a joint traffic arrangement between these railways? The hon. gentleman may say, so far as the Intercolonial is concerned, it is not subject to the provisions of the Railway Act, but if he takes the position he has taken just now, that it is solely due to the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, certainly they are subject to the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now you are on correct ground.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have been on correct ground all along. If any one is on unsound ground it is the hon. minister from the time he began until he moved the adjournment of the House. Has the increase

of rates been approved by the Railway Commission in respect of the Canada Eastern Railway Company? Was all this done on the very eve of the transfer of that railway to the government, and was the government asleep while all this was being done, although it knew that railway was going into its possession and would be operated by it in a very few days or weeks at the outside? These are matters worthy of consideration, and if the minister this afternoon had given his attention to some of these matters rather than indulge in a very elaborate criticism of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), the House would be in a much better position to come to a conclusion. I do not think the report was in very good taste. It is not usual to have the language of any member in this House, used in debate, made the subject of a somewhat controversial report issued by a departmental officer. But putting that consideration aside for the moment, the Minister of Railways ought to investigate this question a little further and find out whether this increase was made under the provisions of the law, and ascertain also whether or not it was made with the concurrence of the Canada Eastern Railway. He is not able to state to-day whether that is the case or not. And in particular, he should inform the House why it is that the rate which prevailed for a great number of years, while the Canada Eastern was operating that line, cannot prevail to-day when the government is operating it. That, after all, is the whole matter in question. The rate was a moderate and apparently a paying one, and was not increased while the Canada Eastern was operating the line, but upon the eve of the acquisition by the government of that line it is increased, and increased under circumstances the precise nature of which has not yet been imparted to this House.

Mr. STOCKTON. I certainly was under the impression, from the remarks of the Minister of Railways, that this present condition of affairs was brought about in consequence of an arrangement made with the Canada Eastern Railway just prior to its transfer to the government. Now he says that the Intercolonial Railway had nothing to do with it, that the Canada Eastern had nothing to do with it, but that in consequence of some action on the part of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway this present condition exists. In other words, the government railway is under the control of two private corporations, and the minister has not taken any step to remedy that evil. Whatever the difficulties may be, it is now apparent that shippers of freight originating west of Montreal are paying more since the Canada Eastern has come under the control of government than before, although it was supposed and practically stated that the transfer was going to be for the benefit of the shippers. This is the way in which the public have benefited.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL. This debate, it seems to me, is a great ado about nothing. In the first place, there is no grievance suffered by the merchants of Fredericton. That is shown by the fact that they have agreed to this extra rate in return for some consideration that they have obtained. We have had no complaints from the board of trade or the merchants of Fredericton against the extra rate. As a matter of fact, I know that the rates on flour are lower to-day in the maritime provinces than they have been, and the rate to Fredericton is lower than it was some time ago and the same to-day as it is to St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. I think that the hon. member has overlooked entirely the correspondence read by the Minister of Railways. The letters he read contain very vigorous protests from the merchants of Fredericton against the increased rate.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Everybody knows that the rate to Halifax is lower than it is to Fredericton, because at St. John you go right into water communication and have to compete with the water rate. The Canadian Pacific Railway can send its freight entirely over its own line to Fredericton, and need not send it over the Intercolonial Railway at all. They have their line right there; and if they and the Grand Trunk Railway agree to charge a certain rate to Fredericton, how can the Intercolonial Railway interfere? If they hand it over to the Canada Eastern, and the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway choose to exact from the Intercolonial Railway a certain rate to the terminal point, that is their own business, and the Intercolonial Railway cannot interfere. What the minister has made clear is that the Intercolonial Railway is charging no more than before; and if there is more charged on certain commodities, that is done by the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway, who are controlling the rate for freight to St. John. But there does not seem to be any great hardship, because the merchants of Fredericton have made no complaint at all. With reference to what the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) says regarding the freight from Brockville to Gananoque being twelve cents a hundred, that, I think, is an excessive rate. But the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) quoting the rates from Trenton to Gananoque as 37 cents a hundred compared with 20½ cents from Pittsburg, should have quoted from Trenton to Brockville 25 cents, and 12 cents additional are charged by the Grand Trunk Railway, and was another contract altogether. For myself, it is an extraordinary rate—it is too high. As a shipper, I know that the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific

Railway both are charging altogether too much for short local hauls.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is the hon. member aware that a great portion of the goods shipped to Fredericton from Ontario are sold delivered, the shipper paying the freight? Therefore, it is the shipper and not the merchant who has to complain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. We sell goods delivered, and if the freight is higher we charge more. If we could have them carried for nothing, we would sell our goods that much cheaper. There is a lot of work cut out for the Railway Commission. I believe that the local rates from one point to another in Ontario especially, are altogether too high. And I am sure that the Railway Commission, now that they have got into working order—I believe in giving them time—will investigate this matter and bring the railway to a more reasonable view.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) seems to think that the government have nothing to do with this that we have given virtual control of the railroad and the fixing of tariffs over to the Railway Commission; and that, that having been done, the government may let things drift as they like. The argument is that the Intercolonial has not changed its rates but that the change in rates was by agreement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will pardon me, I will point out that the change was with regard to Fredericton alone—there is no change in freight rates on the Canada Eastern or any other portion of the Intercolonial. The change is only with respect to Fredericton, and there it is because the Canadian Pacific Railway controlled this situation and had secured that rate. The result is that the Intercolonial does not get the traffic to Fredericton.

Mr. HAGGART. The observations of the Minister (Mr. Emmerson) are not pertinent to the argument I am making. I am answering the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) who said that this increase was by a private arrangement between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. Does not that hon. gentleman know that a joint traffic tariff must be filed with the commissioners?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Then, this tariff must have been filed with them. What we want to know is by what authority the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific changed their tariff? To make any tariff legal, they must have the consent of the commissioners to it; and we ought to be informed, here in this House, by the Minister of Railways and Canals, whether consent has been given to this freight rate, and, if so, for what reason?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suppose that a tariff is filed with the commissioners and that, unless there is something radically wrong about it or unless some person enters complaint, it is approved as a matter of course. I suppose that in this case nobody objected.

Mr. HAGGART. All railway tariffs must be approved, formerly by the government, and now by the Railway Commission. Joint tariffs must be approved like any other. There was a joint tariff with the Intercolonial before the acquisition of the Canada Eastern. Under this joint tariff a certain rate was charged. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) excuses the government on the ground that the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific have entered into an arrangement to raise the rate. Why is it that the government, or the commissioners as the case may be, have consented to anything of that kind.? We have given the Railway Commissioners control over these rates, and one of the conditions we insisted on was that all tariffs should be approved by them. What we want to know is whether the commission approved of this joint tariff by which this higher rate is charged?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I suggest to the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that when he brings down to read to the House, a long statement such as this containing correspondence which is likely to be the subject of discussion, it would be a very desirable thing—especially when he has given no notice—that he should have two copies made, so that one can be utilized on this side of the House. I sent in just now to asecrtain whether it is or is not true that the merchants of Fredericton assented to this. I find that a large part of the statement the minister read has gone to the Printing Bureau. But the fragments that remain seems to indicate that some of the merchants are vigorously protesting against it.

Mr. CROCKET. This firm of Messrs. A. F. Randolph and Sons, whose letter the minister read protesting against discrimination against Fredericton is, I believe, the largest importing house in the city of Fredericton, and the members of that firm are hearty supporters of the present administration. It is news to me that the merchants of Fredericton have assented to the increase of the rates. I do know that there was a vigorous protest in the city of Fredericton when the announcement was made that these rates had been or were to be increased. And the announcement of the increased rate was made just at the time the road was taken over by the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) allow me to ask whether, subsequent to the protest that was made, an arrangement was not entered into by the board of trade, the merchants of Fredericton, with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company whereby the flour rates should be lowered, and whether Messrs. Randolph, who are the chief dealers in flour and large distributors did not accept that along with the other merchants in consideration of some other thing? I am not personally familiar with the facts.

Mr. CROCKET. I am not in a position to say whether that is the fact or not, but the fact is that Messrs. Randolph did object, and I think that the protest that the minister read was subsequent to the conference to which he has referred.

Mr. TAYLOR. Do I understand the minister to say that the merchants of Fredericton were willing, in consideration of the tariff on flour having been lowered that the rates on other things should be increased ? The reduction on flour may have been a benefit to my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell), but I do not know that that fact will be regarded as compensation by the other manufacturers the rate on whose goods has been raised.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was the question I asked of the representative of the constituency. I am not personally familiar with the facts.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT. In trying to put my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in the hole the hon. minister has given the country some valuable information, and that information is that the acquirement of the Canada Eastern by the Intercolonial has led to an increase of rates.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) allow me ? The increase affects the city of Fredericton alone. Right opposite, at Gibson, or at Marysville, on the line of the Canada Eastern, there is no increase on the Intercolonial.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. minister say that this applies only to the city of Fredericton and that there is no increase at Marysville ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no increase at Marysville or at any point on the Intercolonial, except at Fredericton, where there has been an increase by the two railways, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific which made this arrangement.

Mr. TAYLOR. That was my argument.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It appears clear that there has been an increase. Even if that increase affects Fredericton alone, the question arises who is pocketing the increase ? I understand the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to say that the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway have done it. But, surely the Intercolonial is a party to it, for it carries the traffic for a part of the distance. I would like to know whether the Intercolonial does not or does get a part of it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Intercolonial is not in receipt of any portion of that increase.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Then, it would seem that it goes to the short road. I presume that it is pocketing all the increase, though it is not entitled to it. This makes it all the more serious. If the Intercolonial can afford to do the hauling at the old price, it seems strange that the others cannot do so.

Mr. EMMERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If these railways say that this increase is justifiable why is it that the Intercolonial, which does part of the hauling, gets no part of the increase ? The minister's explanation does not seem to explain. Instead of putting my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in the hole it seems to me that the hon. minister's department is put in the hole before the country, because the people see that the amalgamation of the two roads has led to an increase of rate. The minister says that that is not the cause of it, but we see that the practical result is an increase of rates.

Now with regard to the argument of the hon. member for York, who says that when goods are delivered you can put up the price and let the manufacturer pay the increased rate—the hon. gentleman may be satisfied with that line of argument, but it is not satisfactory to the merchants and the manufacturers that are shipping these goods from points west of Montreal. Allow me to state to the hon. member for York that frequently these contracts may reach a year or two ahead, the manufacturer has given that contract at a set discount off price list that cannot be changed when the railway puts up the rates, the manufacturer takes the risk of that change, and if the change is made while the contract is running he has to continue to pay the increased freight rate until the contract expires. He has no recovery against the railway or against the party himself. Manufacturers sell at a discount off list to stated points, manufacturers of agricultural implements in particular. Large shippers to all these points give a set discount off list. When that discount is fixed for a year or more they have no redress, they have simply to pay that increased rate. I think it is very unsatisfactory to find that in face of a Railway Commission having been appointed, and in face of the high rates that have been charged already, this amalgamation that has taken place between these roads has directly or indirectly resulted in increased cost on freights to certain points in the maritime

provinces from points west of Montreal. I think the explanation the minister has given is highly unsatisfactory, and will be so considered by the manufacturers and large shippers of goods in the west.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N. B.). I would like to add a word to this discussion as I am more or less interested in the subject. I realize the circumstances that led up to this difficulty with the Canadian Pacific Railway. In fact I understand from their own agents that they were not satisfied with the former rates charged to Fredericton. They claim that Fredericton was not a competitive point, as St. John was, and they proposed raising the rates on flour and provisions, also the rates on commodities such as dry goods and general merchandise. This protest having been entered, a compromise was made, as I understand it, by which the previous rates should stand good on flour and commodities of that class, whereas on dry goods, textile products and so on, the rates were to be increased, above those they were giving to a competitive point, namely, St. John, New Brunswick. For that reason the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk entered into a traffic arrangement concerning local traffic, by which they charged on commodities other than cereals, an increased rate. That agreement, or traffic arrangement, I have no doubt was confirmed by the Railway Commission at Ottawa, who, I suppose, considered it a reasonable one. But we must not forget that in freight arrangements it is very difficult to make rates that do not work hardly in some sections of the country. For example, let me point out to this House that to-day although Chatham is within nine miles of Chatham Junction, and Fredericton is within about 100 miles, yet freight is carried over the Grand Trunk and over the Intercolonial to Fredericton at a less rate than it is to Chatham. Now I wish particularly to state that that remark applies only to flour and that class of goods. Although is is hauled only nine miles from Chatham Junction into Chatham, we have to pay a higher rate than when it is hauled into Fredericton. Now the railway authorities answer us in this way, they say that Fredericton is nearer the point of production, and is a competitive point, and therefore we have not a right to the same rate that Fredericton has, because of our situation and our not being adjacent to the city of St. John. I can understand why the Fredericton merchants should claim the same rate of freight on heavy goods. But the difficulty in this case seems to be that two great railway corporations have made a joint tariff on local freight which tariff has been confirmed by the Railway Commission. Now the question at issue is this: Is it a justifiable action on the part of the Railway Commission to confirm such a tariff which charges those extra rates? If dry goods, for example, can be hauled from the city of Toronto for 55 cents a hundred, and pay three roads out of that rate, why should two roads charge 66 cents, 11 cents extra? Now we have to consider whether it would not be in the interest of the producer in the west and of the consumer in the east that the commission should revise that tariff and place Fredericton, so far as local trade is concerned, on the same basis that she was before. As I say, we have to pay on heavy goods coming into Chatham more freight than we pay on the same goods to Fredericton, although the haul is only nine miles from Chatham Junction to Chatham whereas it is over a hundred miles to Fredericton.

Mr. LALOR. I understood the minister to say that the freight rate had been changed to Marysville, a point near Fredericton. Might I ask which point pays the higher freight, Fredericton or Marysville?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the papers which I read show that these points get uniform rates, all points from Chatham Junction through to Fredericton are given a uniform rate. If I mistake not, that rate is fixed on the basis of Moncton, and the rate to Moncton would be less than the rate to Fredericton because Moncton and St. John are placed on a par, that is to say, the rate which applies to St. John applies to Moncton. The contention of the Intercolonial was that the same rate should apply to Fredericton, while the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway act to the contrary. But where the Intercolonial have the control, that is up the river St. John to Gibson and Marysville, they continue the rate that had existed previously, that is, the same rate as the Moncton and St. John rate.

Motion, (Mr. Emmerson) to adjourn, negatived.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—SURVEY OF ROUTE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the government whether or not they have any information as to the success which has been met with in locating the route of the Transcontinental Railway from Moncton to Winnipeg. I observe in an editorial of the 'Globe' of yesterday the following intimation:

> The news which comes from Ottawa that the surveys for the Transcontinental Railway have been able to locate a route from Moncton to Winnipeg with a maximum grade of four-tenths of one per cent is the most important piece of intelligence that has come from the capital in many a day.

If there is any information of that kind I think it should be laid before parliament at the earliest possible moment. It may be that the very regrettable illness of the chairman of the commission has pre-

vented any report being made, but there are three other commissioners, and if they are able to give information of this character to the press they should be equally able to prepare a report giving, with a little more exactness, that information to the government who would lay it before parliament. I called the attention of the right hon Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on one or two occasions before to statements of this character which I did not have before me at the time. I would like to ask whether the government has any information and if not how it is that an intimation of this character, apparently founded on information proceeding from the commission, should appear in the public press.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have found it very difficult to check the press, and I have found it very difficult to trace the sources of information. Sometimes the information is accurate and sometimes it is not accurate. I am informed that reports have been received from the engineers by the Railway Department as to the character of the route that is now being tentatively surveyed and I may say to my hon. friend that at the present time I myself do not know what the character of this information is except from what I have read in the press. I understand, however, that the report is very favourable and that the engineers have been enabled to locate a line which will be very much of the character given in the press. But, I must acquit the government of any suggestion that they have given away this report. These things get out, my hon. friend cannot say how and I cannot say how, but as soon as the information is completed it will be brought down to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not objecting to the information getting out, but what I am objecting to is that it is not given to parliament in the regular way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not in a position yet to be given in the regular way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps that is the case. If the information is sufficiently exact and sufficiently important to be communicated to the press and to be referred to by the press in this way, it would also seem that it is sufficiently exact and sufficiently important to be communicated by the commission to the government and by the government to parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the information is of the character mentioned by the press there will be no hesitation at all to bring it to the attention of parliament.

VACANCY IN NORTH OXFORD.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not any writ has been issued for the election in North Oxford and if not what is the intention of the government as to the date which shall be fixed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No writ has yet been issued for North Oxford, but if my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) renews his question within a reasonable time I think I may be able to give him satisfaction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What would my hon. friend regard as a reasonable time ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Within a few days.

REPORT OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) if the report that was promised a long time ago from the Board of Railway Commissioners has yet been placed on the table of the House ? I have taken occasion to ask the clerk of the House and I understand that it has not. When I was making an inquiry as to this matter at least two months ago, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals informed the House that it would be brought down within a very short time. It is important we should have the report and I think sufficient time has now elapsed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that the report has not been laid before the House and that the department is not in a position to place such a report upon the table, but as soon as I am in a position I will submit it to the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand what the hon. minister means by saying that the department is not in a position to lay the report before the House. Probably the hon. minister will inform the House as to whether he has received such a report. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that there was a difficulty about this matter. The statute did not provide for a report and the House ought to know just in what position it stands in regard to the matter. If there is any serious difficulty or any objection to making a report we should pass a statute making the report available at once. It is time it was here. When I asked the hon. minister about the report, I understood him to say that it would be down almost immediately. It is important that he should inform the House definitely what he means by saying that the department is not in a position to bring it down. Has the report been handed to the department, or what is the difficulty ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend must be under some misapprehension as to any assurance that I gave him in respect to the placing of such a report upon the table

of the House. I said that I would exercise due diligence in endeavouring to get that report and that I had been assured by the railway commissioners that such a report would be prepared. I have not received such a complete report. I was mixing up the two commissions. You are asking in respect to the Railway Commission ?

Mr. LENNOX. The Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not received that complete report yet, but I am expecting it.

Mr. LENNOX. If I may be allowed to call the hon. minister's attention to the matter so that we may not misunderstand each other, I think I recollect quite distinctly what occurred as to that. I was pressing the hon. minister for an answer as to whether he had interviewed the Board of Railway Commissioners to get such information as would enable him to promise this report to the House at an early day. I understood the hon. minister to say definitely that he had taken those steps and that he would be in a position to bring down a complete report such as we indicated when we were discussing the estimates and when the question arose to which I have referred. If it is necessary I shall take occasion to look up the reference to it and refer to it again, but aside from that verbal discussion it is time that this report was brought down. The hon. minister again is indefinite when he suggests that he has not a complete report. Either it is a sufficient report or it is not, and if it is not, steps should be taken to have it supplemented in such a way that it would be sufficient to be brought down.

SEIZURE OF SCHOONER 'AGNES DONOHOE.'

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the government to one or two new phases which have occurred in the case of the unfortunate captain of the schooner 'Agnes Donahoe.' I have just received the following telegram :

Halifax, N.S., May 17.

Wm. Roche, M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Montevideo agents cable : Ryan condemned ; sentenced three years penal servitude ; mates one year ; crew six months ; ship cargo confiscated ; we have appealed ; enforce claims immediately. Have Canadian government act with vigour and despatch ; answer.

(Sgd.) E. DONAHOE & SON.

That is a very serious matter, Mr. Speaker, but a more serious matter is this, that in so far as it relates to the crew——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have already had this matter up to-day.

Mr. WM. ROCHE. Then all I have to say is that the second phase of this question is a more serious one, as it affects our sea-faring population. Part of the crew of the 'Agnes Donahoe' took refuge on board an American man-of-war, and they, having been taken to a port in the United States, obtained their release and came to Nova Scotia. The serious part of it is this : Does the British flag protect British seamen as the American flag protects British or other seamen ? If our seamen obtain the idea that they have a protection under the American flag that does not exist under the British flag, it will strike a blow at the prestige of the British flag.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—APPROVAL OF LOCATION.

A. C. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) if he has yet approved of the plans of the Grand Trunk Pacific terminus at Port Arthur and Fort William ? In this connection, I would draw his attention to a report that appeared in the 'Daily World,' of Vancouver, of April 27th, which reads as follows :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I assume that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) intends to conclude with a motion.

Mr. BOYCE. I am simply asking a question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House will be moved into Committee of Supply during the day, and if my hon. friend has a statement to make he may proceed then.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend only wishes to ask a question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If he only wishes to ask a question, I have no objection at all.

Mr. BOYCE. I am only asking the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if the following statement that appeared in this newspaper is correct :

Port Simpson and the Terminal.

Ottawa, Ont., April 27.—(Special)—Hon. Mr. Emmerson expects to approve the Grand Trunk Pacific application for terminals at Port Simpson and Kaien Island, some ten miles south, to-day or to-morrow. He has already approved of the terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Minister of Railways has approved of the route to Port Arthur and Fort William ; that is of the location of the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific branch line of railway from the main line to Thunder bay.

Mr. BOYCE. Are these the plans that were sealed up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; these are the location plans. The other plans as to the terminals have not been approved.

REPORT OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. R. BLAIN. I have taken the trouble to look up the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in respect to bringing down the Railway Commission report. At page 602 of the revised 'Hansard,' my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asks :

When will we have the railway report ?
Mr. EMMERSON. I have not received the report from the Printing Bureau. It was promised for to-morrow.

I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals to say that has not been brought down yet.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Blain) is referring to the report of the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes ; I apologize.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Government Railways Act.—Mr. Emmerson.

On section 1,

Mr. EMMERSON. There are some slight amendments to be proposed to this section, most of which are merely intended to improve the wording and in order to make the meaning clear. The section as amended will read as follows :

The minister shall, subject to the provisions of this Act, have for the purposes of and in connection with the business and traffic of any government railway in his charge or direction by virtue of the Government Railways Act, running powers over the whole or any portion of the lines of Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada between Montreal and Coteau Junction and over all or any of the lines and tracks of the system known as the Canada Atlantic Railway system extending from Coteau Junction to Depot Harbour and the Georgian bay, as the said lines and tracks, including the said line between Montreal and Coteau Junction, now exist or as they are hereafter constructed, reconstructed, or extended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the discussion that took place on the first reading, this Bill seemed to be regarded as merely an option to the government to exercise or not to exercise running powers over this railway. It may be that in one sense the government may not be bound to exercise those running powers, but this section expressly and explicitly says that the government shall have running powers. Now if you enact a statute of that character will you not, by the very circumstance that the government is placed in the position to enter at any time and to exercise running powers, place the government and the country in the position of having to pay compensation to the Grand Trunk whether those running powers are exercised or not ? For example the property of the Grand Trunk Company subject to a power of that kind which may be exercised under statute by the government would be a less valuable asset possibly to the company than it would be if it were subject to no such rights. It seems to me that the government by this legislation is doing something more than was suggested by the Prime Minister upon the introduction of this Bill and also by the Minister of Railways himself, and I would like to have a little more definite statement as to exactly what the result of this statute will be in this regard. Suppose this statute is passed and nothing more is done ; is it suggested that the Grand Trunk Railway whose property is made subject to this right will have no power of enforcing compensation against the government ? I would think that the opposite result is one which might be regarded as a fair result from the wording of this statute.

Mr. EMMERSON. Or course my hon. friend is asking a legal question as to the legal consequences. My own view of the matter would be that the Grand Trunk Company couid not by any possibility have any legal, moral or equitable claim against the government of Canada. This is the parliament of Canada, it is the supreme power, it is the highest court in Canada, and it has power to deal with these matters and it enacts with respect to certain property that the government can, if it chooses, shall if it will exercise, and have the right to running powers and of course that section is to be interpreted in connection with the other clauses of the Act and no possible damages can accrue to the Grand Trunk Railway or to the other company, reading the whole Act together.

Mr. HAGGART. Have there been any negotiations, or correspondence, verbal or otherwise with the Grand Trunk or the Canada Atlantic as to the passage of this Act either before the acquisition by the Grand Trunk or the Canada Atlantic or since, and what is the effect of those negotiations and what is the purpose you intend to carry out under the Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say to my hon. friend that there were no negotiations with the company. Representatives of the company have been here when this Bill was before the committee and I think they addressed themselves to members of the Railway Committee when their Bill was before that body and this other proposition was spoken of. I think they are not disposed to favourably view this matter ; certainly they objected to the delay that resulted by reason of the desire which I expressed to have time to determine as to the character of the legislation that should be brought in giving running rights to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. Then you have no idea as to what meaning Sir Charles Rivers-Wilson had when he was addressing the stockholders in London, and said that he was

sorry he could not take them all fully into his confidence because there were some negotiations and correspondence going on connected with this bargain which it would be impossible for him to disclose at the present moment, but they must take his word and rely on it entirely that these negotiations and this correspondence were in the interest of the company ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not seen the remarks to which my hon. friend refers. I am speaking for my own department ; there have been no negotiations, there is no bargain. I thought it was in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway that this Bill should be introduced, I obtained the consent of my colleagues, the Bill was prepared and is now before the committee, but not as the result of any bargain or any negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. KEMP. The hon. gentleman has said that so far as his department is concerned there have been no negotiations.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will make it wider, and say that so far as I know no negotiations of any kind were conducted with the government. I was speaking for myself and I was surprised when my hon. friend mentioned the remarks he did. I had not seen the remarks and I know of no negotiations with any other member of the government. Certainly there were none with me nor were there any with the Department of Railways and Canals and I assume that is where negotiations would be carried on.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand the minister to say that when the Canada Atlantic Railway Bill was before the Railway Committee, the government having in view the insertion of a clause in the Canada Atlantic Railway Bill and now foregoing that and introducing this Bill, there was no conference between the Grand Trunk Company and the government with respect to the conditions to be attached to this Bill?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was asked with respect to correspondence. I said there was no correspondence, but I stated that when this matter was before the Railway Committee there were some verbal expressions against the proposal which I had suggested to the committee. It did not take the form of negotiations ; it simply was an expression of opposition on the part of solicitors to the proposal which I had suggested to the committee.

Mr. INGRAM. That is to say that any clauses put in the Canada Atlantic Bill would affect the interest of the Grand Trunk Company in the matter of raising money and for that reason they did not want that class of legislation placed in their Bill. But apart from that I understood the hon. gentleman to say that neither verbal nor written communications nor conferences have taken place with the Grand Trunk Company. Now the minister says there was a verbal——

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh no, I qualified that before.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not so understand from the minister's answer to the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and it seems to me a rather strange thing that there would be no conference or anything of that kind in reference to those Bills.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason that I suggested the construction which I thought might be placed on the words of this Act is this : You have under section 1 a right created in this government in respect of a railway owned by a private company. There is no ambiguity about the terms of that section. I shall omit the immaterial work : The minister shall have for the government railway running powers over that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Côteau Junction and over all the lines and tracks of the system known as the Canada Atlantic Railway system. Then section 5 provides that the terms and conditions and the payment or compensation subject to which the said running powers may be so exercised shall be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners. If you put those two provisions together, it seems to me that the Grand Trunk Railway will have the right to recover compensation against the Crown for that easement created in favour of the government over the property of the Grand Trunk Railway. For that reason I thought the Minister of Railways should be able to give us the opinion of the law officers of the Crown as to the effect of these two sections. The First Minister, on the first reading of the Bill, suggested that this was merely the creation of a right which might not be exercised for a long time, and which involved no obligation on the part of this country to pay anything. I am now stating it as my opinion that the converse is at least fairly arguable. I would like to know whether or not the minister has taken the opinion of the law officers of the Crown upon the construction of these two sections. If you create an easement and say that it shall be paid for according to the arbitrament of a certain tribunal, do you not permit the party against whom the easement is created to make application on its own initiative to the tribunal for the purpose of determining that compensation and incidentally the terms and conditions upon which this right shall be exercised. That seems an important question to be considered because you will find in the end that it is not the intention which the government may put into the Act, but that which is to be read in the words of the statute which will have effect and be carried out.

Mr. EMMERSON. As was stated by the right hon. the First Minister at the first

reading, the exercise of these rights is not imperative. These rights need only be exercised when the government sees fit, and then the compensation will be determined by the Railway Commission. The question stated by my hon. friend was submitted by me to the Department of Justice. That department drafted the Bill in accord with the expressed policy of the government. I would not presume to give a legal opinion upon these sections, but, as an individual, I would read them very differently from the way my hon. friend reads them. I would take into consideration the whole Bill and not pick out a word here and there in the different sections. According to the fifth section the running powers shall be subject to the terms and conditions to be fixed by the Railway Commission ; but it is evident that the exercise of these powers is purely discretionary, and I cannot see how the Grand Trunk Railway could have any claim legal, equitable or moral against the government for the non-exercise of these powers and privileges, the exercise of which is discretionary with the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I stated that I was omitting the immaterial words, and I did not observe in any of the other sections anything which at all cuts down what is contained in the words I did read. This seems to me to be a statutory expropriation of an easement in respect of the Grand Trunk Railway lines between Montreal and Depot Harbour. The Bill contains also provisions for compensation. Would the Minister of Justice give us his opinion, if he has had the opportunity of examining the different sections of the Bill ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Bill was originally drafted by the Railway Department and sent to the Department of Justice for consideration. It was sent back to the Railway Department and they amended it again, so that the form in which it appears before the House is not that in which it left my department.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If hon. gentlemen will have a little patience, they will hear something more. While the draft Bill was being considered, I thought it well to consult the solicitor of the Grand Trunk Railway in connection with the matter. I sent for him and we considered the point together. The conclusion to which we came was that this Bill gave to the government the right to exercise running powers over that portion of the Grand Trunk which extended from Montreal to Coteau and over the Canada Atlantic Railway and its branches from Coteau to Depot Harbour. I may say that, incidentally, my advice was that the Bill should be drafted in the way it is rather than have the measure appear as a clause in the Canada Atlantic Railway Company's Act. This Bill gives the government power, which it may only exercise in the dim and distant future, there is no immediate connection between the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Intercolonial which must run over the Grand Trunk from Montreal to Coteau Junction. I am old enough now in the profession to be willing to see an error, if there is one, in anything I am connected with. But I may explain that the object was to provide that the government should have running powers, and that those powers should not be exercised until two things had been settled by the Railway Commission. The first of these to be determined would be the terms and conditions under which this power should be exercised ; and, after the terms and conditions are settled the second would be to fix the compensation—because it is clear that the compensation must depend upon the conditions under which the power is exercised. That was the object, and this provision, it seems to me will carry out that object. I entertained no doubt about it, until some doubt was suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). If there is any doubt, it is our duty to make the thing absolutely clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I appreciate what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has said. Two points occur to me. The first is that the mere creation of an easement which may or may not be exercised, would afford ground for compensation. For instance, if a right of way is created which may never be exercised, but which the party is free to exercise if he chooses, that may be a subject for compensation. True, that compensation might be small. The second point is that if you enact legislation of this character, and if the view which the Minister of Justice has suggested be the correct view, would it not almost necessarily follow, that the Grand Trunk Railway company, owning property which is subjected or might be subjected to the easement, would have the right to go to the Railway Commission to have the terms settled and the compensation fixed ? There might be that view of the situation. That is to say, the courts, it seems to me, would refrain from putting the Grand Trunk Railway in the position of having a right created against it in the shape of an easement so that its property would remain subject to that right for an indefinite period in the future without giving the company the right to have compensation or without giving the company the right of its own initiative to have the terms and conditions settled and the matter closed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To settle the terms and conditions, it would be necessary to know the extent of the user which the government may make. That is a preliminary step. To settle the terms and conditions of the user to be made, you would need to know what the dominant party, as we call

it under our civil law, is going to do. In this case, the dominant party is the government, and we would need to know whether the government is going to exercise the right it undoubtedly will have if this Bill passes. No doubt my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has considered the matter. I cannot, on the spur of the moment, suggest the wording to meet his view. But, if I have correctly stated his position, I will make it clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I simply suggest that it is a thing capable of being made clear and that it ought to be made clear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I agree.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, we may give our considered opinion here in the House, but after all we cannot thresh out these matters as thoroughly and closely as they would be threshed out in the courts if the matter should come up for adjudication.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We do not want to get into the courts anyway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: No. But I would consider the matter sufficiently important and sufficiently doubtful to justify the government in making an amendment of this clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 1 stands.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) is agreeable.

Mr. EMMERSON. In view of the opinion of the keeper of my law conscience, I will certainly defer. If he thinks the clause should stand, I am quite agreeable.

On section 2—running powers defined,

Mr. BERGERON. I was not here when the discussion on this Bill commenced. I understand that clause 1 stands. But I would like to make a suggestion to the government relating to that section. If I understand the matter, the object of the government in obtaining running powers for the Intercolonial over the Canada Atlantic Railway to Depot Harbour would relate principally to freight traffic. The Canada Atlantic Railway, as we all know, crosses the St. Lawrence, at Coteau. I would suggest, that, instead of only obtaining running powers from Montreal to Coteau and thence to Depot Harbour, it would be well to obtain running powers from Coteau on the Canada Atlantic Railway to Howick Junction in Chateauguay, thence by Grand Trunk Railway to St. Lambert. This will be a shorter distance for traffic, and also it would serve at least three counties in which there is a good deal of traffic—Beauharnois, Chateauguay and La Prairie. As the clause has been allowed to stand I would throw out the suggestion for consideration, whether we could not take these running powers over the two lines from Montreal to Coteau on the Grand Trunk Railway, and, on the Canada Atlantic down to Howick Junction and thence by Grand Trunk Railway to St. Lambert. In the latter case the freight would go on straight by the Intercolonial without passing by the city of Montreal.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will consider the suggestion. Of course, the section is allowed to stand.

Mr. HAGGART. This section 2 reads:

> Such running powers shall consist of the right, perpetuity or for such period or periods from time to time as the Governor in Council determines.

And so on. What does the government intend to do—take it in perpetuity? Or are they going to exercise the option for such times as the Governor in Council from time to time decides?

Mr. EMMERSON. The right would be to take it in perpetuity. But when the moment arrives when it shall be determined as to the question of the exercise of the right, it is at the option of the Governor in Council for that time to decide as to whether it should be in perpetuity or whether it should be for a shorter period or series of periods.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the Governor in Council decides it. As I understand, the Governor in Council can decide whether they take it in perpetuity or for a short time. If they exercise it for a short time, they cannot have power to exercise it for another time under the Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think they could. I think they could exercise it for a short time, and if, at the end of that period, they wanted to extend the time, I think they could do so. The Act says 'or for such period or periods from time to time as the Governor in Council determine.' As the Governor in Council determines from time to time, I think would be a reasonable rendering.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What about the practical working out of this arrangement as regards, for instance, the running of trains over the line from Montreal to Parry Sound? Will you not have practically to operate the line, to create divisions of the train crews, and so forth? How will it work out as a matter of practical operation of this railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. That would have to be determined at the time. It could be worked out in the way we worked out the running of the Canadian Pacific Railway trains on the Intercolonial; that would be one method of doing it. It could be done in the same way as we have the right to run our trains over the portion of the Grand Trunk between Ste. Rosalie and the terminal at Montreal, as we now operate that section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is a much longer section.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think the question is affected by the length of the line. Our men take charge of the trains that come off the Drummond section at Ste. Rosalie, they continue on those trains, but those trains are subject to the despatch and control of the Grand Trunk. Our train hands have to take their orders from the despatchers of the Grand Trunk Railway. We are running over their track, we are subject to their direction.

Mr. HAGGART. Of course, it must be operated by the owning company.

Mr. EMMERSON. So with respect to the line between Hamilton and Toronto—the Grand Trunk, I think, own the line and the Canadian Pacific Railway have running rights over it.

Mr. HAGGART. Under that arrangement the minister made provision as to the amount we will have to pay to the officials along the line of the road each year for the user. It was paid according to the user on a train basis. You paid your contribution for terminal facilities for the use of the line to the officials along the line of the road. There is no provision for anything of that kind here.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think this could be determined by the Railway Commission. They can put the compensation in any form their judgment suggests, that is under clause 5. It need not necessarily be a lump sum. It can be put in any form, as long as there is a consideration given. I think their powers are ample in that respect.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 4,

Mr. BERGERON. I always understood that the Intercolonial Railway did not come under the control of the Railway Commission. As a matter of fact would not this section give the Railway Commission control over the Intercolonial Railway to the extent that the Intercolonial Railway has running powers over this line?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the first reading of this Bill I explained this clause. It would not be fair to the other railways running west of Montreal that they should be obliged to have their tariffs determined by the Railway Commission, while the Intercolonial Railway could use these very same tracks and adjust their tariffs at their own sweet will. While I objected to the freight tariffs of the Intercolonial Railway proper east of Montreal being subject to the Railway Commission, I felt that in the common interest it was only just that the rates west of Montreal should be approved by the Railway Commission as in the case of other railways.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the practise on the joint section between Ste. Rosalie and Montreal?

Mr. EMMERSON. My impression is that we have no local freights between Ste. Rosalie and the Montreal terminals.

Mr. BERGERON. I presume that if there is any freight taken by the Intercolonial Railway there, it would be through freight?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and we do not submit our through freight rates to the commission.

Mr. BERGERON. But you would carry through freight from Depot Harbour to the maritime ports?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be under the commission only so far as that portion of it west of Montreal is concerned.

Mr. BERGERON. But you purpose doing a through freight business?

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the minister to mean that the railway companies may make a joint tariff arrangement between themselves, and against the Intercolonial Railway as one of the railways affected, which does not need to submit its rates to the Railway Commission?

Mr. EMMERSON. The companies can admit a joint tariff but it is subject to the approval of the Railway Commission. The leader of the opposition stated on a former occasion that the Intercolonial Railway, in proposing to do a through business should be subject to the same authority as the other railways are with respect to the through business west of Montreal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think I said exactly that.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my impression.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I remember correctly, I said that it seemed very anamalous that the Intercolonial Railway carrying through freight from the Georgian bay to the maritime ports should be subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission in respect to a portion of the distance and not in respect to another portion of the distance. I did not see exactly how it could be worked out, because it seemed to me that the Railway Commission in determining a through rate must have regard to that portion of the line which is excluded from the provisions of the Railway Act. I confess that I do not yet see exactly how it can be worked out.

Mr. EMMERSON. We propose to do a through freight business and a through and

local passenger business. It is proposed that the tariffs west of Montreal shall be subject to the Railway Board in order that there may be uniformity, and in order that the government railways should not be in a different position from the other railways. This would seem to be just and equitable when we are carrying freight over a railway belonging to a company which is under the Railway Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the commission would have jurisdiction from Georgian bay to Montreal on the freight that is carried on the Intercolonial Railway. That would be determined by the local rate, but the other railways would have the right to make a through rate and the Intercolonial Railway will not under this arrangement.

Mr. EMMERSON. That through rate is subject to the supervision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HAGGART. The through rate on the Intercolonial Railway is subject to the supervision of the Railway Commission ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It certainly is under the Railway Act.

Mr. HAGGART. Not at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. Surely my hon. friend will not dispute that ?

Mr. HAGGART. The Railway Commission has no jurisdiction at all over the rates on the Intercolonial Railway. Where do you give them jurisdiction over the through rates from the Georgian bay to St. John or Halifax ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me explain. We are not allowed to do any local freight traffic on the leased line. Section 3 says :

> In exercising any such running powers the minister shall have the power to do a through freight and passenger business and a local passenger business.

We have not power to do a local freight business. Section 4 says :

> The minister shall submit tariffs of the tolls to be charged for the carriage of traffic upon the said line and track to which said running powers extend, to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

The tariff so submitted must of necessity be a through tariff because the Intercolonial Railway can do no local freight business on the leased lines. The Intercolonial Railway would be compelled to file its tariff on that section with the Railway Commission just the same as the other companies.

Mr. BERGERON. Let me understand the matter. Take a freight train of the Grand Trunk Railway, starting from Depot Harbour for St. John or Halifax and passing over the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Intercolonial Railway, would the freight on that train be subject to the Railway Commission for the entire journey, although it would be running for the greater part of the way on the Intercolonial Railway which is not subject to the Railway Commission. Is that what I am to understand ?

Mr. HAGGART. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. They could not do a local freight business on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BERGERON. Whether it be through traffic or local traffic, it would be subject to the Railway Commission upon the Intercolonial Railway, a railway which is not under the Railway Commission. It might be a difficult thing to fix rates under such conditions.

Mr. KEMP. Will the Minister of Railways explain what 'through' and 'local' traffic mean ? Does the minister hold that local traffic means freight gathered on the lines between Depot Harbour and Montreal and destined for points in the maritime provinces? Can the Intercolonial Railway gather freight on the Canada Atlantic Railway lines between Depot Harbour and Coteau or on the Grand Trunk Railway lines between Coteau and Montreal for points on the Intercolonial Railway in the maritime provinces, and would that be considered through traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my understanding of the term 'through traffic.'

Mr. KEMP. I understand from the discussion that through traffic meant traffic from the lakes to points in the maritime provinces, but I am now told that through traffic also means traffic originating at various stations on the Canada Atlantic and destined for Intercolonial Railway points in the maritime provinces.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is my understanding of through traffic.

Mr. BERGERON. Local traffic is the traffic from one station to another.

Mr. EMMERSON. On the leased lines that is local traffic.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say the Intercolonial Railway can gather up freight where they have running rights on the Grand Trunk Railway ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For points on its own line east of Montreal, but it could not take traffic along the leased lines or the operated lines to Montreal or to any intervening points.

Mr. KEMP. Do I understand the word 'traffic' in clause 4 includes passenger as well as freight traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. KEMP. Well then if 'traffic' in clause 4 means only freight traffic then

the Railway Commission has no control over passenger rates. Is that what that clause means ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it is only as to freight.

Mr. KEMP. Then the Board of Railway Commissioners will have no control over the passenger rates to be charged ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. KEMP. Why is that not included ? In clause 3 it refers to passenger and freight business but in clause 4 the minister says that the word 'traffic' only relates to freight traffic and not to passenger traffic and that the Board of Railway Commissioners will have no control over passenger traffic. I do not understand why the discrimination is made.

Mr. EMMERSON. That certainly is the case as I remember. I do not see the same necessity for bringing the passenger traffic under the supervision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. KEMP. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well for the reason that passenger traffic is not so much a subject of revision by the Railway Board. That is governed more by usage. Take for instance the passenger rate between St. John and Montreal. Necessarily that rate is governed by the shortest route, that is to say, the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have to take passengers from St. John who are destined for Montreal to Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway around up to Lévis, and on to Montreal, and that passenger rate is governed by the passenger rate of the Canadian Pacific Railway from St. John direct through Maine to Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. The charge is the same although the distance is longer.

Mr. EMMERSON. The rates are identical and that is a recognized principle that the short haul governs the longer.

Mr. KEMP. The point I wanted to make is this. On the present Intercolonial Railway there are some advantages which the Intercolonial Railway gives to passengers which the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway do not give. The rates per mile are higher on the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway than they are on the Intercolonial Railway for certain classes of passenger traffic. According to the reasoning of the Minister of Railways if this Bill came into effect, if the bargain was made, the Intercolonial would be fully justified in adopting the same schedule on the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway which is leased as they do on the Intercolonial Railway at present, thereby reducing the passenger tolls if they saw fit and the Board of Railway Commissioners could not interfere with such a movement as that.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the way it stands.

Mr. BARKER. I perhaps misunderstood something the minister said. I understood him to say that the leased line traffic would be local traffic. Is that what the minister said ? Does he mean by that that there is no local traffic except the traffic of the leased line ? Take traffic arising on the leased line of the Canada Atlantic Railway from some middle point to another middle point, what is that ? That is local traffic.

Mr. EMMERSON. For any middle point where——

Mr. BARKER. I am not talking of traffic going to St. John, take traffic going from some point on the Canada Atlantic to another point on the Canada Atlantic not to the termini, but to any intermediate point, never touching a leased line at all. Is that not local traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. When I say a 'leased line' I mean a line over which we would acquire running rights. We call that local traffic. That is to say we could not take traffic at any point along the present system of the Canada Atlantic or the Grand Trunk between Coteau and the terminal at Montreal ; we could not engage in that freight traffic. That is what is called local freight traffic ; that is what I would term local freight traffic.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman uses the words 'leased lines.' What did he refer to when he used that expression ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was referring to lines over which we had running rights as distinguished from the line of the Intercolonial Railway as owned and controlled by it. Properly speaking of course, it is a misnomer because there is a portion of the line from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal which is a leased line properly so called, but I do not wish to be understood as including that in the term. It was not an expression taken from the Bill here ; a more correct expression would have been 'those lines over which we had running rights,' the running rights included in and given by this Bill.

Mr. BARKER. That is on portions of the Canada Atlantic.

Mr. EMMERSON. And a portion of the Grand Trunk as far as Montreal.

Mr. BARKER. You are not dealing with purely local traffic upon either of those lines if it is freight traffic but you are dealing with it if it is passenger traffic ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you are dealing with all through traffic whether passenger or freight ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. If you are carrying passengers from Depot Harbour down to St. John or Halifax that does not fall under this Bill. If the privilege enjoyed by the Intercolonial Railway of not coming under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission applies here, you could for instance carry passengers a great deal cheaper than the Grand Trunk Railway would and I think in that way you could take away the passengers from the other lines. What would prevent you from doing that? The hon. gentleman would have the right to do so if he chose.

Mr. EMMERSON. I grant that, just as there is nothing to prevent us to-day from carrying passengers from Montreal to St. John for one-half the Canadian Pacific Railway rate.

Mr. BERGERON. Except that the deficit might be much larger.

Mr. EMMERSON. We might have a great influx of passengers.

Mr. BERGERON. On the other hand, on the part I am talking of it would not be the same thing at all; even carrying passengers much cheaper might be good business.

Mr. HAGGART. The trouble about this Bill is that you give the Railway Commission jurisdiction over what you say are through rates, but by the Railway Act they have no jurisdiction over the Intercolonial Railway at all. Then the only jurisdiction they have is from Georgian bay to Montreal. Would the Railway Commission fix a different rate, having no jurisdiction over the Intercolonial Railway than what they would allow to the Canada Atlantic or the Grand Trunk? In other words, not having jurisdiction over the Intercolonial Railway they could only fix the rate from Georgian bay to Montreal as they would fix it for the Grand Trunk Railway. In that case you would be terribly handicapped because the Grand Trunk Railway may have a through rate a great deal lower than what you would have on the Intercolonial Railway. For this reason the rate from Georgian bay to Montreal would be the same rate as would be attached to the Grand Trunk Railway. Not having jurisdiction over the Intercolonial Railway, the Railway Commission need not take that into consideration at all in fixing through rates. Then what would the commission have to decide upon? They would only have the fixing of the rates between Georgian bay and Montreal, and they make them the same as over the Grand Trunk Railway. But the Grand Trunk Railway may have a through rate to St. John which is a great deal lower than from Georgian bay to Montreal. If the Railway Commission should take that into consideration, then they have the right to take into consideration what are the rates on the Intercolonial Railway in fixing the rate from Montreal to Georgian bay, if they are to fix a through rate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I fear that we do not understand each other. At present the Intercolonial Railway ends at Montreal and its rates are not subject to the determination of the Railway Commission. If this Bill should become law and the powers given by it be put into execution, the Intercolonial Railway would then have running rights clear through to Depot Harbour. Now the Bill as proposed makes it necessary for the Railway Commission to determine the through freight rates, that is the freight rates for any traffic originating on the Intercolonial Railway and going to any point along the line over which we had acquired running rights. Or if we, in the exercise of our running rights, gather up freight on the Canada Atlantic system destined for a point in the maritime provinces along our own line, we could not arbitrarily fix a through rate to those points. Although we have the power to fix our local rates as between points on our own original line, we could not fix through rates which would be subject to the determination and judgment of the Railway Commission, without at the same time fixing through rates for the Grand Trunk Railway and also for the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is presumed that the same principle which now applies and fixing those through rates would be applied under those circumstances and that there would be uniformity. It is required now that the freight tariffs shall all be filed at a certain date, whether local freight or general freight. All tariffs must be filed at a certain date. If the commission takes no action with respect to those freight tariffs thus filed, the railways are entitled to collect the rates fixed by them. But if the commission decide that these tariffs need to be revised, they would necessarily frame a uniform tariff applicable to all railways.

Mr. HAGGART. Where do you give the commissioners the right to fix a through traffic from Georgian bay to St. John or Halifax or any point on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the Railway Act there is such a power. Every railway running from Georgian bay or any other point in the west is compelled to file its tariff on a certain day each year or at certain stated intervals, and that through rate—I do not care what it may be—is subject to the revision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HAGGART. If it passes over the Intercolonial Railway, the Railway Commission will have no jurisdiction.

Mr. EMMERSON. We propose by this Bill to make it subject to that jurisdiction.

Mr. HAGGART. Under what clause?

Mr. EMMERSON. By the fourth section of this Bill we are obliged to submit tariffs of the tolls to be charged for the carriage

of traffic upon the side lines and tracks to which such running powers extend.

Mr. HAGGART. That is not the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. It must be because we are not allowed to carry local traffic over those lines. Therefore the traffic, with respect to which we must submit a tariff, is traffic that extends over the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. HAGGART. It is confined entirely to the said lines and tracks to which such running powers extend.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No doubt the Railway Commission has no control over the Intercolonial Railway freights purely and simply; but are we to understand that if a through freight rate is made between any other road and the Intercolonial Railway, the commission then has control over the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. The commission has control over the rates of traffic which would be gathered on these lines and be carried over the Intercolonial to any point on it.

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you not say so?

Mr. EMMERSON. What other meaning can you get from that fourth section if you consider it in connection with the third section? Under the third section the minister, in the exercise of such running powers, shall have the power to do a through freight and passenger business and a local passenger business. He is not given the power to do a local freight traffic over those lines, and therefore any tariff he would submit could not relate to rates on local traffic over those lines.

Mr. BARKER. I wished, some moments ago, to ask a very simple question of the minister with regard to the fourth section. I wish to take the words of the section and ask how he interprets them to cover more than the Canada Atlantic Railway:

> The minister shall submit tariffs of the tolls to be charged for the carriage of traffic upon the said lines and tracks to which such running powers extend.

What lines and tracks? The Canada Atlantic Railway only?

Mr. EMMERSON. Excuse me. The Intercolonial can only carry the traffic to a point on the Intercolonial, and that must include the carriage of traffic over these through lines; and, in so far as the whole traffic is concerned, the board must determine as to the tariff. That is to say, the board can regulate the tolls to be charged and collected originating on these lines and carried by the Intercolonial over these lines to Montreal and to any point on the Intercolonial.

Mr. BARKER. It does not say so.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. BERGERON. The section before us refers only to lines over which running rights are acquired, and does not speak of the Intercolonial at all. As the minister says, they will not carry any local freight, he must intend this to refer to through freight. It means, I imagine, grain coming from Depot Harbour——

Mr. EMMERSON. We will not refuse anything.

Mr. BERGERON—and going to St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. Halifax as well, or Sydney.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course, the Grand Trunk Railway will carry grain from the same place, and so will any line that has running powers over the Grand Trunk Railway. What will happen if inducements are given by the Grand Trunk Railway in the way of cheaper rates, to send the traffic to Portland? What is taken into consideration by the commission in fixing the rates? Is it the distance? If it is, the Intercolonial from Montreal to St. John would be at a disadvantage. According to this clause there is nothing to say what rates should be charged on the Intercolonial.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the clause, as it reads, covers what the minister (Mr. Emmerson) holds it covers. The expressions 'through and freight and passenger business' and 'local passenger business' in clause 3, apply to the lines of the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal to Georgian bay, and 'through freight' means the carriage of freight from Georgian bay to Montreal, I should think. That is the only interpretation that could be given to section 4. Now, how is this to be worked out in practice? The Intercolonial is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission so far as its lines east of Montreal are concerned. The Intercolonial, operating this line from Montreal to Georgian bay, will be subject to the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission so far as concerns the tolls in respect of the business it is authorized to do. The minister has in his mind through freight from Georgian bay to maritime province ports.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not necessarily maritime province ports, but any points on the Intercolonial.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are all in the same category, I used that expression merely by way of illustration. If you propose to create a through rate from Georgian bay to St. John or Halifax—which again I use by way of illustration—you may probably go to the Railway Commission to fix the proportion of the rate which shall be charged from Georgian bay to Montreal over this line. But, so far as the remainder of the freight rate is concerned, that part which is to be charged by the Intercolonial

in respect of its lines east of Montreal, the Railway Commission surely will have no jurisdiction under this Act or under the Railway Act. But you may, in the end, establish a through rate by adding these two together, the result being that, so far as one part of the rate is concerned, the Railway Commission has nothing to do with it; and, so far as the other portion is concerned, the Railway Commission may perhaps exercise control over it. That, it seems to me, is the only result you can get out of this Bill from the standpoint of the government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There seems to be a little doubt even in the mind of the minister himself, and there is very decided doubt on the part of members on this side, as to the proper interpretation of this section. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) and the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) if they consulted as to this interpretation?

Mr. EMMERSON. The terms used here are technical terms; and I consulted with the general manager of the Intercolonial, the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial and the deputy minister and chief engineer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not with the Minister of Justice?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Bill was submitted to the Minister of Justice. While I recognize the Minister of Justice as a very eminent authority in matters of law, he is not considered an authority on the technical terms used on railways. I consulted the experts who were available to me—Mr. Pottinger, Mr. Tiffin and Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. KEMP. Perhaps we could get at this better by illustrating it in another way. The Bill is passed in view of a bargain with the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canada Atlantic Railway to give business to the Intercolonial and to direct business to St. John, Halifax and other maritime province ports. The Minister of Railways tells us that the through rates from Depot Harbour to St. John or Halifax will be controlled by the Railway Commission. At Depot Harbour traffic will be delivered to the Intercolonial in the shape of grain from Duluth, Fort Arthur and Fort William; and the minister says that, so far as concerns the freights to the sea-board over the Intercolonial, that traffic will be governed by the Board of Railway Commissioners. I would point out to the minister that the Grand Trunk Railway, owing to their arrangements for the handling of through traffic, are not wholly controlled by the Board of Commissioners. If the board settled upon a rate of freight from Depot Harbour to St. John or Halifax, immediately after it was settled and when the Intercolonial could not reduce its rate the Grand Trunk Railway would be at liberty in respect of its through freight, which goes by way of Sarnia to Portland, to make a slightly lower rate and get the business.

Mr. EMMERSON. They cannot do that.

Mr. KEMP. They could do it under the clause made by the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. My interpretation was entirely different.

Mr. KEMP. Will the hon. minister dispute what I say? He admits that the rates from Depot Harbour, on the freight to which I have referred, are to be controlled by the Railway Commission. I submit that the through freight rate by Sarnia and Portland is not controlled by the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is where I take issue with my hon. friend. I say where there are two railways passing through Canada the tariff must be subject to the Railway Commission, and any discrimination that is found to exist as respects its through rates in comparison with Canadian rates can be revised and can be controlled by the Railway Commission. There are two or three clauses in the Act enabling the Railway Commission to control that very matter.

Mr. KEMP. I never heard of it. I do not believe the Grand Trunk Railway ever considered the Board of Railway Commissioners with respect to its through traffic to American points.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then they are not conforming to the law.

Mr. KEMP. I do not think there is anything in the Railway Act in respect to traffic originating in the United States for shipment through Canada to Portland, giving the Board of Railway Commissioners any control over it whatever. But they will have control over the same kind of traffic that the Intercolonial propose to take, under this law.

Mr. HAGGART. Section 269 seems to give all the control that is required over traffic that comes from a foreign country passing through Canada into a foreign country, by compelling them to file the tariff.

Mr. EMMERSON. And if they do not conform to it in a case of that kind, they can be made to pay duty.

Mr. HAGGART. But there is no control of the kind over the rates. They file the tariff with the Railway Commission, but there is no control by the commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the minister is mistaken about that, I think that only implies where traffic originates in Canada and is carried through Canada to foreign points. I do not see that we could control a foreign corporation

operating a railway in the United States which happens to make connection with the railway of a Canadian company. We might attempt to do it by some similar provision to that which has been made available in the case of traffic originating in Canada and going through a foreign country into Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. When it reached Sarnia, for instance, what would we do ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might apply the same principle, and say that freight originating in a foreign country and coming into Canada, which was brought into Canada by a railway not conforming to the regulation of the board, should pay fifty per cent more customs duty, or something of that kind. But you have not done that, you have no penalty or means of enforcing any control over a foreign company which takes traffic in the United States for the purpose of bringing it into Canada. My hon. friend says they may be obliged to file a tariff, but there is no means of enforcing any regulations made by the board in respect of that tariff, so far as I have been able to examine the provisions of the statute. There is of course a provision to which the minister has called attention with regard to traffic originating in Canada, brought through a foreign country and delivered at its destination in Canada—there you have the provision that customs duties will be charged upon it unless the company or the companies conform to the regulations of the board.

Mr. BERGERON. When it is only one company like the Grand Trunk coming from the States and passing through Canada into the States, what will be the effect ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In that case there are two companies, one an American company operating in Michigan and the other a Canadian company.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That point was up a few days ago, and that was the interpretation that the minister and the government placed upon it, namely, that the Grand Trunk, although it runs from Chicago to Portland, was virtually two companies, if not three, one in the western end, one in Canada and one at the Portland end. Therefore it comes under this clause 233 of the statute.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will read section 273 so that the members of the committee may have it in their minds :

Joint tariffs shall, as to the filing and publication thereof, be subject to the same provisions in this Act as are applicable to the filing and publication of local tariffs of a similar description ; and upon any such joint tariff being so duly filed with the board, the company or companies shall, until such tariff is disallowed by the board, charge the toll or tolls specified therein ; provided that the board may except from the provisions of this section the filing and publication of any or all passenger tariffs of foreign railway companies.

Now the second clause of this section is the one that is pertinent to this question :

2. The board may require to be informed by the company of the proportion of the toll or tolls, in any joint tariff filed which it or any other company, whether Canadian or foreign, is to receive or has received.

They can regulate and control in accordance with that.

Mr. KEMP. That does not cover the point we are trying to make. The board requires them to file these tariffs and requires them to make public what they charge for the haul through Canada. But this does not compel them to charge any more or less than the rate they make themselves.

Mr. EMMERSON. The board would then have power to disallow their tariff.

Mr. KEMP. But section 269, I take it, covers what we are discussing, and that is the only section that refers to the question before the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I mean is this : The subsection to which the hon. gentleman has referred does not give the slightest control to the board over a foreign corporation. Suppose you are bringing goods from Chicago to Ottawa. The Railway Commission declares that the proportion charged by the foreign country shall be seven cents and the proportion charged by the Canadian company shall be eight cents, the total rate being fifteen cents. Suppose the foreign company says, We won't do anything of the kind, we will charge ten cents—what is the Railway Commission going to do about it ? Under the present provision they cannot do anything. Even if they could do anything about it under section 2, that would not affect the Intercolonial, because that is a railway owned by the Crown. The Crown is not affected by any act unless it is specially mentioned. In addition, there is an express provision in the Railway Act that none of its provisions shall relate to the Intercolonial.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are provisions as respects discrimination in favour of American ports.

Mr. INGRAM. Since confusion has arisen between the minister and hon. gentlemen on this side, I am bound to say I do not understand it.

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope you will settle it.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to settle it in my own mind. As I understand it, hon. gentlemen on this side claim that freight originating at Depot Harbour and going to Montreal is subject to the Railway Com-

mission; but if it passes on over the Intercolonial line through to Halifax, then the Railay Commission have no control over its freight. Now it seems to me at present the government have control over the rates over the Intercolonial. The Railway Commission has control over the Canada Atlantic Railway, but by the legislation introduced by the Minister, the Railway Commission will have control of rates from Depot Harbour to Halifax. It seems to me that the hon. minister's section really provides for that. I may be wrong but it strikes me that way.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend is agreeing with me.

Mr. INGRAM. I do really agree with the hon. minister in this case and I may be wrong. I am in the minority and minorities rule just now; therefore I am willing to rest my case with the minority.

On section 5,

The terms and conditions, and the payment or compensation, upon, for or subject to which the said running powers may be so exercised shall, subject to this Act, be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada upon the application of the minister in accordance with the rules of procedure of the said board, subject to the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to what he is going to pay for. The right he is taking is to run through freight, through passengers and do a local passenger business. It is quite possible that he may find it contrary to his best interests to do a through passenger business or a local pasenger business, but, as this clause is drawn, he will have to pay for that right or privilege whether he afterwards chooses to exercise it or not. He will have to pay for the right. I think that a railway company would take the option to exercise all or any of these rights, and agree to pay for whatever portion of the rights they should from time to time exercise.

Mr. EMMERSON. The very definition of the word 'compensation' refutes the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker). When it is determined that this right may be exercised the minister may make application to the board setting forth the powers which he would, in the interest of the railway, require to be exercised. Upon that statement the board of Railway Commissioners would determine and decide what the compensation should be. Compensation for what? Not for all the possible rights which the minister might exercise under this amendment, but simply compensation for the rights which he asks to be exercised. If there were no passenger business done then certainly the board would not take into consideration compensation for the permission to do a passenger business. It is only to the extent that the powers given by this Act would be exercised that compensation would be determined. That is my rendering of the meaning of the section and it seems to me that it would be a very strained interpretation indeed that would give it any other meaning.

Mr. HAGGART. When the point was up for discussion some time ago the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) made a promise to the House in regard to how far the country would be bound in reference to this question. The clause seems wide enough to give the power to the board of Railway Commissioners or the Supreme Court to fix the value which might be paid in a lump sum or an annual allowance just the same as they do with the Grand Trunk Railway Copany for the user to-day. On the basis of a joint ownership they fix the amount paid for the right of user by both railways. But this goes a great deal further. It gives to the board the power to fix the compensation. How would you arrive at the compensation for the right of the user of that railway the extent of which is to be determined by the minister in future? The only fair way to do it in the interest of the country is to agree to a payment of so much per mile for each car running upon the road. There should be no compensation in the shape of a payment for the property itself. The compensation should be fixed in the same way as was done in reference to the user of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge and terminal facilities at Montreal. If you give this wide power to the Board of Railway Commissioners or the Supreme Court to determine the value, they will do as is done in every other case where there is a joint user by different railways. A joint user means common ownership. If you have common ownership then you have to pay jointly half and half, as we do in reference to the terminal facilities and the bridge at Montreal. I understood from the right hon. leader of the government and from the hon. Minister of Justice that they would carefully guard against any payment of a lump sum or any annual allowance for the user of this road, and that it would be decided entirely on the basis of the use the Intercolonial made of the road or that they should pay for the use of this road on a mileage basis. This clause gives a greater power to the commissioners than that. I understood further that the compensation would be fixed on the same line and on the same basis as the Railway Act provides for one railway company using another railway company's property. This clause goes further.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is the point in regard to which an objection was raised by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) previous to the adjournment and I then said, of course, subject to the better information of my hon friend

the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson), that it would be well to see if we could not frame some amendment that would make the point absolutely clear. That would not affect this section that we are dealing with now, that would be an amendment which should be inserted in section 1 which was held over for that purpose. I understand—of course speaking offhand and without intending to commit the government in any way—that we are not paying for the option, but that we are merely taking the option and what we are to pay for is the use that we make of the option hereafter.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but when you exercise that option the word 'compensation' is broad enough to mean payment for joint ownership.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think we are all at one in regard to that point and that it might be made clear.

Mr. HAGGART. By an amendment.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest also to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals that it would be proper in this fifth clause to provide for the fixing of the compensation for short periods, say, for five years. This is a very common practice amongst railway companies, because it is usually found that errors are made and if you fix the compensation for a longer period you might find that you have been paying as the result of a mistake.

Mr. KEMP. One of the reasons why I object to this kind of legislation is that we do not know what kind of a bargain will be made under it. It is a peculiar way of proceeding for the government not to bring down an absolute bargain which they have made and submit it to the House.

They evade that mode of procedure and they say that the Railway Commission will fix the compensation and make the bargain, and that if either party feels aggrieved he can appeal to the Supreme Court. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) if he thinks the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific Railway would be willing to make an agreement between themselves based upon legislation of this kind and submit it to the Board of Railway Commissioners or the Supreme Court to determine what compensation should be paid. Why is it that the government will not state in exact terms what compensation they wish to pay for this privilege? Why was it necessary to bring this Bill in upon which to base a bargain that will be decided by the Railway Commission or the Supreme Court. I imagine the country will get the worst of it in a matter of this kind. All sorts of evidence will be produced as to the cost of the roadbed and other facilities of the leased lines, and from the experience we have had of the Drummond County agreement we ought be very careful. I think the Grand Trunk Railway got the better of that bargain; it was more advantageous for the Grand Trunk Railway than for the people of Canada, and if a bargain is made under this legislation the country will get the worst of it too. I do not think this procedure is business-like; I think the government ought to be competent to make a bargain irrespective of the Railway Commission or the Supreme Court.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sure it is not because of any want of ability that my hon. friend (Mr. Kemp) has failed to grasp the intention of this Bill. He says, that it is not good business to not have a bargain prepared by the government, and then he says, that the bargain made by the government some years ago in connection with another, railway was an improvident bargain, and that the government always gets the worst of it.

Mr. KEMP. Did you admit what I said to be true?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is arguing both ways. The intention of this Bill is that we shall now reserve the right to exercise running powers, and I think that is a wise precaution. If it is deemed necessary in the public interest that we should take running powers then the question of the compensation shall be referred to an independent tribunal, and if the conditions imposed by that tribunal are unsatisfactory either party can take it to the Supreme Court. We all have confidence in our courts, especially in the highest court in Canada, and we need not feel any alarm as to what they may do.

Mr. KEMP. When I spoke of the Drummond County deal I had in my mind that this administration has been in power for several years since that bargain was made, and having had experience they might perhaps be better able to make a good bargain for the country in the future,

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend said that no matter what bargain was made the government always got the worst of it; he took the pessimistic view that no matter what course we took we would be worsted.

Mr. KEMP. My remarks applied to the Drummond County Railway deal. This section 5 is very indefinite, and the interests of the country would be better guarded if we had the terms of the bargain before us.

Progress reported.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the Minister of Justice concludes that any amendment is necessary to the first clause, would he be good enough to send a copy to us as my

hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) would like to see it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th of June, 1905, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act of 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House.
Ottawa, 17th November, 1905.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the message of His Excellency together with the supplementary estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House went into Committee of Supply.

Experimental Farms, $100,000.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This is the usual item.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that all the information we are going to get on this big item ?

Mr. FISHER. I shall be happy to give the hon. gentleman any explanation that is required.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would seem that the Minister of Agriculture has adopted a new role. Formerly he gave a great deal of information, sometimes more than we thought necessary, but now he seems to think it sufficient to say that this $100,000 is for experimental farms. Where is the money to be spent ? The Minister of Agriculture might at least devote ten minutes to an explanation of this item.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend knows very well that the farm system extends over the whole country. There are the Central Farm at Ottawa and four branch farms : at Nappan, N.S., for the maritime provinces ; at Brandon, for Manitoba ; at Indian Head for the Territories, and at Agassiz for British Columbia. Salaries in general and the work of the officers, that is to say the expenditure in connection with the chief officers comes to between $19,000 and $20,000. That includes the botanical and entomological department of which Dr. Fletcher is head, $4,000 ; the chemical department of which Mr. Shutt is head, $4,700 ; the distribution of seed grain and potatoes, $4,800, and petty expenses about $2,000. The expenditure properly chargeable to the Central Farm comes to about $37,500 and the amounts expended at each of the branch farms were as follows : Nappan, $12,000 ; Brandon, $12,000 ; Indian Head, nearly $11,000 ; Agassiz, $7,500. These were the expenditures for the last fiscal year.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give the amount received at each of the experimental farms ?

Mr. FISHER. The amounts received were as follows : At Agassiz, $392.23 ; at Brandon, $873.57 ; at Indian Head, $502.27 ; at Nappan, $585.67; at Ottawa, $3,074.64, a total of $5,828.38.

Mr. BARR. It is important for us to know the profit or loss on each experimental farm. I can understand where there is an agricultural college that there would be a deficiency, but where there are purely experimental farms we should know the deficiency on each farm.

Mr. FISHER. Of course the receipts are comparatively nothing in comparison with the expenditure. The receipts are practically from sales of surplus and what is left over from the experimental work. I do not call it a deficiency ; it is the difference between the expenditure and the receipts. It is not a question of balance at all, because the expenditure has nothing whatever to do with the receipts in most cases.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the department to establish and operate a farm in the Grimsby district or has that been considered ?

Mr. FISHER. That question has come up not infrequently. I have been asked from different sections of the country to establish other branch farms. The statute defines the number of branch farms and I would have to change the statute ; I have no authority to establish or to spend any money on any branch farms beyond the four that are already in operation. I have had a great many applications from different parts of Canada for additional branch farms, but I have never seen my way clear to acceding to those requests. A good deal the same argument might be applied in probably as many as fifteen or twenty different parts of Canada as in any one part, and if I should once extend the system I think it would be likely we would have to extend it very considerably for the reason I have just mentioned. I therefore felt it would be a very serious new departure which I have not been ready to recommend. I take it for granted that in the near future a new farm will have to be established in one of the new provinces in the west. The system as outlined in the

commencement was that there should be one farm for the maritime provinces, one here in Ottawa for Ontario and Quebec, and one in each of the three divisions of the west, one in Manitoba, one in the Territories, and one in British Columbia. Now that the Territories are to be divided into two provinces I rather think that we will have to look forward to the establishment of a new farm in the province of Alberta, which would otherwise have no farm, and which certainly is large enough to justify the establishment of another branch farm. But that is a little different from the question of establishing such a station as my hon. friend alluded to, in the Niagara peninsula. That would be of a different character, for a specific purpose, just as in many other cases I have been asked to establish branch stations for particular purposes in particular localities.

Mr. BARR. Has the government taken into consideration the opening of a farm in the Temiscaming district? We are told that there is in that country millions of acres of clay. There is no part of the Dominion so little known, and consequently no place where an experimental farm would be more desirable. We have reports that that clay belt is very productive and, on the other hand, we have contrary reports; and I think it is very advisable that we should have exact information on the subject. No doubt it would be advantageous to have an experimental farm in the new provinces, but there the nature of the soil and the climate is much better known than in New Ontario. Now that railways are going into that country, large numbers of immigrants will follow, and the government should be in a position to give these immigrants reliable information. That would save a great deal of difficulty in the future, should it turn out that the climate and soil of that clay belt are not what they are represented. We believe that there are greater possibilities in that country than anybody realizes, but these possibilities can never be tested until we have there a properly directed experimental farm. I hope the government will give this suggestion most careful consideration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would urge on the minister the necessity of investigating more closely still, not only the Niagara district, but the western peninsula. They are seriously in need of an experimental station in one of those directions for the benefit of the fruit industry. My hon. friend realizes that the fruits and other perishable products amount to a very large sum in those districts, and the experimental farm at Ottawa is not very closely in touch with those districts.

Mr. FISHER. If I were to undertake to establish a branch station of some kind in the Niagara peninsula, it would also be demanded that I should establish one in the western peninsula, and there are about twenty other places which have asked for similar stations. With regard to New Ontario, just as soon as we can obtain information to justify us in the selection of the site, I think we ought to take steps to establish some kind of branch farm in that country. I have had that in my mind, but we have hardly reached the point when that can be done satisfactorily this coming year. That country has been pretty well explored; we know the character of the soil in a general way; but until the location of the railway is absolutely fixed and we know where settlement is going, it would be a little premature to fix on any one point. Of course, if anything of that kind is done, there will have to be an additional vote. We could not carry on the present experimental farm efficiently and do extra work of that kind on the present vote. Very likely in the supplementary estimates for next year I may ask for a small amount which would enable me to take action with regard to that very matter, not only in the clay belt, but also in the northern parts of the country further west, and in the province of Quebec as well as Ontario. The new railway is going to open up a lot of new country. I believe that immigrants will pour into it during the construction of the railway, and there will be a great demand for agricultural products. If we can do anything which will help the settlers going in there, the money spent will be well spent. I have, however, not quite formulated any plan, but hope to be able to do so before the close of the session, to a certain extent, and it is possible that we might be able to extend stations to the older parts of the country, but that would mean a very considerable vote in addition for experimental purposes. Whether I could justify the asking such a vote, I am not yet in a position to say.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to hear the minister at last give reasonable consideration to the suggestion to establish another experimental farm. I would suggest that he might possibly establish experimental stations, which would not be so extensive or expensive as an experimental farm.

Mr. FISHER. Any such stations would have to be on a small scale and much more limited than an experimental farm. I would not consider myself justified in expending anything like $8,000 or $10,000 a year on such stations.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the department has been making experiments with regard to the introduction of fruit trees into Manitoba and the Northwest. Can the minister state whether the experiments so far induce him to expect that there will be some success attained in that line in the near future? As I understand it, the kind of fruit so far attempted has been in the nature of the crab apple, and I would like to know

whether the hon. minister has had any other kinds of fruits tried or not.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite right. We have been doing most excellent work with regard to hybridizing apples in the hope of getting an apple tree that will produce a useful fruit and will stand the climate of our Northwest. Professor Saunders, who is an expert in these matters, takes as a basis what is known as the pyrus baccata, the wild Siberian crab, which is perfectly hardy in Siberia and in our Northwest, and has cross-fertilized that with pollen from a large number of better apple trees, with the result that, while the pyrus baccata is about the size of a small cherry, we have produced from it apples as large as the largest crabs, as large as some of the small varieties of good apples. These trees have been bearing for about four or five years in various places in the Northwest. A number of them have been placed in the hands of people who wished to try them. This was about three years back and the trees have lived and borne fruit. The experiments are still going on. We hope to make further improvements and ultimately to produce a fair-sized apple of good, fair quality which will be absolutely hardy in our Northwest Territories. I need not explain how valuable an addition this will be to the resources of the settler there, perhaps not for export or anything of the kind, but for home use. Any apple that will make jelly or jam, or that can be used in cooking will be of the greatest value to the people there who are entirely dependent, for apples for cooking purposes, upon fruit brought from a long distance, and, therefore, pretty expensive. There is no doubt in my mind, nor, I may say, in Professor Saunders' mind that, in the near future we shall be able to distribute to the people of the Northwest a large number of trees which will bear a good, useful apple for ordinary household purposes.

Mr. DANIEL. I suppose the new apples are of the nature of crab-apples and have the flavour of the crab-apple ?

Mr. FISHER. Not altogether. One parent is a good apple, though the other is the pyrus baccata. And then it is graded up by cross-fertilization. The product partakes to a certain extent of the character of the true apple, although it has also a part of the quality of the crab. I would say that at page 8 of the Experimental Farms Report for 1904, there are illustrations showing the pyrus baccata and the apples that have been produced from it.

Mr. BARR. Has the minister made experiments with any other fruit, such as plums ? If so, what have been the results?

Mr. FISHER. We have been working on the same lines with regard to plums and cherries. These experiments, while they give hope, have not yet resulted in anything positive.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would remind the minister of the petitions sent down from the west signed by the ex-Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the Northwest Territories and others pointing out the necessity of the establishment of an experimental farm in Central or Southern Alberta and showing how the farms at Brandon and Indian Head fail to serve that section of the country. I would point out to the minister that with a country of the extent and with the variety of climate and soil of the Northwest Territories, it is impossible that all parts can be served by one experimental farm. In Southern Alberta we have a condition of soil and climate entirely different from that existing at Indian Head, where the farm is located. The petitions I have referred to were sent down last July, and at least some hope was held out to the people that the matter would receive the early attention of the department. I might say that the petition was submitted to the minister through the then representative of Alberta the present minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). In reply to the ex-Deputy Minister of Agriculture of the Northwest Territories, he says :

> Yours of July 20th to hand regarding the establishment of experimental farms with copy of memorial inclosed. I am very pleased to forward my endorsation to the minister. . . . I regret to say that the reception which the estimates of the Department of Agriculture has received at the hands of the opposition during this session is such as to discourage the minister from making any new proposals of expenditure.

Mr. FISHER. Who wrote that ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. It is signed 'Frank Oliver.' Has there been any opposition to such an undertaking ? I think not. I should regret if anything were to stand in the way of the establishment of an experimental farm in that part of the country where it is so much needed. I would again urge upon the minister the necessity of an early investigation that he may ascertain for himself that it is impossible to serve that part of the country by the experimental farm at Indian Head.

Mr. FISHER. This is another evidence of what I said a few minutes ago to my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). The portion of the Northwest Territories to which my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has referred has been asking for an experimental farm, just as the northern portion of Alberta and also the territory of Saskatchewan have been. I would not like to detain the House by going over all the different places that are asking for the same. As I have said. there are fifteen or twenty of them. It is hard to discriminate—the arguments in the case

of one are about as good in the case of another.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to corroborate what the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has said about the need of an experimental farm in Southern Alberta. The experimental farm at Indian Head is about five hundred miles away, and the climatic conditions are entirely different from those of Southern Alberta. There is as great a difference, I suppose, as between any two provinces of the Dominion. One is a country where stock runs out the year round, while the other is a purely agricultural country with a cold climate. In that western country we have long been trying to find some grass that would make permanent pasture after the land is once cultivated. We have had a great many experiments made by private parties and these experiments have been going on for twenty years, but, up to the present time without complete success. If the government could solve this problem, it would be of the greatest advantage to the western province. In view of the difference of climate condition in different parts of the western province, I think the government should seriously consider the idea of having one experimental farm in the north and one in the south.

Mr. FISHER. I may say to my hon. friend that we have been for years distributing what is called Brome grass seed, with which a number of acres have been sown in the neighbourhood of Macleod, and it has proved very successful. I think I may say that large areas have been sown successfully, and this grass has proved a boon to stockmen. It was introduced by the experimental farm staff about seventeen years ago, and has been gradually distributed until it is now obtainable all over the country. There is no difficulty in growing it in immense sections in Alberta.

Mr. HERRON. I agree with the minister in what he says about Brome grass, but it has not always been considered an excellent quality for feed.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON. I would suggest the desirability of additional experimental farms in the province of Ontario. This idea has not originated with me, but with the county council of the county of Elgin, of which I have been a member. They have in the county of Elgin a home for unfortunates with about 100 acres of land adjoining. It has been suggested that we turn it into a sort of experimental farm. Although I have no fault to find with the experimental farm which is near the city of Ottawa, yet as a matter of fact it is not a guide for agriculturists in the southern part of Ontario. I would suggest that something like we have in the county of Elgin be established in other counties in the province of Ontario, and that the Dominion turn them into experimental farms. In that way this government would do more to instruct farmers in each county than it is now doing from Ottawa. Most of the counties in Ontario have these homes with farms belonging to them. The county of Elgin would be willing to pay any additional expense if there were some means by which they could receive seed in larger quantities than they now receive it, as well as shrubbery of different kinds to experiment with. They might even go further, and introduce better grades of stock and poultry with which to make experiments in each county. This experimental farm in Ottawa is not located where it can fill all the requirements for an agricultural province like Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would not like to ask the minister to incur the great expense of establishing so many experimental farms as my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. William Jackson) has just suggested; that is perhaps going a little too far. But if we had one in the western part of Ontario and another in the eastern part, dealing with the products that are raised in those districts, I am sure they would be vastly more beneficial to the people than a matter of $100,000. I think the minister will find members on this side of the house ready to assist in passing estimates that will be of advantage to the farming industry of our country.

Mr. INGRAM. At one of our meetings of our Agriculture Committee I advocated the distribution of grain in larger quantities so as to meet the idea expressed by my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. William Jackson). I found that grain is distributed in such small quantities that the farmers do not think it worth while to experiment with it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I find on page 487 of the Experimental Farm report that the minister is paying $3,377 in wages for taking care of cattle and stock, including the salary of the herdsman. That seems to be a large amount.

Mr. FISHER. That includes the salary of the herdsman who has entire charge of the barns, an experienced and successful man. He gets this year, I think, $650. That includes the men who have charge of the barns, piggeries, sheep pens and horse stables.

Mr. WILSON. Can the hon. minister tell us how many there are and the wages paid at the different places?

Mr. FISHER. I am informed that these men get from $40 to $45 per month. I think there are six of them.

Mr. WILSON. May I ask the hon. minister to give us a statement of the stock that is kept at the central and other experimental farms?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman will find at page 77 of the report of the Central Experimental Farm the live stock inventories. On the 30th June, 1904, there were 19 horses, 79 cows, bulls and heifers, 22 steers, 66 sheep and 260 swine. On page 78 there is a statement of the cost of labour in connection with the care of horses, cattle, sheep and swine, as follows :

Herdsman..	$ 660 00
Two men at $480..	960 00
Three men at $432	1,296 00
Extra help, teaming, &c..	461 40
	3,377 40

In the report of the branch farms the same kind of information appears.

Mr. WILSON. Are the same kinds of experiments carried on at all the farms in reference to cattle ?

Mr. FISHER. Not altogether. At Agassiz there is very little stock yet and very little experimental work being carried on in regard to stock. That farm is chiefly devoted to experiments in fruit culture ; and while there is some stock kept, there is not a very large amount spent for that purpose. At Indian Head there is a certain amount of stock kept, chiefly Shorthorns ; and at Brandon there are some dairy cattle and Shorthorns kept. At the Central Experimental Farm we have a large dairy, with thoroughbred and grade cows, and we raise young stock for the purpose of replenishing the herd.

Mr. WILSON. Perhaps the hon. minister, when he is telling us about the different farms, will tell us whether these cattle are kept for dairy purposes or for feeding, and will give us the particulars in regard to them.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, I could go into the details of these experiments by looking up the report of each farm.

Mr. WILSON. Take up the one in Nova Scotia, for instance.

Mr. FISHER. The farm in Nova Scotia is largely a dairy farm. At the same time we do feed some beef animals there every winter, but the farm is chiefly devoted to dairying.

Mr. WILSON. How many cattle have you ?

Mr. FISHER. From 20 to 25 cows are milked there, and then we get some young stock to replace the animals in the dairy herd. In doing that, as some of these animals are thoroughbred, we also raise their bull calves and sell them for breeding purposes to the farmers of the province.

Mr. WILSON. When you get good stock, do you not raise the heifer calves, too ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes ; we raise the heifers for the purpose of replenishing our own herd, although we sometimes sell heifers, too. We sell the bulls to the farmers at prices which are generally well within the reach of the ordinary farmers of the district for the improvement of their stock. We also feed a certain number of steers every year at the Nappan farm.

Mr. BARR. Do you purchase or raise these steers ?

Mr. FISHER. As a general rule, we buy them in the fall.

Mr. BARR. Do you purchase these animals that you raise for breeding purposes ?

Mr. FISHER. A few years ago I went to England and bought quite a little importation. We have bought a few pigs and sheep since, but no cattle have been imported for four years. We made an importation of 27 head of thoroughbred animals at that time. We sometimes buy thoroughbreds in this country, although, as a general rule, we are able to keep our herds replenished. At Nappan and at the experimental farm here we have been increasing the number of thoroughbreds and decreasing the number of grade stock. We have also bought a small herd of French Canadian cows to test them along with the others ; and, of course, we have bought these in the province of Quebec.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that at the Central Experimental Farm $44,456.91 has been expended for wages and supplies. Are tenders asked for these supplies ?

Mr. FISHER. No ; I do not think so. These supplies are small items, as a general rule, and we buy them on the market at the market price, whatever it may be.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that certain firms appear very frequently in the list.

Mr. FISHER. We try to buy them from the best firms.

Mr. BARR. I notice in connection with each one of these farms a very large item for the services of veterinaries. Have you had much disease amongst these cattle ? For instance, here is the sum of $205 for the Central Experimental Farm for drugs, &c.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that is a very large charge for 100 head of cattle and 20 horses.

Mr. BARR. If the farmers throughout the country paid at that rate for veterinary services and also for wages, they would find that they would be very much in debt at the end of the year.

Mr. FISHER. That is one item, I am sorry to say, most of the farmers do not pay. It is for the testing of cattle. We test our cattle at the end of every year, and we have to pay a veterinary for doing it. This probably accounts for the greater part

of this expenditure at the Central Experimental Farm.

Mr. WILSON. I see an item of $480 for feed for stock. Was that raised on the farm and just credited ?

Mr. FISHER. At Nappan we did not raise nearly enough grain to feed the stock, and I am sorry to say that last year the hay and straw crop were short.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How large is the farm ?

Mr. FISHER. We have a considerable area of land, but not a large amount cultivated.

Mr. BARR. Is it poor land ?

Mr. FISHER. Very poor land.

Mr. DANIEL. I thought you had marsh land there.

Mr. FISHER. We have about 50 acres of marsh land, but two years ago the dyke broke and it has yielded very little since. For the last two years the hay crop from the marsh was less than half the ordinary crop.

Mr. DANIEL. I always understood the land was good round there.

Mr. FISHER. Our marsh land is very good but the other is poor.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is not a good example to farmers to keep more stock than you can feed from the land. That would be a poor experiment to follow.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. You have to have the animals there to show what they are like.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is not much use to have them if you cannot produce enough to feed them.

Mr. FISHER. The hay crop all through Nova Scotia was very short last year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The ordinary farmer would make arrangements to produce a substitute if he thought the hay crop was likely to be short.

Mr. FISHER. The ensilage and the root crop were also short.

Mr. BARR. You bought $115 worth of fertilizers for the Brandon farm, is it usual for farmers to have to buy manure on a farm of that size ?

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Yes, if they want to get the best results.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. I may say that we farmers in Ontario often find we cannot grow enough feed for our stock and we find it profitable to buy something in addition to what we grow.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In time of the failure of the crops ?

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. Not always in time of failure. We frequently buy grain to feed our stock in addition to what we produce.

Mr. BARR. Is that usual ?

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. We find it profitable or we would not do it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The ordinary farmer tries to raise grain enough to feed his stock and sometimes he has more than enough for that purpose. I do not know where they would get money to buy feed if they could not raise it on their own farms.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. Some of the most successful farmers in the old country buy their stock and their feed too.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is not regular farming ; it is speculating.

Mr. P. H. McKENZIE. We farmers like to speculate a little too.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am sorry the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane), is not here because this is a particular hobby of his and he would be able to describe that kind of farming in better language than I can.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister explain what experiments are being carried on at these different farms ? Have we been branching out into new lines, and if so, what new lines ?

Mr. FISHER. In a general way I may say we are testing different varieties of grain and fruit and corn ; first in experimental plots and then in large areas. At the Central farm especially we have tested different methods of cultivating soil, different periods of ploughing, ploughing immediately the crop is out and sometimes later——

Mr. SPROULE. Do you give data of all these in the report ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. We have our orchard experiments at the different farms and at Indian Head and some other farms we are experimenting with trees and shrubs, and with fruit specially in British Columbia. We have 65 acres of an arboretum at Ottawa in which we have practically every known Canadian tree or shrub that will grow in this climate. We have a variety of small fruits and vegetables in connection with the orchard. Mr. Saunders just reminds me that we have been studying very carefully for some time the inoculation of the soil and the seed of clovers. The growing of clover is one of the most crucial agricultural questions, and the successful growing of clover is I may say almost a basis of successful farming in most provinces. We have made careful investigation by the chemist as well as by the outside men on the farm as to what can be

done to improve clover culture, and lately we have been inoculating, as it is called, the soil and the seed and the results have been on the whole very satisfactory. We have been experimenting also as to whether the crop succeeding a clover crop was better than a crop succeeding other crops than clover, or where other grasses were sown in the place of clover. These are very important experiments and the results have been very extraordinary, as I think I might call them, and very much to the credit of the clover crop. In regard to fruits we are trying different varieties of apples, plums and cherries, but we do not try pears here; we have not been successful with pears at Ottawa. At Nappan we have tried them as well as apples to a certain extent, and in British Columbia of course to a large extent. We try varieties of small fruit, strawberries, raspberries, black currants, &c., and we also try different methods of culture, the results of which are published in bulletins. We experiment a good deal with fruit at Nappan and Agassiz but very little at Brandon and Indian Head although there we are doing a good deal in the way of propagating hybrids which it is hoped will supply the Northwest with an apple good for household purposes.

I have been explaining what might be called the outdoor work. Apart from that we have the indoor experimental work in the way of feeding and dealing with animals. We have dairy cows here and at Nappan, a few at Brandon and very few at Indian Head, and just enough at Agassiz to supply the farm with milk, not really enough for experimental purposes at all. At Nappan, here and at Brandon and Indian Head we every year fatten some animals, experimenting with the different methods of fattening, different feeds and with animals of different ages. The most exhaustive of these experiments are carried on here because practically the feeding of an animal indoors is much the same wherever the feeding is done. When it comes to outdoor work it is a little different. The results of these experiments serve practically for live stock men all over the country to a great extent.

Mr. SPROULE. Am I correct in understanding that you are not carrying on any experimental work in regard to butter and cheese on the farm?

Mr. FISHER. Not as to the making of it. We are experimenting all the time in regard to the production of milk, but as far as the making of butter and cheese is concerned we make no experiments here at all. We make up the milk at the Central Experimental Farm into butter and the same is done at Nappan. At Brandon and Indian Head there is just enough to supply the farm hands and people like that to whom it is sold, but there is not a dairy kept there for ordinary purposes, nor is there at Agassiz. Then of course we do experimental work in the fattening of pigs and sheep as well as cattle and also some experimental work here at Ottawa in regard to the feeding of farm horses so as to try and develop some method of feeding which will be more economical than the ordinary method of feeding farm horses on Canadian farms.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the minister how many years the present experimental farms have been in operation and whether it would not be possible to expend less money on some of these outlying stations and thereby be able to establish others without a very great deal of extra expense?

Mr. FISHER. The farms have been established since 1886, about 17 years; this is the 18th season I think. My hon. friend suggests that a good deal less money might be spent on these branch farms. The establishment of course was made years ago, and I have not seen my way at all clear to reduce it at any of the farms. The expenditure is increasing a little all the time owing to the increase in the rate of wages and increases of salary to men who have been a long time in the service. There has also been some little increase in the staff because we have been doing a little more work at each farm. We have also an immense amount of correspondence at all the branch farms as well as at the Central Farm which has to be handled and dealt with. The distribution of seed grain involves a very large expenditure which is constantly increasing. Then we have the sending out of the bulletins, &c., which costs a great deal and is constantly increasing.

Mr. INGRAM. The circulation of the bulletins in connection with these experiments is very limited. I know I have had some inquiries about this and I drew the attention, I think, of Professor Shutt to this matter and got a copy of the experiment, but I think the bulletins ought to be circulated more freely and more fairly than they are.

Mr. FISHER. We have now a mailing list of over 60,000 and every bulletin is sent to 60,000 people the moment it is published and any farmer or any one else in the country who applies, has his name put on the mailing list perfectly freely, willingly and gladly.

Mr. WILSON. Is the evidence taken before the Agriculture Committee sent out on the mailing list?

Mr. FISHER. No, that evidence goes to the members of parliament and the department have nothing whatever to do with it, except that each officer who gives evidence is granted the favour of having 500 copies for his own personal distribution to his friends or anybody who applies.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help feeling that since it is eighteen years since these

stations were established, and since they have not grown very materially in that time, the necessity of establishing new stations, at least small stations, in different parts of our country is certainly a matter that deserves the serious consideration of the hon. minister.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I notice large amounts at the various farms are expended for the purchase of implements, tools, &c. I would like to know if these are bought by open competition or on what system the orders are placed. There is no information on that subject.

Mr. FISHER. They are placed on the judgment of the officers as to where they can get them best, as a general rule. Not infrequently, however, people send in implements and ask us to try them and then they send the bill afterwards and expect us to pay.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Are they always accepted in that way.

Mr. FISHER. If we use them we cannot very well refuse sometimes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If we send a few from Brantford, I hope they will be accepted in the same way.

Mr. FISHER. Send us good ones and we will use them.

Mr. BLAND. Would the minister say whether the live stock on the government farm pays or not? I would also like to know whether he proposes to experiment in the breeding of horses. Some time ago an imperial army officer was over here to see whether he could get in this country different classes of horses required for the British army, including horses for cavalry and artillery. For serviceable horses to suit the different branches he would pay from $125 to $150. At present we can breed light horses, but many of them do not come up to the standard required for fancy horses. When the South African war broke out this country was flooded with horses for which there was no demand, but we shipped them over to South Africa. If the government would establish a remount depot here and give the farmers an idea of the kind of horses to breed, and if the government would bring in sires for use by the farmers in improving their stock, that would be a benefit to the agricultural community all over the Dominion.

Mr. FISHER. The breeding of military horses is a matter entirely outside the experimental farm. I am glad to know there are in Canada some officers seeing what they can do in the way of purchasing horses for the War Office, but that is a matter which could not be handled in connection with experimental farms. There are other ways in which it could be dealt with more satisfactorily. The hon. gentleman asked if the live stock of the farm paid. If he will look at page 78 of the report he will find a full statement. The central farm showed a profit of $1,000 last year. The year before it was a little higher.

Mr. SPROULE. How do you get at the increased value of animals in your account?

Mr. FISHER. An inventory is taken on the 1st July each year and the valuations are made by the superintendent, Mr. Drysdale, who takes the market price.

Mr. HENDERSON. Certain stock is kept for feeding purposes and others for breeding purposes. Is the hon. gentleman able to show that the keeping of stock in the farm can be done at a profit, leaving outside altogether the profits that may be made by importing and selling cattle for breeding purposes?

Mr. FISHER. In general terms, without exception, we have bought steers in the fall, fed them through the winter, and sold them in the spring for more than they cost including cost of feed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the hon. gentleman calculated the labour and then given credit for the manure?

Mr FISHER. I am informed that a careful estimate has been made of the value of the manure, and an accurate account kept of the labour, and taking those into account the balance is still more in favour of the animals. In a rough way manure is considered to pay for the care, but an absolute careful account has been gone into and the result has been still better than when the rough way was taken.

Mr. BLAND. Would it be a fair margin to create a profit after the winter's feeding?

Mr. FISHER. Of course that varies very much according to the prices at the time of the sale. We just sold a few the other day at the rate of six cents a pound. Eight weeks ago we sold at five cents a pound. We have still more to sell and do not know what we will get. Those cost all around 4·25 cents in the fall.

Mr. BLAND. Some years, I suppose, the experimental farm, like a private individual, makes no profit on the stock it feeds? I have bought and sold at all prices. Sometimes, there has been a balance on the wrong side.

Mr. FISHER. I have done that myself. It is true of the experimental farm also. In 1903, we did not make any profit, but I think that is the only year since I have had charge in which a profit was not made.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice by this report that the farm fed 457 head of stock, and returns amounted to a total of $11,092.96. The cost of everything charged up against

these animals makes a total of $10,020.23, leaving a balance of $1,072.73, which is counted as profit. But the farm has credited itself with 1,100 tons of manure at $1 per ton. If it did not credit itself with this item, it would come about $28 short.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, all the labour is charged. And, if we have 1,100 tons of manure over and above everything charged in connection with the feeding of the animals and had that put on the land in the spring, I think it would be fairly profitable.

Mr. SPROULE. But the farmer who would allow himself $1 per load for manure would allow himself a pretty good figure. If the operations of the ordinary farmer did not come out better than that, I shoult imagine he was not making farming a great success. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the results of an experimental farm can be judged like those of an ordinary farm, because a great deal of labour must be devoted to carrying on experiments which give no direct return.

Mr. FISHER. It must be remembered also in the feeding of this stock he charged all the grain and hay fed to the animals at market prices, and not at what they cost. Moreover it was charged at what was harvested and not at what was actually fed, though there is considerable difference. If a man can take a barnful of animals and through them get for all he raises on his farm full market prices as if he had sold them off his farm, and has also 1,100 loads of manure at the end of the winter, he has done a pretty profitable winter's work upon his farm.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me pretty much like Mark Twain's experience in raising pork. He bought a lot of pigs, and fed them on corn. When the proper time came to sell and he went to learn the price of pork, he found that he would come out all right, because he could get as much for the pork as he had paid for the pigs. He was reminded that he was not getting anything for the corn. But he replied that he never was accustomed to charge for corn and besides he had the excitement of raising the pigs.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Exactly—there was the educational experience. You can't expect to make money on an experimental farm.

Mr. CHRISTIE. The experimental farm is not a place to make money but a place to make experiments. I think that one experiment that should be made is to learn what we should sow after different kinds of grain. Another would be to experiment with different breeds of cattle to see which can be best fed at a profit—take Herefords, Polled Angus and other breeds, feed them, charge the cost of labour and feed, and find out which breed yields the best profit. I have fed some kinds of cattle and lost money, while on others I have had a good profit. The experimental farm does its work and earns a profit if it helps the farmers to a knowledge of what is best to do on their farms. The object is to enable the farmers to make money on their own land. If the experiments are carried out properly, even though they cost money, the country will get the benefit in the end.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad to hear the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Christie) speak as he does. I have always contended that the profit made out of the experimental farm was the information given to the farmers all over the country and not in what is sold. The experiments to which the hon. gentleman refers have been made, to a certain extent. Some years ago experiments were made with feeding steers of different breeds, Polled Angus, Shorthorns, and, I think, Herefords. The hon. gentleman will find the result in the report. At the experimental farm here we have been feeding almost entirely Shorthorn grades and trying experiments rather in the character of the feed than in the character of the animals. But the experiment to which the hon gentleman (Mr. Christie) refers is an important one and one which we will have to take up again sometime. I know that the information supplied as to different experiments carried on in these farms has been very helpful to the farmers in their work. Without going into details, I may mention again the experiment concerning clover of which I spoke. There was also the very careful investigation made six or seven years ago into the question of soft pork which showed clearly how bacon hogs should be fed in this country. Within the last few years we have heard practically nothing of soft pork in the export bacon trade of Canada, and I have no doubt that the results of the experiments of that time contributed very largely to this important change in our methods. Then the experiments undertaken in regard to Brome grass, were another triumph of the experimental farms and one of enormous value to the Northwest. There are many others which I might mention. These things show no results so far as the work on the farm is concerned, but they show great results in the country.

Mr. SPROULE. Either the minister misunderstood me or else he has a sensitiveness which many would hardly have been ready to credit him with. I was not dealing with the general experiments, but with the feeding of the animals on the farm. What is the object of this feeding? I take it that the object is to show how animals can be fed at a profit. If the experiment is a success, we naturally look for a return. The result with all the animals is a return of

$9,992.96. Against this expenditure are charged for meal, hay, straw, cost of labour and so on. The results do not show very much profit made out of the stock, because the farm is obliged to credit itself with 1,100 tons of manure at $1 a ton which would be regarded by the ordinary farmer as a very big price. If farmers were paying 50 cents a load for manure they would think they were paying a pretty good price, not to speak of paying $1 a load. Now may you not have put these things too high to make up the account and bring it out on the right side? I take it that the aim is to show the farmers that the things he is doing from year to year can be done in a better way so as to bring in a better return. But I respectfully submit that with reference to stock this does not show a very profitable return. In saying that, I make due allowance for the fact that a great deal of labour must be put into the care of stock, into measuring and weighing the grain every day, and that increases the expense of keeping the stock.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The men that are employed have to be first-class men in order to do their work accurately.

Mr. BLAIN. The other day in the Agriculture Committee the question was brought up of raising turkeys, geese and ducks on the experimental farm, and a resolution was unanimously passed requesting the minister to look into that question and see if it would not be in the interest of the farmers to set aside some portion of the farm for the raising of these fowl. A small portion of the farm is already set aside for raising poultry, and the bulletins that have been sent out to the farmers containing suggestions with reference to breeds of poultry have been very valuable. I am of the opinion that the experimental farm should undertake the raising of turkeys, geese and ducks. I do not think anything is produced on the farm that brings in a better revenue than these fowl. It is well known that the home market is a very valuable one, and the export market is growing from year to year. Farmers are exporting large quantities of turkeys from the central part of Ontario. The industry is so important that I think the authorities of the experimental farm might well pay some attention to it.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with my hon. friend that the raising of turkeys and ducks has not received the attention it deserves, in view of the importance that industry has attained, both in the home market and in the export market. As to ducks, I think there is now a good market for them. The raising of ducks is a specialty. I agree that the time has come when the experimental farm might undertake investigations in that line.

Mr. INGRAM. I am glad to hear the minister say that he proposes to go into the experiment of raising ducks and turkeys. In the section of the country I come from the raising of turkeys is a very important industry. Mr. Gilbert the other day gave us some information about the disease called 'blackhead' that attacks turkeys. That information would be useful to those who are engaged in raising turkeys.

Mr. WM. JACKSON. It might be difficult to conduct an experiment on a large scale in the raising of turkeys, for the reason that they are much given to wandering about. But there are no domestic animals we have that are as profitable as turkeys. After a turkey is three or five weeks old he begins to wander over the fields and through the shrubbery, but in doing so he performs a very useful work in destroying insects, grasshoppers and crickets, which are injurious to our crops. While it might not be a very easy job to raise turkeys profitably on experimental farms, yet the authorities might throw out some ideas which would be useful to those engaged in that industry. A turkey is a very profitable fowl to raise. There is an unlimited demand for this fowl in the United States and in Great Britain. But up to the present we have received no instructions from the experimental stations as to the best mode of putting them on the market. In some instances they are shipped just with their necks broken; in other cases the feathers are removed from fowl before shipping. I think the experimental stations should ascertain the best mode of putting that product of the Canadian farm on the foreign market.

Mr. SPROULE. To what extent are you distributing seed grain now?

Mr. FISHER. We sent out this spring 38,000 packages. We still continue the custom of sending out packages only to those who make request for the seed grain.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand that you have a mailing list of 60,000 that you supply from the farm. When and how is that list revised?

Mr. FISHER. It is being revised all the time. We ask the postmasters to return to us anything that is not asked for. And we do get back a certain number. The names of the persons to whom these are addressed are struck off the list. Of course, we are always adding to the list as a result of the request of people to be put on the list. Hon. gentlemen in the House have frequently asked me for the list of those in their counties who were receiving it, and very frequently they have gone over the list and they have been able to say that so-and-so was dead or so-and-so had removed, and we struck off those names. We add any other names that members ask us to add. I have not called upon members to do that regularly, but those who take an interest in it do so as a rule, and we are always glad of their assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. That was the course followed years ago, but, as far as I can remember, there has not been a list submitted to us for revision for many years. I know that when I went over the list for my own county I found that there were names of many men on the list who were dead or who had moved away, and it was to my mind perhaps not entirely a waste of literature because it might fall into some one's hands——

Mr. FISHER. It was since the time of that revision that we asked the postmasters to return any unasked for mail and it has made a great difference.

Mr. SPROULE. Do I understand that the postmasters are instructed to return this literature?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, we ask them to do this. The request is printed on every envelope.

Mr. SPROULE. That would make an improvement, no doubt.

Mr. FISHER. It made a great change.

Mr. SPROULE. I would suggest that from time to time these lists be submitted to members of parliament who can look over them, revise them and perhaps add other names, because there are always new men coming to the front. This would make the list a more valuable one to the public.

Mr. FISHER. If members would take the trouble to do it we would be very glad to submit the list to them.

Mr. SPROULE. I have not been to the Central farm for the last year or two, but I would like to inquire if there have been any buildings put up lately or if there are any in contemplation?

Mr. FISHER. We have added one or two small outside buildings for poultry, costing $100 or something like that, but no other buildings.

Mr. SPROULE. It occurred to me when visiting the farm that it would be very desirable, especially when the weather was inclement, to have some place where the people could have shelter and where they could sit down, if they had their baskets along with them, and take a meal. I remember being out one day when it was raining, and the only places that the crowd of people, including men and women, could get into were the barns, stables and sheds. It occurred to me that we might be able to put up some cheap building that people could get into and have a little comfort and at the same time shelter from the inclemency of the weather.

Mr. FISHER. It is evident the hon. gentleman has not been there for some time, because five years ago, when we had to rearrange and rebuild the root cellar, we built over it an implement shed and above that again we provided a large open space with tables where excursionists can arrange for having their lunches and where people can go in large numbers when it is raining. There is room for several hundred people. In connection with the dairy building we have quite a large room, with conveniences where ladies can go. From 50 to 100 can get in there. Besides that there are the farm offices, laboratory and greenhouse where people can go.

Mr. SPROULE. I was not at the farm last year or this year, but previously I had been going over the farm every year, and I did not suppose there was much change. It occurred to me that it would be desirable to have such a building. If it has been provided I am glad to know it. It is not intended out of this vote, of course, to do any extensive building?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were any buildings to be erected they would be provided for by another vote?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, out of the vote of the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice that for some time there have been experiments carried on in regard to fruit by hybridizing and otherwise. The present director, I know, has conducted a good deal of work in that line. We have not had any information in regard to his success.

Mr. FISHER. I gave a full explanation before my hon. friend came in to-night.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought I was only out a few minutes and that I would not miss very much.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) told me last night that I was learning better and I have been giving my explanations more concisely

Mr. SPROULE. I want to merely ask in regard to these experiments——

Mr. FISHER. If my hon. friend will examine the report he will find a complete statement of these experiments with pictures of the fruits we have produced.

Mr. SPROULE. I might go home and take the report with me and thus save asking any questions on the floor at all. But we shall continue to ask questions.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but it was because I had already given the explanation to the committee that I made that suggestion to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to know if the director's experiments have been the same as those of that man in California, and if he has been able to demonstrate that we are able to cultivate plums without stones and apples without seeds?

Mr. FISHER. No, we have been trying to do more practical work. We have been trying to produce apples as good as other apples, but we have not tried to produce seedless apples or seedless plums.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to inquire from the leader of the House what the government intend taking up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think we will, if the House consents, proceed with supply, and I would be glad if hon gentlemen would give their attention to the estimates for the current year which I brought down to-night. The notice is short, but some of the departments are in need of money very badly and if there is anything which is not controversial we will endeavour to obtain the assent of the committee to these estimates to-morrow. Of course, if they are objected to they cannot go through.

Mr. SPROULE. That is for the civil service ?

Mr. FIELDING. These estimates are for the current year. If there is anything that is controversial we cannot proceed. Some of the services in connection with the House are out of money and unless we are enabled to secure an early vote it may be embarrassing to some of our officers.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 18, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

OPINION OF MONSEIGNEUR LEGAL.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE asked :

1. Is the government, or any of the ministers, aware of the following paragraph that appears every day in 'Le Canada,' of Montreal, under the heading : 'The Opinion of Monseigneur Légal.' 'We are satisfied with the system of education that we have, and we hope that it will be left to us' ?

2. Are these words an extract from any document of which the government or any of the ministers has a knowledge ?

3. If so, has the government or the minister who knows of that document any objection to communicate to the House the entire document in question ?

Mr. SPROULE.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The ministers, like all others who read 'Le Canada,' have seen the sentence which is quoted in the question. The words so quoted are not an extract from any document of which the government or any of the ministers have a knowledge. I may say to my hon. friend that Monseigneur Legal has not written to the government on this question so far as I know.

SALVATION ARMY—MR. RIDER HAGGARD'S REPORT.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Has the government received a copy of the report made by Mr. H. Rider Haggard to the imperial government respecting the working of the Salvation Army colonies in the United States ?

2. If so, will the government leave a copy of said report on the table of the House at an early date ?

3. If not, has the government any reports by its own officers of the operation of these colonies, and will they be presented to parliament ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The government has not received a copy of Mr. H. Rider Haggard's report, and has no reports of its own officers respecting the workings of the Salvation Army colonies in the United States.

CHILD IMMIGRANTS FROM ENGLISH WORKHOUSES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Has the government, or any official thereof, had a conference with Mr. Neill, an English Poor Law Guardian, with reference to the migration to Canada of selected children from English workhouses ?

2. What is the nature of the proposal, if any, that Mr. Neill made ?

3. What answer was given by the government or its officials ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Neill is in this country gathering information as to the progress of children emigrated from Great Britain by boards of guardians, and has not made any proposal to the government or its officials.

SUPPLY—PROHIBITION OF IMPORTATIONS INTO THE STATE OF NEW YORK OF FISH CAUGHT IN MISSISQUOI BAY.

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

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, before this motion is put, I wish to draw the attention of the House and the government to a matter of some moment. The legislature of the state of New York has just adopted an Act prohibiting the importation into that state of fish caught in Missisquoi bay and the Richelieu river.

According to United States newspapers that Act was passed in retaliation against the Dominion government, the latter having thought proper to allow fishing in Pike river—viz., in that part of Lake Champlain which belongs to us—against the will of the United States government. That Act is such as to cause serious loss to fishermen in the district which I represent, and wherein the fishing industry is quite large. That trade has been established for quite a while, and our fish are sold largely on the New York markets. The matter is of interest, not only to fishermen in my constituency, but to the country at large. The United States government has adopted this vexatious law against the province of Quebec because the Canadian government would not comply with its request.

I shall not undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, what our government should do under the circumstances. It seems as if negotiations would not be of much avail; but there is surely some remedy at hand. The suggestion of people in my district is that tolls should be exacted as formerly on the Chambly canal. Traffic over that canal is carried on in United States bottoms. According to the Trade and Commerce returns, river boats in that part of the country are almost wholly controlled by people from the United States. The tonnage of exports in 1904 was as follows:—United States boats, 82,000 tons; Canadian boats, 10,000 tons. The tolls on the Chambly canal used entirely by United States boats, amounted to $24,000 yearly during the period tolls were levied on this canal. The exports of fish by the St. Johns farmers and fishermen average $23,736 yearly. Should we decide to exact tolls as we did formerly on the Chambly canal, we would thereby reach the shipping interests of the state of New York and be compensated for the loss resulting from that prohibitory law, the outcome of which will be to ruin that trade. Besides, that canal being used mainly by United States boats, it seems only reasonable that we should resume exacting the tolls which were levied formerly.

In order, Sir, to give you an idea of the loss inflicted on us by the prohibition of this trade, I may be permitted to read to the House an extract from a letter written by Mr. Pierce, agent of the American Express Company, who refuses to reopen the agencies of that company in the St. Johns district, on the ground that the trade with the United States will not in the future be of sufficient importance to warrant the carrying on of the business. I quote his own words:

> I beg to say that, after looking into this matter very carefully, I do not see how we can consistently reopen the offices at Clarenceville, Henriville and Sabrevois as there is not sufficient business to warrant the expense. The new law which has recently been passed in New York State prohibiting the importation of fish from the province of Quebec makes the prospect less favourable than it otherwise would be, as this fish business would constitute the larger portion of the revenue which we might hope to obtain providing we reopened the offices.

I trust that the government will at once take up this matter. It is a mere act of retaliation against us, an act which has no justification in itself, and which will surely be regarded in that light, not only by the people of the district I represent, but by the government as well.

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). (Translation.) This is not a new question. It has come up in this House and before the people several times within the last few years. The Department of Marine and Fisheries has done all in its power to bring about a friendly settlement with our neighbours. However, we have not succeeded in concluding a satisfactory agreement. We had, a few years ago, in 1901 or 1902, I believe, made arrangements whereby Canadian fishermen were debarred from using nets in Missisquoi bay. On the other hand, it was understood that United States fishermen would be prevented from fishing on the remainder of Lake Champlain. It has often been the case, as shown by our past experience, that while we are expected to carry out our part of the agreement, United States people do not carry out their own pledges. Although Canadians were prohibited from fishing in their own waters, no watch was kept on the other side of the line, and United States fishermen were using nets almost openly and at will. While we conformed to the law in Canadian waters, they did not conform to it within their territory. Subsequently, perceiving that fish were diminishing in numbers in the waters of Lake Champlain, United States authorities took up the matter once more and requested the Department of Marine and Fisheries to re-enact the ordinance passed in this connection in 1900, as the misdeeds I have just referred to had induced us to repeal it as regards fishing in the Bay of Missisquoi.

These misunderstandings have given rise to a good deal of discussion and have induced our neighbours to renew their efforts towards bringing about an understanding with us on that point. We answered that this was not the only question awaiting settlement; that there were many others. For instance, there is the question of the Pacific coast fisheries, which is of much greater moment than this, and concerning which we are seeking to bring about an agreement with the authorities of the state of Washington, with a view to putting a stop to the destruction of salmon in Puget Sound and in the Fraser river. And we informed the United States authorities that if they would agree with us to appoint a joint commission for the purpose of considering all these controverted questions, all these difficulties which spring up in Canadian and frontier waters we would willingly co-operate with them in taking the necessary

steps for the protection of the fisheries belonging to both countries. Of course, we are all well aware that in the neighbouring republic fisheries are left under the control of the respective states. There are seven of these interested in fishing. The President of the United States is in favour of appointing such a commission, but negotiations have fallen through.

I agree with my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville that the question is one of exceeding interest for his constituents; but, for the time being, I do not think it possible to remedy matters, except by reopening negotiations between the two countries. However, I have not lost all hope of attaining that object, seeing that the main issue, that concerning the fisheries of the Pacific coast, is one of interest, not only to the state of Washington, but, in a large measure, to the United States trade as a whole. As regards any other step which might be taken, the question is rather a difficult one just now; but the Department of Marine and Fisheries has not given up the idea of resorting once more to negotiations.

My hon. friend suggested the re-enactment of tolls on the Chambly canal. I am not sufficiently well posted on the question to give an opinion off-hand; but I am under the impression that such a step would not be productive of good results. I think that by means of diplomacy an understanding may be brought about with our neighbours, which will result in the passing of regulations satisfactory to both people.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as these difficulties have been in existence for some time past, I think the House is entitled to know whether there has been an interchange of correspondence between the Dominion government and the United States authorities on the subject, and of what character have been the negotiations carried on between such authorities and Canada. There must have been an interchange of correspondence, there must be records and memos on file in the department, and I think the hon. minister would be meeting the wishes of the House by having this correspondence brought down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. (Translation.) I may inform my hon. friend that when the supplementary estimates for fisheries are laid before the House, I shall be in a position to give all the information he wishes for, and to bring down papers which will shed new light on thet question.

Mr. MONK. (Translation.) I also am of opinion that we would obtain more through diplomacy than by taking the means suggested by the hon. member for St. Johns, although the House should be grateful to him for the information he supplied as to the effect of such a measure. Our trade with the United States is extensive; we are all interested in it; and its profits are shared in, not only by the constituents of the hon. gentleman, but by those of other counties as well in the vicinity of Montreal. I am not sure that by exacting tolls on the trade carried on with our neighbours, as suggested by the hon. gentleman from St. Johns, we would be bettering the condition of things. More would be obtained through negotiations, provided they are followed up as they should be. The government may prove their watchfulness by laying before the House the correspondence, which will show what negotiations have been carried on with a view to settling the difficulty. It is contended that United States authorities were not the first to fail carrying out the agreement. The papers which I wish to have brought down would put things in their true light.

The following newspaper clipping, containing an item sent from Albany to the Montreal 'Star,' has been handed to me:

> Albany, April 3.—Confiscation of all fish caught in Missisquoi bay, Lake Champlain, if shipped into this state, is planned in the Bill introduced Friday by Assemblyman Knapp of Clinton county. This is proposed in retaliation against Canada, that government refusing to prohibit the use of nets in Missisquoi bay. The Bill was advanced to third reading, and introduced to-day in the Senate.
>
> Ninety-five per cent of perch, pike and bass of Lake Champlain are hatched in Missisquoi bay and at this season fish are running in large numbers. Until recently Canada issued licenses to fifteen men in Canada, who were able to take out fish valued at $30,000 a year.

According to the above item, dated, it is true, April 3rd, it does not seem to be such a foregone conclusion that we are not to blame in the matter, or that our government has not been neglectful of its duty. Under the circumstances, it seems doubly necessary that we should have access to the correspondence carried on, and that we should know where we are at concerning this disastrous state of things, for it is a disastrous state of things for parties concerned.

THESSALON, ONT., POSTMASTER.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the House, and particularly of the Postmaster General, to certain irregularities which have occurred in connection with the post office at Thessalon—irregularities of so gross a nature that if the facts which I have to present to the House remain uncontradicted, as I believe they will be, the House will be seized of one of the most notorious transactions that have ever characterized this government or any other government. I refer to the subject of questions which were asked in the House yesterday and the replies of the hon. Postmaster General thereto. The hon. Postmaster General was asked who was the postmaster at Thessalon, and he stated that the post-

master at Thessalon to-day is one J. B. Dobey. Then he was asked as to why the former postmaster whom J. B. Dobey succeeded had vacated the office, and the hon. gentleman stated that he chose to resign. When asked if that were all, the hon. gentleman said—I did not hear him say it, but read it for the first time in 'Hansard' this morning—that there was a reason for the resignation of the gentleman who was succeeded by J. B. Dobey. When I inform the House that the former postmaster at Thessalon and the gentleman who was appointed by the hon. Postmaster General on the 16th of February of this year to succeed him are one and the same person, it will be seen that the matter is so extraordinary that it demands some explanation from the government. The hon. Postmaster General, in his answers to the questions of yesterday, stated that this postmaster resigned on the 21st of May, 1904, and was reappointed on the 16th of February, 1905. Now, I have some information to offer to the House on the history of this extraordinary resignation. I propose to state the facts for the consideration of the House, and if the hon. Postmaster General can controvert or explain away the extraordinary facts which I am about to disclose, I am sure that the House and the country will be very greatly relieved. I understand that on the 11th of April, 1904, an investigation was ordered by the postal department into the Thessalon post office. At that time the same gentleman who now occupies the position of postmaster was in charge of that office. The inspector reported to the department in April of last year that there was a shortage in that office of $505.44, that that shortage had been unexplained, and that the postmaster had promised to make it good. In arriving at that shortage the postmaster had been credited with a remittance of $500, alleged to have been made by him to the postal department. If that remittance was a sham, if the statement that he had remitted $500 to the department was false and fraudulent, then the shortage as discovered by the inspector should have been $1,005.45. On the following day, the 12th of April, the department here telegraphed to the inspector that it was impossible to arrive at the balance of that office until the February accounts had been received. The Deputy Postmaster General about the 2nd of May wrote a letter to the inspector in which he referred to the alleged remittance of $500 which the postmaster had stated that he had made by registered letter, giving the number of the letter. The Deputy Postmaster General also makes the following statement to the inspector for his information in the inspection of that office; that the department is not satisfied that that remittance (referring to the remittance of $500) was ever despatched by the postmaster, because if he (the postmaster) misstated the date of mailing each of the cash accounts, it may be inferred that he would also mis-state the facts in connection with the remittance in question. The deputy also asks the inspector to visit the office again, and says that if the inspection proves that the remittance was not forwarded, he will take the money order books and place a reliable person in charge. He adds that there is scarcely any reason to doubt that the postmaster, for some reason unknown, has been making false statements for four or five months with regard to the returns to the department. The inspector visits the office, and on or about the 10th of May, 1904, I believe, he made a report to the postal department, with which doubtless the hon. Postmaster General is familiar. In order to draw the attention of the House to that report, I will just state a few heads of the subjects which were covered by it. He reports, I understand, that he visited the post office at Thessalon on the 7th day of May and made a careful audit, that before leaving Ottawa he had examined the letter book of the railway mail service in the department, and that there he had checked over the letter bills, with the entries in the registered letter book; and he found that the statements made by the postmaster in regard to the disposition of the accounts on the 8th and 11th of April were not correct, and were not substantiated by the letter books. He further states that the credit taken by the postmaster on the 5th of April, for $500 sent by registered letter No. 200, was not correct; that no such number appeared on a bill of that date; and that credit had been taken for a further remittance of $608 on the 30th of April, 1904, under registered letter No. 580, but there was no receipt for it. In that report he adds: 'I am satisfied it has not been sent.' He further says that the postmaster or his assistant has been falsifying the returns. He says he examined the assistant in the post office, from whom he obtained the following information, which is of an extraordinary character, in view of what followed. He says that the assistant stated that he had handed the postmaster, at his request, out of the post office till in the Thessalon post office the following sums: about the 10th of May, $450, which was to enable the postmaster to buy a house adjoining his own residence which he considered a bargain; $172 a short time before the date of the report, with which to buy pulp wood, as, forsooth, he was speculating in timber; $200 a few days before the report; and he thinks $300 further; in all about $1,100 out of the post office funds. The inspector in that report further says that he questioned the postmaster, and asked, as would be reasonable and proper, for an explanation; and this is the explanation that he got. The postmaster admitted that he had received sums of money

from his assistant, but said that he supposed all the time that they were from what had been placed to his credit by salary warrants. The inspector criticises that statement, and says 'This statement I do not believe, but I am satisfied that there was an understanding between the postmaster and the assistant.' The inspector had said he was led to believe that the postmaster was well off, but he was now satisfied that he was in financial difficulties. As a matter of fact the postmaster at that time was, and now is as I understand—although I am subject to correction in this—an undischarged bankrupt. He says :

> I have been much deceived with the postmaster and his assistant. I told him that he would be dismissed. The postmaster said that he would prefer to resign.

And the report closed with a recommendation by the inspector that the postmaster be forthwith dismissed. That is the report of the inspector, as I allege it against the hon. the Postmaster General and his department. He may be able to explain it.

> The postmaster said he would prefer to resign.

Contrast that statement with what we got yesterday from the Postmaster General when he said that he chose to resign and there was a reason. On receipt of that report it appears that the Postmaster General was seized with a fit of most virtuous and righteous indignation because across that report he appears to have written his magnificent fiat that this postmaster be forthwith dismissed. That was on May 19, 1904, according to the report. Then in order to implement that and to make the dismissal effective the hon. gentleman, I believe, wired the member then representing that riding for a recommendation for a postmaster at Thessalon, intimating to the hon. member that the circumstances before him did not warrant any delay, and that he must dismiss the postmaster unless a resignation were filed. At that time I understand—the Postmaster General may set me right if I am wrong—the hon. gentleman had signed the fiat, for the dismissal, that the dismissal had taken effect, and that so far as the department was concerned, this gentleman, the postmaster at Thessalon, was a dismissed official and was no longer in the employ of the department.

The next circumstance that arises is a telegram on May 19th following, referring to the office and stating that the postmaster at Thessalon is still in charge of the office and that he signs the returns, and on May 20, there having been, as I understand, some correspondence in the meantime with regard to the employment of somebody else in the post office temporarily, the secretary of the postal department telegraphed the inspector that these arrangements were satisfactory provided the accounts and the cash were kept exclusively in the hands of a young woman who had been employed since the dismissal to take charge of the office temporarily. That is the extraordinary fact, Sir, that a postmaster could remain postmaster after his dismissal, that the arrangement was a perfectly satisfactory one to the Postmaster General provided he was not allowed to exercise the duties of postmaster or touch any funds or money or any returns which were within the responsibility of his office. On the 20th of May, the hon. gentleman again wired the hon. member for Algoma for the resignation of the postmaster at Thessalon. He had dismissed him the day before for the reasons set forth in the inspector's report, and no wonder he had been dismissed. I think the hon. gentleman could not have done otherwise. But having dismissed him and having signed the sentence of dismissal with his own hand, he sent two telegrams to the hon. member for the district, begging him to get this postmaster to be pleased to resign and saying that unless he did resign he would remove the postmaster whose sentence of dismissal he had already signed the day before. Then the hon. member for Algoma wired the Postmaster General that he had wired the postmaster to resign. Then there comes a letter from the inspector to the Postmaster General on the 21st of May stating that the postmaster is under the impression that the difficulty may blow over, and further, that when the difficulty has blown over he will remain postmaster. Then there comes under date of May 21st the resignation of the postmaster, and, Sir, I commend to this House the reasons which are given in that resignation of the postmaster. The postmaster after he has been dismissed, after he has been found, as the inspector found him, unworthy to continue in his office, after the hon. Postmaster General has signed the fiat for his dismissal and afterwards begged him to resign, then the postmaster writes a letter saying he finds his other business, which is that of keeping a grocery store in connection with the office, is such a pressing and important thing that he cannot any longer attend to the duties of postmaster at that place and therefore he respectfully begs to be allowed to resign and accordingly tenders his resignation. Now this farcical proceeding—because it cannot be characterized in any other manner, unless one realizes to the full the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of the farce—this farcical proceeding might well have stopped there and the hon. gentleman might well have ended his part of the play at that point, but let us see whether it ended there. The temporary employment was continued in the meantime and Thessalon apparently was without a postmaster; without a postmaster for two reasons, first,

that the former postmaster had been dismissed on the report of the inspector, for the reasons I have disclosed to the House, and secondly, because he had finally yielded to the importunate request of the Postmaster General and had been persuaded after his dismissal to resign. Matters drifted along until July 13, when the hon. gentleman writes to the hon. member for Algoma for a recommendation to fill that office of postmaster at Thessalon and the member, I believe informed the Postmaster General that he had no recommendation to make at present. It is an extraordinary thing that on September 8, a gentleman applied for the position of postmaster and referred to the sitting member for that district, the government member for Algoma, as his recommendation, and his letter was politely acknowledged by the department on September 9. On September 5, the inspector wrote, I believe, to the accountant of the department instructing him to see that no payments were made to Dobey. This was on September 5, and Dobey had been dismissed on May 19, and his resignation had been accepted on May 23rd, but on September 5 the accountant was warned not to make any payments to him. Why? Let us see. The Postmaster General will contradict me if I am wrong, but I feel so satisfied that I am right that I challenge his contradiction. Then that post office at Thessalon was not actually transferred until September 3 and that the money of this country was paid to that postmaster up to the 31st August, 1904, or nearly four months after his dismissal and resignation. During the time that elapsed between the 19th May, when he was dismissed, and the 31st August, 1904, that gentleman was laughing in his sleeve at the Postmaster General. He was telling himself that his resignation was a farce, that his dismissal was a farce, that the Postmaster General was about the easiest subject he had ever met, and that he could remain out of the post office and yet continue to draw his salary for doing nothing; and during all that time, between the 19th May and the 3rd September, 1904, a temporary employee of the department was in charge of that office and paid a salary, so that there were two salaries going on at the same time. The postmaster, for some reason or other, probably because of the ingenuity he had displayed, as shown by the inspector's report, was being paid his regular salary, and a temporary employee of the department, who was doing the work, was also being paid. It was recommended by the hon. gentleman, that this temporary employee, who was in charge from the 19th May to the 3rd September, should be paid during that time the full salary of postmaster. I believe that on Oct. 6 there was a further application for the position of postmaster, but it appears that no notice was taken of it and that the post office remained in that condition until the appointment on the 6th February. I suppose it is not forgotten that last fall there was a general election throughout this Dominion, and among the most prominent advocates of the Liberal cause in East Algoma, was the late postmaster. He canvassed and spoke on the public platform and accompanied the government candidate to distant parts of the country, and did all he could to secure the election of the present member for Algoma East (Mr. Dyment). The late postmaster was then useful, he was doing well, but perhaps the work he was doing then was not sufficient to purge him thoroughly from the sins he had committed. Therefore when the Ontario government appealed to the country last January, he again came to the front. The provincial candidate for the district of Algoma was one Thomas G. Wigg, a Crown timber agent, who resigned his position in order to contest that riding in the Liberal interest. The hon. member for Algoma, who is a great friend of Mr. Wigg, went heartily into that campaign. He stayed away from this House for the purpose of advocating the cause of his friend, and I believe upon every platform on which he appeared, there appeared also Mr. J. B. Dobey, the postmaster at Thessalon, and Mr. Dobey was always ready to help the Liberal candidate with a speech. Mr. Dobey worked and spoke and strove along with the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Dyment) in order to secure the election of the Liberal candidate. But unfortunately he was unsuccessful because the electorate of that district were against Mr. Wigg and disapproved of him to the number of about 450. That election took place on the 25th January, and between the 25th January and the 5th February Mr. J. B. Dobey was able to satisfy the Postmaster General—without investigation or inquiry and without any denial of the serious charges against him, and for which he had been dismissed—that he was a fit and proper person, to be postmaster at Thessalon. Therefore the Postmaster General, over his own signature, on the 15th February, gave this order: Reappoint J. B. Dobey anew. The salary attached to the office of postmaster at Thessalon is in the neighbourhood of $1,000, a very snug little plum, and I presume that Mr. Dobey convinced the Postmaster General that his services deserved that salary. I am curious to know what explanation was made by the postmaster at Thessalon to the Postmaster General which induced the hon. minister, without inquiry or investigation of any kind, to recommend to Council the reinstatement of Mr. Dobey. Why did the Council reappoint him? Was it because of his political services and political activity generally on behalf of the Liberal party? Surely the hon. minister is above that sort of thing. Surely he would require something more than a mere political excuse to varnish such grave offences.

Might I ask the hon. minister to explain whether, before making that recommendation, he consulted his colleagues in the cabinet; and if so, what were the representations he made to his colleagues? Did he lay before them the facts on record in his own office? Did he give them the reasons why he had dismissed this postmaster? May I ask the hon. minister whether the facts reported by the inspector were false? Whether he believed the inspector, when he reported the facts and the hon. minister acted upon them? And whether, if he did believe the report of the inspector at the time, he subsequently found that the charges were without foundation? It is on record that the Postmaster General knew that this postmaster had been guilty of dishonest practices such as would render him liable to criminal prosecution on two or three points; yet in the face of that, not only does he not prosecute, not only does he not even censure, but for reasons best known to himself and which only can be described as political exigencies, he begs this postmaster to resign and then whitewashes him.

There are hon. members in this House, and no one knows it better than the hon. gentlemen who are acquainted with instances where righteous indignation for petty offences has been visited upon postmasters and their employees in the post offices, for far lesser offences than those that have been committed by the postmaster at Thessalon. Let us see. The day before yeterday upon the order paper were certain questions with regard to a post office in Algoma, at a place called Kentvale, and it is an extraordinary fact that this gentleman was dismissed after the Dominion elections. After the Dominion elections the postmaster at Thessalon was reappointed, whitewashed and sanctified by the Postmaster General, while the postmaster at Kentvale was summarily dismissed, and although petitions and requests have been made to the hon. gentleman to reinstate him, they were treated with scorn. The questions that I asked the hon. gentleman the other day with regard to the Kentvale office, were these:

1. Who is the postmaster at Kentvale, Ont.?
2. Who were his sureties?
3. When was he appointed?
4. Who was the former postmaster there?
5. When did he vacate the office?
6. Was he discharged? If so, for what reason?
7. Has the post office been removed from the site on which it was established? If so, when, and for what reason?
8. Where is it now established?
9. Has any protest been made against such removal?
10. If so, how was such protest dealt with?
11. What is the salary attached to the office?

To these the Postmaster General replied. There was no difficulty about answering these questions, although there was some difficulty about answering the questions with regard to the postmaster at Thessalon, and a part of those questions still remain unanswered. The hon. gentleman said:

The former postmaster at Kentvale was F. B. Kent. On the 4th January last, he was directed to be removed from his office because of his having been an active political partisan during the last Dominion election, and also with a view to removing the office to a more convenient site. The present postmaster is John Rousseau, who was directed to be appointed on the 4th of January, 1905. A petition against the change in the location was presented, but the decision of the 4th January last has been adhered to. The salary is $25.

Sir, Mr. Kent I know, Mr. Kent is a farmer and general store keeper in the prosperous little village of Kentvale, on St. Joseph's Island. It was well known when he was appointed many years ago, that he was a strong Conservative. But the little polling subdivision at Kentvale had the audacity to give a Conservative majority of thirty-seven out of forty-two votes cast, and no wonder the indignation of the Postmaster General was aroused. He had to do something, and the only luckless individual he could seize upon was Mr. Kent, and not only did the Postmaster General dismiss Mr. Kent for political activity on the Conservative side—and I may say to the Postmaster General that there was no political activity at all on the part of that gentleman, it was merely imaginary—not only that, but he took away the post office from the people of Kentvale to punish them for their sins, and removed it a mile and a half away where it would only serve the convenience of five or six out of the forty-seven people who were getting their mail there. Those facts have been reported to the hon. gentleman by petition of the residents. Out of the forty-seven people who were served by the post office at Kentvale, there were forty-three, I think, who signed the petition to have the office restored on the score of convenience. There is one instance. There was another the other day when my hon. friend for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) moved for a return in regard to the dismissal of the postmaster at Shelburne, and I believe the papers in that case will show that the hon. gentleman treated him as he treated the postmaster at Kentvale. But these are not the only sins which are visited by that hon. gentleman with grievous punishment. The hon. gentleman knows that he has pursued with persistence men employed in post offices, rural and city, who have been guilty of the smallest irregularities against the post office regulations. The doors of the penitentiary have yawned wide open for them, and he has not relaxed the ardour with which he pursued them. But when political reasons intervene the hon. gentleman is very apt to change his mind. Political principles the hon. gentleman adheres to sometimes. We have seen in the debates of this House that he has changed his mind for political reasons upon a very important principle,

namely, the principle of provincial rights, which he championed so loudly in 1896. For political reasons and having regard to political exigencies of the situation, he changed his mind with regard to the enormity of offences committed by the postmaster at Thessalon, and he retracted his dismissal. He made up his mind that the gravity of that offence had been wiped out by the subsequent political activity of that gentleman. Sir, I look forward with some anxiety, certainly with eagerness, to the explanation of the hon. gentleman with regard to those facts. I would like to ask him what steps were taken by the Postmaster General towards visiting the consequences of those offences upon the postmaster, or his surety. Were the sureties of the postmaster ever changed ? Was a new post office bond ever entered into? Was the postmaster ever prosecuted ? Was any inquiry ever instituted further than that involved in the report of the inspectors ?

Now, Sir, there is appropriated out of the funds of this country thousands of dollars every year for the maintenance of an efficient staff of post office inspectors, whose duty it is to ascertain just such facts as these, and to report. They are presumed to be competent men, and are judged to be competent by the hon. gentleman who has acted upon a report in this instance. Then, Sir, of what value to this country is that corps of inspectors of the Post Office Department when all their reports, all their inquiries, and the result that was ascertained, are set at naught, as in this case, where the crimes that were reported by the inspectors to have been committed have been condoned by reason of political exigencies ? Let me summarize again. The offences of which this postmaster was guilty resolve themselves under three heads : First, the misappropriation, the misuse, the conversion, or any other name the Postmaster General, as a lawyer, likes to put to the facts, and he knows the proper term to apply—of the sum of at least $1,100, and possibly $1,600 ; second, the report of the inspectors that the postmaster has falsified returns for four or five months ; third, that the postmaster has been guilty of falsely pretending to send money in two registered letters, one with $500 and the other with $608, when there were no such letters on the letter bill. These facts require explanation. I ask the hon. Postmaster General to give a frank explanation to this House and to the country and to explain why, as Postmaster General, as holding the dignified office of a minister of the Crown, he could, without any investigation, without any explanation at all, condone offences so grave and foist upon the public the services of a man who was reported against by his own department for having committed such grave offences.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I think that fair-minded men will agree with me when I say that when a question is raised which goes to injure the character of a hitherto respectable citizen of the country it ought to be approached in a fair, impartial and non-partisan spirit, not for the purpose of trying to distort, or misrepresent facts, or create false impressions, but simply in a judicial and fair way to try to ascertain the proper view to take of a public transaction. In this particular case it is beyond controversy that there were irregularities at the Thessalon post-office, but that doubt arose because of the question : 'Who is responsible for them ? In the particular case of the Thessalon post office that doubt arose because of the fact that the postmaster chose to delegate the management of the office to a person in whom he had every right to place the fullest confidence. The postmaster, as is often the case throughout Canada, was not giving his detailed and exclusive attention to the office although he may have signed reports made out for him by those whom he employed. In the particular case in question the postmaster appears to have been trustful and to have throughout his tenure of office, in the last few years at least, relied on the fidelity of his employees. When my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) put a notice of motion on the order paper my attention was called to it by my hon. friend from East Algoma (Mr. Dyment) in whose constituency this post office is situated, and as it did not appear, as I viewed the case and as I view it to-day, to be one calling for any public criticism and as it was probable that no good would come out of it but simply that we might succeed in breaking the hearts of some people——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The hearts of whom ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. At all events the hearts of people are entitled to consideration. In any event, before the matter was brought to the attention of the government, it would be reasonable that whatever information was possessed on the subject should be given to the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) that he might decide on his course. I had not the slightest doubt in my mind that any impartial man on seeing the information that I acted upon, would take the course I took. Therefore I at once invited the hon. gentleman to come to my department, and I instructed the officers to place before him whatever information there was within the reach of the department, anything that had any bearing on the question. I had not the slightest doubt that an impartial consideration of that information would have been accepted as a satisfactory reason for the course pursued. It seems to have been different. Some people might perhaps think that when a member is admitted to the files of the department in that way some-

thing is owing from him. In this particular case, on the information that I had in the month of May, 1904, I came to the conclusion that the postmaster should be dismissed. I gave him an opportunity to send in his resignation and, as my hon. friend says, a resignation was received. It is of no special consequence, I suppose, if a man is put out of office whether we allow him to resign or whether we dismiss him. Perhaps there may be cases where dismissal should take place promptly. However, he was ordered to be displaced from a position of responsibility and power in connection with the management of the office in the month of May, 1904. Subsequently information came to me which caused me to question the justice of my decision, and I am of the opinion that no lawyer in this House, if he stripped himself of bias, or that no judge on the bench would sustain my decision of May, 1904. As I say the postmaster left the management of his office to others, and I was in hopes it would not be necessary to have given publicity to these charges against people when you cannot pin down the responsibility to any one person. In this particular case I say it is not possible for any person to say without a reasonable doubt that the postmaster was the one to blame. On the contrary, I think a reasonable conclusion would be that there was another person to blame for whatever took place. The postmaster had been in office for a quarter of a century. He was appointed, I think, in 1880. He had an unblemished character. These circumstances were brought to my attention and other circumstances, all of which I am perfectly willing should be placed in the hands of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden).

Mr. FOSTER. Would my hon. friend (Sir William Mulock) allow me one question ? So long as the matter has developed as far as it has and the Postmaster General is giving publicity to the case, does he not think that he ought to be frank with the House and tell the House what these reasons were ? I think we ought to have all the information now that the matter has gone as far as it has.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My information is that the postmaster was not the guilty one.

Mr. BARR. Who was ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think I should say who is guilty.

Mr. BARR. Is my hon. friend attempting to throw suspicion on the assistant who is known to be——

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Known to be what ? I did not hear the conclusion of my hon. friend's sentence.

Mr. BARR. I ask the hon. gentleman if he is not attempting to throw suspicion on the assistant who is known not to be guilty and every person knows up there that he is not guilty.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would the hon. gentleman say on what information he makes the statement that the assistant is known not to be the guilty one ?

Mr. BARR. That is what we want to know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman says that every one knows the assistant is not the guilty person. I ask him upon what evidence he makes that statement ?

Mr. BARR. We would like to know who is the guilty one ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Barr) has nothing on which to base that statement, and yet I have information upon which to base my conviction ; and my conviction and my firm opinion is that no person in the discharge of judicial duties could find the postmaster guilty morally of the offence of having for a certain length of time made use of post office funds. Though it would not, in my judgment, in one sense, mitigate the offence, I may observe that there has been no loss sustained and that the misappropriation was promptly made good. The member who introduced this matter made a statement about sureties ; I do not know upon what evidence he made that statement. I would say that Mr. Dobey, when formerly postmaster, was insured in a guarantee company for $800, and the hon. gentleman says the security was not renewed when he was reappointed.

Mr. BOYCE. I did not make that statement. I asked the Postmaster General whether there was a new bond or not.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is immaterial whether the hon. gentleman made that statement or not, because in one sense it was suggested by him, and, as his remarks will show, he challenged me to prove that there had been any new security obtained. The postmaster on being reappointed was insured according to our assessment system, which is the method of insuring postmasters almost generally throughout Canada to-day. We have a security from him to the extent of $1,200 ; a security set on foot since his reappointment. The hon. gentleman says that I knew the postmaster had geen guilty of illegal practices. I say I know nothing of the kind. I admit that the postmaster is blameable for having put too much confidence in others, but I would like to know who has not, in the course of his life, been obliged to regret being over-trustful of people whom he thought he was perfectly warranted in trusting ? That is the head and front of the offence of the postmaster—hav-

ing been trustful and having not exercised that full supervision over the work of his office which he ought to have exercised. But that is a different sort of shortcoming from that with which he is charged here by the hon. gentleman, and if I were to dismiss him for that particular offence the result would be that I would ruin him in the minds of the people of Canada.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the Postmaster General state that this postmaster did not personally sign the account and return claiming credit for $500 and $680, which he never remitted ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not know what he may or may not have personally signed, but any person who has been in the office of Postmaster General knows perfectly well that among the thousands of postmasters throughout Canada there are those who are constantly signing their weekly returns without being absolutely aware of the facts upon which they are built up. Their clerks, their staff, make up these returns for them, and the particular case in question is one of that kind. I suppose this posmaster signed these returns trusting to their correctness, relying upon the statement made to him by his assistant or by whoever else may have had charge of the office at the time.

Mr. LALOR. Do I understand the Postmaster General to say that this postmaster receives $1,000 a year salary and does not give his personal attention to the business of the office ? I think that is the statement of the Postmaster General, and I would like to be sure about it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I did not say anything about the salary, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) may be about right as to salary. I say that up to the time of his dismissal it appears that his trouble had arisen because of his not having, up to that time, given the duties of the office his personal attention. It was not to my knowledge. Doubtless he now gives the office his personal attention, but his initial trouble arose from his not having supervised and been actually aware of the whole of the details of the office, and, in fact, not taking the actual management of it as he ought to have done. It is an office of sufficient importance to warrant the full and undivided attention of the postmaster. The hon. gentleman who introduced this question stated that after the dismissal of the postmaster he had been paid his salary up to the 31st of August last. Will the hon. gentleman inform me whether the postmaster was paid any money for services performed after his dismissal ?

Mr. BOYCE. My statement was that it appeared that the postmaster had been paid his salary up to the 31st of August, 1904. I asked the Postmaster General, if that were not correct, to contradict it. That fact is as I am informed and as I understand.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not able to say up to what date he was or was not paid, because I do not carry the affairs of the accountant's office in my head. I am quite satisfied on this point : that no money was paid to him for any services rendered by him after he was dismissed from his office. I will get the information on that point.

Mr. BOYCE. Is it not on record in the Postmaster General's department that this man was paid up to the 31st of August, 1904, that is, that he was kept in the employment of the government as postmaster of Thessalon and paid a salary up to that date, many months after his dismissal ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Well, the hon. gentleman has made that statement——

Mr. BOYCE. I am asking the Postmaster General if that is not the case.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman made that statement, and he knows more of the files in connection with this matter than I do. I have not looked into that point to see whether or not the money the hon. gentleman says was paid to him in August was for services rendered up to August, or whether it may not have been moneys that were owing to him up to the time of his dismissal. It is my opinion that when that point is looked into it will be found that there was paid no money for any services after the time of his dismissal. He would be entitled to nothing unless it would be for the rent of the premises.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not pretend to know more about the hon. gentleman's department than he does, but I want to tell him that if he will take the trouble to look at the papers—and he has had twenty-four hours' notice of this motion—he will find that the accountant sent him a memorandum, which is among the papers, stating that the man was paid up to the 31st of August, 1904. I do not know more than that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. You say that the accountant sent a memorandum, to whom ?

Mr. BOYCE. To the Postmaster General, and it is in the files.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Oh, well, that is all nonsense ; the accountant never sent me a memorandum about the pay of any gentleman in the service of the government.

Mr. BOYCE. Before the hon. gentleman calls it nonsense, might I ask him to look at the files and he will see.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I have not the records of the office here, but it is impossible

to suppose that the accountant sent me a memorandum telling me up to what date he had paid the postmaster.

Mr. BOYCE. I may tell the hon. gentleman that there is such a memorandum among the papers if he takes the trouble to look at it. There is a memorandum stating that this man was paid up to the 31st of August, 1904, and that the office was transferred on the 3rd of September, 1904.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not saying whether or not there was a memorandum——

Mr. BOYCE. But the hon. gentleman said it was nonsense.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What I said was nonsense—and I should not have used such an undignified word—what I say is this: The hon. gentleman stated that the accountant sent to the Postmaster General a memorandum to the effect that this officer had been paid his salary up to the 31st of August. What I say is that the accountant would have no possible reason for sending to me a memorandum on any such subject, and I am satisfied that he never sent me any such memorandum. If the papers were before me at that time, there would be no occasion for his sending me a memorandum.

Mr. BOYCE. Do I understand that the hon. Postmaster General denies what I state?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I state that the accountant never sent to me the memorandum the hon. gentleman speaks of.

Mr. BOYCE. That is not the question, Mr. Speaker. I ask the hon. Postmaster General whether he denies my statement that there is among the papers referring to this matter in his department a memorandum to the effect that this postmaster was paid up to the 31st of August, 1904, and that the office was transferred on the 3rd of September, 1904?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I am not making any statement as to that, for I do not know what paper may or may not be on file.

Mr. BOYCE. Then why does the hon. Postmaster General deny things the existence of which he does not know?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The point I deny is that the accountant sent me a memorandum.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman says he does not know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I know what is sent to me. I do not know what is put on file in the 10,000 post offices in Canada, and I say that on that point the accountant would have no reason to send me a memorandum. I am not speaking from memory. I am speaking from the practice of the department, where we have to work by rules. The accountant would not send me a memorandum of that kind, and when the hon. gentleman said that the accountant had sent me a memorandum to the effect that this man had been paid his salary up to the 31st of August, and sought to hold me responsible for his having been paid after his dismissal, I point out that the real point of that statement was, not that there had been a memorandum, but that I had been notified by the accountant of that payment. On that point the hon. gentleman is in error; there is no foundation for the statement.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me one question? Did he reappoint Dobey to the post office at Thessalon without looking over the papers on file in his department?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not recall everything that occurred on the reappointment. I recall the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Dyment) coming to me after the commencement of this session. The fact is that when an order is issued to send to the person who has the patronage of a riding for a recommendation to fill an office, the matter disappears from my attention until it is brought up again by some circumstance. Months may elapse, and long periods do frequently elapse, when positions are vacant, but it does not follow that the transaction is present in my mind until final action is taken. In this particular case, if anything was brought to my attention I dealt with it, the file would then be put away, and that would be the end of the transaction. I do recall the member for East Algoma coming to me during this session and giving to me his strongest opinion as to the innocence of the postmaster of any guilt; and on that occasion I made it my business to review the circumstances, and go through all the available information. That was the information which I desired the hon. gentleman to study as a professional man and a person familiar with weighing evidence; and I was in hopes that as a lawyer he would have seen the case as I did—that I was not warranted in dismissing the postmaster on the charge of having committed a crime, and by that act disgracing him in the eyes of the public when there was a very grave doubt, or more than a doubt as I think, as to his guilt. As I have said, I had no reason to doubt his innocence when the whole case came befor me, and I would have been doing less than my duty if I had not reinstated him under these circumstances. I was not aware until this moment of his having taken part in politics. I have never seen the gentleman, I have never spoken to him, I have never had any communication with him except in the ordinary course, and I think no one could have acted in a

more conscientious way than I did in dealing with this case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. Postmaster General a question? The case came before him originally upon the report of the post office inspector, which sets out the guilt of this man in the clearest possible terms, if its effect has been correctly stated by the hon. gentleman who brought the matter to the attention of the House. The hon. Postmaster General speaks of the case having come before him more fully. Upon what did it come before him more fully? There was the report of the post office inspector; was there any further investigation? I think that is a very important matter for us to know.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have no opinion as to the officials of this post office. I have no reason whatever to shield one of them more than another; I have no reason to shield any one of them. I have only one duty to perform, and I am only performing that one duty; but in the discharge of my duty as Postmaster General, I want to spare the feelings of people if I can do so, and if no public good is to be served from disregarding their feelings; and I will say this to the hon. leader of the opposition, who is a lawyer of standing, and who would, I am sure, take a non-partisan view of this matter. If he were to go through the file—and he is most welcome to it—I am perfectly sure that he would not have made the speech which has been made to-day. I would be pleased if he would do that, and he will see that this is not a question so one-sided as it has been represented. I ask my hon. friend if he would be willing to do that? The reason I do not wish to bring the file down is obvious to the hon. leader of the opposition.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I ask the minister what is the method of paying the salary of the postmaster at Thessalon?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. A percentage, do you mean?

Mr. FOSTER. No. I mean, does he get it quarterly, and by whom is it payable, and to whom goes the receipt from him?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I judge from the statement of the hon. member for West Algoma that he is paid by what are called salary warrants.

Mr. FOSTER. Issued where?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think the salary warrants all come from the accountant. I am not aware of the working details; but I understood that what are called salary warrants are issued by the accountant at regular intervals, under which the postmaster is in some way entitled to be paid, that payment coming out of the revenue for the time being instead of having to be voted by parlament like the ordinary expenditure. I think that is the way.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that monthly or quarterly? I think it is monthly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Quarterly.

Mr. FOSTER. Whence does the money issue for the payment of this quarterly or monthly salary, from the office here?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That I cannot say; it is an old practice that has been in force I suppose ever since there has been a post office, I do not know whether it is a warrant entitling him to retain that amount or whether it is in the nature of a cheque transferring to him that money. Perhaps the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who has been Postmaster General, can say.

Mr. HAGGART. I am not sure of it. You can see the point easily, if it is a monthly payment and he took $450 he must have known of his guilt.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is a very reasonable explanation of it, and that is why I think it is so unfair, with all respect, so unfair to the parties interested to make use of this occasion in this House to debate in an ex parte way a matter that ought to be dealt with judicially and in no other way. I say there is an explanation—it may not be the true one—given by one of the officers in the office.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that explanation on the file?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. My hon. friend has seen everything on the file, he is in possession of everything and perhaps it would occur to him—it does to me— that when I, as I did in this case, invite him to look into the whole case and withheld nothing from him, not even the private correspondence, the letters from anybody—I gave instructions to my secretary to place all the material at his disposal and there was no desire to conceal anything—I wanted to satisfy the hon. gentleman as to the fairness of my course and he knows what is on the file and what is not; and I would agree, returning to the question, to ask the leader of the opposition if he would care to look through that file himself, and if after looking through that file he says he thinks there would have been any service to the public by my bringing a return to this House of every document there except communications that are marked 'private and confidential' and what I could not produce without the consent of the writers, I would be most pleased to give the reports and everything to the House and they may judge for themselves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman is making an appeal to me in this regard I would say that I would be very glad to discharge any public duty which devolves

upon me, but it does not seem in a matter of this kind to which so much publicity has been given, that hon. gentlemen on either side of the House would be satisfied with my report as to matters on which there might be very grave differences of opinion. I was asking the Postmaster General a very simple question, that is whether or not his fuller consideration was based upon any report of any officer of his departmetn. For example, whether this inspector or any other inspector of the department had made any subsequent report withdrawing or modifying in any material respect the report which was originally made. I ask that question because I gathered from the language of the Postmaster General in the first instance, that there must have been something of that kind, and I thought possibly he was omitting through inadvertence.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. When I made my decision to dismiss this officer I only had the one opinion of an officer. I was not aware at that time of his having given a different and conflicting opinion, but I subsequently found that it would be quite unsafe for me to act upon the opinion of that officer in regard to this particular case as to where this guilt lay and I would not act upon it; I felt I was taking a very grave risk in purporting to find a man guilty of an offence on the advice of an officer who had expressed different opinions regarding the case, and therefore, I could not place confidence in the soundness of the judgment of the officer to whom the hon. member for West Algoma has referred. Therefore, when in February last the hon. member from East Algoma (Mr. Dyment) called upon me and requested me to reinstate this officer I went through the papers and decided that that was the only reasonable course open under the circumstances. But since my hon. friend says he does not care to assume any responsibility except of a public character I shall go this far: if it should appear that some person very close to the postmaster occupying a very delicate relationship to him should have made known to the department where the guilt lay, and that it did not rest with the postmaster, that satisfied me where it did rest as this did, what should I have done? So far as this postmaster is concerned, I was satisfied that the evidence did not prove him guilty. There may be a doubt as to who is guilty, but I am satisfied the postmaster was not proved guilty, and under those circumstances I was not going to ruin that man, ruin him in the eyes of the public, a man who stands as high in the community as any person who has been for twenty years a public servant, and with this exception has been faithful and reliable, has not been charged with being short in his money or guilty of any breaches of trust. I do not think, under the circumstances, I was doing more than my duty in revoking the decision which I had arrived at from only a partial consideration of the case. All lawyers can understand that cases can be presented and for the moment you may form an incorrect impression; subsequent light may be thrown on the case and cause you to feel that you have made a mistake. That was so in this case, and I have no more to say upon the subject except that if the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) chooses to go through my file and if after reading those papers he thinks the whole file should be brought down and presented to the public, minus confidential papers, if he thinks that it does not dislodge the finding I made in May, 1904, I will produce those papers and the House can again go into the subject.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The defence that has been made by the Postmaster General (Sir Wm. Mulock) if we are to call it a defence, or the explanation, if we apply the milder term, is really the most extraordinary I ever listened to, and I appeal to the experience of hon. gentlemen on either side of the House if they ever heard a charge brought and substantiated in the way this has, to which a reply has been made in such a manner as this has been attempted to be made by the Postmatser General. A most singular thing that he thought it his first duty to prove to this parliament and the country his own utter unreliability. What did he say? As head of a department with innumerable officials under his direction, men who, in the exercise of their office, come to be experts in investigation, who investigate matters on the spot and get all the local flavour and make themselves acquainted with the circumstances of the case right in the home where the proceedings took place—after a thorough and searching inquiry by responsible officers, extending over a considerable period, so grave was this case, under the presentation made by his officers, made to a gentleman with so kindly and tender a heart that he would not for the world do an injustice to any man, official or otherwise, that he dismissed the official. One would naturally suppose that every care would be taken before the initial sentence was pronounced against a man who, the minister says, has always had a reputation for honesty, has had twenty years' public experience, and whose conduct he was called upon to judge, and in whose case an advance judgment would not only put him out of business as an honest man and official but reflect upon his family and relatives as well. The Postmaster General, a thorough lawyer, himself at the head of a department, with all its responsibility, knowing what hinges on his decision, undertakes that most responsible of all duties—the duty of making a pronouncement against one of his fellow men—he does it deliberately and on the evidence declares that the man must be dismissed. And now he comes up and

says that there is not a lawyer or judge or a man of common sense in Canada who would sustain the conclusion he came to at that time.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I cannot allow the hon. gentleman to misrepresent me. What I said was that fuller and later information brought to me showed me that my judgment in the month of May was wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman did say that and he also said the other. If he denies, I shall take his denial but I appeal to 'Hansard.' Then he goes on a second step, and says: I came to the conviction later that this official was innocent; I shall not give you the ground upon which I came to that conviction, but I will let the leader of the opposition into the secret if he will take the trouble to come over to my office; the country and this House however must not know what are the grounds upon which I came to the conviction that the official was innocent, but such grounds there certainly are. Well, the same gentleman came to a conviction and gave his sentence that the man was guilty and dismissed him. Then he says that no judge or lawyer or man of common sense would uphold that opinion, and he now asks us to sustain the conviction which he subsequently came to and in respect of which he does not furnish us any evidence or ground. Does he not see that he has read himself out of court, and there is not a bit of use in his standing up now and saying that any one of the conclusions he came to is a proper and right conclusion?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Did the hon. gentleman never make a mistake?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, often. What does the hon. gentleman ask the House to do? He asks this House to trust him for a conviction. But this has gone too far. It is impossible to stop him. This hon. gentleman who was so tender of heart that he would not break a heart—and no one wants to break hearts if it can be avoided—that hon. gentleman has stood in his place and used language just as plain and clear as was necessary to show that a certain person was absolutely guilty, who has never been tried, and against whom, so far as this House knows, there is not a tittle of evidence to prove any charge. Very tender hearted about the heart of a grown man but not so tender hearted about the heart of one who is not a grown man. Everybody on each side knows to whom the reference is made. Nobody needs to go a step further to know that the hon. gentleman has pronounced a judgment against the second person after having taken back his judgment against the first. This matter has gone so far that it cannot stop here. This House wants to know all the facts and must know them. This House wants all the papers and must have them. The hon. gentleman has not always been so tender about shielding private correspondence. There is an episode in his history, which he will not forget and which, if he tries to forget, this House and country will not, when he absolutely rifled private correspondence and made it public to the world. He issued a volume in which it could be edited, published and distributed; but when it comes to be a matter of a public official wrong-doing when the moneys of the country have evidently been used wrongly and taken wrongly—the hon. gentleman will not deny that nor will anybody. Now, however, it comes to this, every public official in this Dominion looks to-day to the Postmaster General and this government to know whether or not officials have to toe the line or whether it is permissible for them to do about as they please. What is the admission of my hon. friend? It is that there are ten thousand postmasters in this country who never know what they are signing, who do not know whether they are affixing their names to what is a correct report or not, that this is a shining example of such a postmaster, and when it comes to moneys being wrongly taken, when it comes to the misuse and embezzlement of public money, then the hon. gentleman says: we must be tender hearted; we must not punish the wrongdoer; we must not punish officials who do that sort of thing. You do not need to publish it on the streets now, you need not send a circular to every official under this government. That is not necessary. Every one will know, when the report of to-day's proceedings is circulated, that, so far as this government is concerned, they need not be at all anxious, if they are only good partisans.

The Postmaster General undertook to say to my hon. friend who brought this matter up to-day—he did not say it in so many words but implied it—that my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) had not acted honourably and had abused the right which he had given him to look over the correspondence. But had not my hon. friend the right to see that corrrespondence? Whose is it? Does it belong to Wm. Mulock, Esq.? Is it the property of the Postmaster General? It is the country's business that is being carried on and my hon. friend is simply a departmental officer carrying on this business, and this parliament represents the country and has a perfect right to all that correspondence in order to get at the bottom of this question and see that its affairs are being properly carried on. What discourtesy was my hon. friend guilty of? What courtesy was exercised by the Postmaster General when he said to him, go over and look through the files? The Postmaster General did no more than his duty, and my hon. friend exercised no more than his right. The right and the duty were side by side, and the House has the right to look into the whole matter. It

goes further than the minister would have us think it goes ; it touches at the very foundation of things. Here is a department the responsible head of which is the Postmaster General ; here is all the array of his machinery. He sets that machinery to work, that machinery does its work and reports thereon, and statements therefrom come up to my hon. friend the Postmaster General for his final decision. What is the report of the inspector ? My hon. friend tries to excuse the matter by saying that somebody who was in the office paid out the money when it should not have been paid out, when the postmaster himself knew without a shadow of doubt that he was getting money which did not belong to him. What was his salary ? $1,000 a year. Suppose it was paid by monthly warrants, and suppose he has the right to take it out of the till, he can only take out one-twelfth of that per month. Suppose it is a fourth of that salary, he can only take one-twelfth of that fourth out of the till per month.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing to show that it was taken out of the till.

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the Postmaster General's inspector shows that that money was paid out of the till, it must have been paid out of the till.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It does not show that the postmaster knew it was taken out of the till.

Mr. FOSTER. The postmaster knew that he got it.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He may have known there was money there.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my hon. friend so trusting in this regard that he does not think a man of business getting a salary of $1,000 a year, knowing that he needed the money, knowing just how far he had drawn out his salary—I do not imagine he ever left it to rust in the till of the post office—do you mean to say it is conceivable that when he took out of the post office $450 at one payment, he did not know that he was getting something over and above what was due to him? It was inconceivable.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is nothing to show he knew that he was getting money out of the till.

Mr. FOSTER. Where would it come from ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. As I have said, there is an explanation. It is explained that the party who gave him this money had money for him.

Mr. FOSTER. How derived ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Left with the assistant.

Mr. FOSTER. Who left it ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The postmaster from time to time had been allowing accumulations in the hands of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not appear.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. That is the explanation that has been given to me of that amount.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not appear from the inspector's report, but what does appear from the inspector's report is this, that the postmaster admitted that he had received sums of money from his daughter, but that he supposed all the time it was from what she had placed to his credit from his salary warrant. Now does my hon. friend and the members of this House think that a village postmaster, evidently wanting his pay when it was due, did not take his pay when it was due, when he could go at one time and get $450, and directly after get $172, and shortly after $300 more. and attempt to pretend that he believed that that money was lying there at his credit? Did the post office inspector believe it ? The post office inspector informs the Postmaster General in his report that he did not believe it. Well, now, there is something more. There is not only the —taking of the money which he must have know was not his—all the worse, all the meaner, all the more reprehensible if he would allow an innocent related hand to dip into the till instead of his own. Do you mean to say that he not only did that but in order to cover it up he falsified the accounts, in order to cover it up—cover up what? His own credits of salary in arrears there. Why should he want to cover that up? In order to cover it up he made false statements with reference to sending registered letters, which the post office inspector himself investigated, and which were investigated here at the head office as well, and from both sources were found to be absolutely incorrect. He took the money out through a hand that he should have withheld from meddling with anything of that kind, took the money out, and to cover it up, falsified his accounts, took the money out and to cover it up made certain false statements with reference to sending money by registered letter, which he never sent. What graver thing could an official do? Can any one think, can the Postmaster General himself think, what graver things an official could do than that?

Now that comes to him in an official way. His post office inspector makes an inspection on the ground, reports those things and his belief in them, and that the man be dismissed. The Postmaster General sits here in his office, goes as a judge at the papers, at the information he has so received, issues his decree, and the man is dismissed. Then he gives way to evil influences and he allows the man to send

in his resignation. Why should that be done? If the Postmaster General had the information which he had at that time which he now says is wrong, and on that information said this man should be dismissed, why did he allow him to resign? Is that conducive to official honesty and probity in the department of which my hon. friend is the head? Later convictions had not come to him then. These two things were done just about the same time. A man whom he decided to be guilty and worthy of dismissal, instantly, the very same moment almost, he allowed to resign, to hand in his resignation, and then gives a misleading statement to the House as to why he resigned. That was not a fair and frank statement that the Postmaster General gave my hon friend in answer to his question. Now that is what took place in his department, after a thorough investigation by his own officials. There was the opinion of his post office inspector. Every high official at least, and probably every official in my hon. friend's department, knew what was going on. The post office inspector knew it, post office inspectors other than that one knew it, the whole service became honeycombed with this knowledge of things. What is the moral effect upon a department where its own officers are snubbed, where, after investigations are thoroughly carried on, they are set aside by the Postmaster General, and where things like these are condoned? Is it in the interest of public morality, is it in the interest of official probity and the proper performance of the duties of the office?

Now what will the inspector say? My hon. friend was challenged as to whether he had made any official investigation and got reports which would upset the statements that he had made. He had no frank answer. I conclude therefore he has no answer, that he did not undertake this second part of it through officials of his department, but he arrived at his conviction from other sources. Now, Sir, it seems to me that there can only be one thing that an official can say, and that is this: It is thoroughly useless for me to make examinations and try to perform the duties of my office, because when I make the investigations, when I make recommendations, the minister simply turns me down and puts the man back again. What respect will any official in the Postmaster General's department, in that division of it, have for a post office inspector after this? The post office inspector is sent somewhere else to investigate something or some one, but the man whom he goes to investigate says: A fig for you and your office; I have got Mr. Dyment, or I have got some other Grit member behind me. I will have it made right with the minister; you may go on with your formal work. Thus you have shorn your post office inspector of every vestige of authority. You have shorn your officer of self-respect and of the respect that is due to him in the department over which he presides. You have made the name of inspection a by-word and a reproach and you have taught your department, through and through, on the case as it stands to-day, that if officials have political influence behind them they need not be honest, that they may take money and buy a house if they can make a bargain out of it, that they may take money to pay for pulp wood when they are in the speculation, that they may take money for this and for that out of the till provided they can get a relative to do it for them and upon whom they can, when the time of stress comes, throw, in an unmanly fashion, the onus of the guilt of the thing. That is what the hon. Postmaster General has taught his department and that is what, if the government sustain him, the government will teach this country. It is all of a piece. This is not the first.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, this is not the first.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. Postmaster General had ideals when he was in opposition—he threw them aside when he became a member of the government—ideals, beautifully painted, painted with great care, as with the brush of a master, held up to those on the other side of the House before 1896 and every man on that side of the House who could not gaze upon that painted ideal and read his own image clear was represented as being a man not fit for the public service of this country. Every one of these the hon. gentleman has turned to the wall and nailed it there, and on the obverse side since he has painted actual pictures, not ideals—the Jackson picture, for instance. This is of a piece with that. The hon. Postmaster General sits there to-day with the onus upon him of having taken a criminal from the province of Ontario, made him a high public officer of this government and sent him abroad knowing his record, and with infinite chivalry that old knight, Sir Richard Cartwright, after long years of warfare stood up here and looking around, especially on the hon. Postmaster General, and knowing his former course said: I will relieve his conscience of it altogether; I will take the sole responsibility of this appointment. Chivalrous Sir Richard Cartwright! But that did not absolve the hon. Postmaster General. The hon. Postmaster General made that appointment just as much as Sir Richard Cartwright made it. It had to be made by Council. It was an Ontario appointment in a public way and by geographical responsibility as well as by ministerial responsibility the hon. Postmaster General has to take the odium of it. What has he done? He has sent a man that the judges scored, a man that reputable lawyers would not appear in court with, a man, who, if

certain papers had not been lost, would have been disgowned, to represent Canada abroad, in a country where the name of a public official or agent has been from time immemorial the synonym for probity. That is the way wrong doing has been committed by my hon. friend. This, as the case appears to-day, is on a par with that. But, oh, how virtuous my hon. friend gets in a different case. The quiet little village of Kentvale, whose only disparagement in the eyes of the Postmaster General is that it is inhabited chiefly by wilful and rebellious men who will vote the Conservative ticket, has a postmaster, who, I suppose, had a heart, who had a reputation, against whom not a word could be said or has been said, and yet, because, in the village of Kentvale, a large majority voted the Liberal Conservative ticket and against the government side, my great hearted and large minded friend the Postmaster General must, forsooth, don his armour and go into the fight. There is an enemy of the public service. He must be dismissed. He drew the enormous sum of $25 a year. He has dared as a free man in Canada to exercise his political opinions and vote for the man of his choice. That never must be allowed in the public service of Canada, and the hon. gentleman decapitates this postmaster at Kentvale. Utterly oblivious of broken hearts, of lacerated feelings and of the almost infinite tenderness with which he is known to handle his fellow creatures he disgraced, in so far as he could, and dismissed the postmaster of Kentvale. But here is this man, Mr. Dobey, who conveniently, between the sentence and the execution of the sentence and the time that a new conviction comes to the Postmaster General, part of the time being paid his salary, goes into the political field with all his armour on, speaks publicly, does all he can, an active partisan out and out; yet, consistency compels the Postmaster General to dethrone and recapitate a man who votes on his convictions and is not a violent partisan and to put back into office a man with a record such as has seldom been brought down to this House and a man who was a violent political partisan. That is consistency. That is acting on principle. Oh, the pettiness, the meanness of conduct of that kind? The hon. Postmaster General owes to this House now all the papers so that we can take it in hand as soon as possible and let the people's representatives see where the rights of this case are.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the discussion has widened a good deal and my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who has just spoken has referred to matters which, while they are in order in a debate of this character, do not reach the immediate question which was brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). The facts of the case, as I learn them from this debate, because I am, like the rest of the members of the House, only learning the facts from this debate, seem to be very few. Representations having been made that a certain postmaster had been guilty of misconduct, my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock), being satisfied with the information that is presented, dismisses him from office. So far there will be no question but that my hon. friend acted as he thought in the interest of the public service. But, a few months later, information reaches my hon. friend which satisfies him that a mistake has been made and that the man is innocent. The statement of my hon. friend the Postmaster General is that upon further information he believes that he made a mistake. What then is the proper course to pursue? Having dismissed the man in good faith, but as he subsequently found out through erroneous information, should he adhere to his unjust decision or should he reinstate the man in office? My hon. friend the Postmaster General says that the later information satisfied him that an injustice had been done and that therefore he was convinced that he should reinstate the man.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) why that information is not here.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a point I was about coming to. My hon. friend the Postmaster General has stated that he thinks no good purpose whatever will be served by bringing down all the papers in this matter. He has stated that, having obtained this information, he gives the substance of it to the House and he offers to submit it in full to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), who, of course, is not bound to accept it unless he wishes. The Postmaster General has nothing to conceal, but he thinks the widening of this discussion and the introduction of other names will not be conducive to the public good, and might do individual harm. That is a fair statement of the case. The Postmaster General says he prefers not to bring down these papers. I do not agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the House has a right to all these papers. Of course, the House has a right to dismiss the government if it wishes —but the House is always reasonable in matters of this sort, and will only demand papers when their production is felt to be conducive to the public good. If the information received by the Postmaster General was such as to lead him to believe that a mistake was made, surely everybody will see that it was only common justice that he should remedy that mistake and reinstate the officer. If my hon. friends opposite insist that the papers must be brought down, well that is a question for the Postmaster

General to consider, and I am not going to speak for him, but I can quite conceive there may be good reasons why papers should not be brought down. It constantly happens that it is in the public interest that papers be not brought down ; it is not an unusual thing to have papers submitted to the leader of the opposition, who has a certain degree of responsibility, differing perhaps from that of the hon. gentlemen by whom he is surrounded ; it is not an unusual thing to have papers submitted to him in order that he may satisfy himself that in the main justice has been done. If the Postmaster General believes he has good reason for not causing the introduction of other names by bringing down these additional papers, why should there be any assumption of partisanship or anything else that has nothing to do with the case ; why does it not present itself as a case of injustice having been done unwittingly to a public official and of that injustice being corrected in the light of further inquiry ? That, after all, is the whole case. You may broaden the discussion out into other points, but confining myself entirely to the question brought before the House by the hon. member (Mr. Boyce), it seems that it can be disposed of in a very few words. The Postmaster General dismisses an officer, and then afterwards believing that he has made a mistake he corrects the error, re-instates the officer, and tells us there are good reasons why he would prefer not to bring down all the papers, although he would gladly submit them to the leader of the opposition, so that the leader of the opposition may satisfy himself the whole thing has been done with the best intentions and without any wrong to the public interest.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The evidence has been brought out that this man Dobey was an offensive partisan in the official sense of the term. Would not that prevent the Postmaster General appointing him in any event ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not understand that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) bases his case on any question of offensive partisanship. I understood the hon. gentleman to present the case in a different light, and I am merely dealing with the question of the dismissal of a public official for misconduct and of his re-instatement upon inquiry and in the belief that an injustice has been done him. We may introduce other questions, but dealing solely with the case of the appointment of this postmaster, I am not able to see anything in it beyond the simple fact of a mistake having been made, an injustice having been done, and that mistake having been corrected and that injustice having been remedied by the Postmaster General under the circumstances stated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that the Minister of Finance has very remarkable ideas as to the circumstances under which papers should be brought down. Here is a man who was dismissed by the Postmaster General, on his own fiat, upon the report of the post office inspector, and, notwithstanding that dismissal, it would appear that this postmaster remained in charge of the office for some months, and that finally his resignation was accepted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He never was in charge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I have a memorandum here on the file of the department which indicates that he was still in charge on the 19th of May, and the Postmaster General previously to that had signed this fiat that he should be dismissed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The order may have been made a few days before the 19th of May, but it would take a little time to put some person in charge. When instructions were given for his dismissal instructions were given about the same time to have a reliable person put in charge, and the postmaster was not left in charge a moment longer than was necessary to get some one to take charge of the office. The inspector had some reliable person in his mind and, when authorized, put that reliable person in charge. That took place, I think, a few days after the order was made, and from that time forward the late postmaster, I assume had no control of the office.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The information to which I have already referred is contained in a telegram of the 19th of May from the inspector to Mr. Smith, who, I think, is secretary of the department. The telegram says :

> The postmaster at Thessalon is still in charge.

He seems to be amazed that the postmaster should be still in charge, and on the 20th of May the secretary of the department wired Mr. Henderson, the inspector :

> Present arrangements are satisfactory if the accounts and cash are kept exclusively in the hands of the young woman.

Why should you keep a man there as postmaster during a considerable period, if his conduct has been such that it is necessary to keep the cash and accounts exclusively in the hands of one of his assistants ? But the significant circumstance in connection with this is that on the 21st of May the inspector reports to the Postmaster General—I gather from the memorandum it is to the Postmaster General himself—that the postmaster is under the impression that the difficulty may blow over and that he will still remain postmaster. That is a very significant circumstance. The Minister of Finance says that he could see no good public reason why these papers should be brought down. Let us examine that for a moment. The Postmaster General does not

deny that there has been at least embezzlement of the public funds; that there have been false returns; that there have been letters alleged to contain money sent forward as registered letters which did not contain money at all or which were not really forwarded at all, one or the other. Three different charges were enumerated by my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce), and I listened attentively to the Postmaster General in order that I might hear from him some denial that these three breaches of the criminal law had taken place. Now, I do not care whether it is the postmaster or whether it is some one else, an official of the department has been guilty, according to the facts which have been placed before the House and which are still uncontradicted; some person in the employ of the department has been guilty of these several offences. It is suggested by the Postmaster General that the postmaster himself—although his answers to the inspector would not lead to that conclusion—was not really guilty. I would find it very difficult indeed, without a formal investigation, without some better evidence than the mere statements of gentlemen who may have gone to the Postmaster General for that purpose; I would find it very difficult to believe that even if that money were abstracted by the assistant and relative of the postmaster at Thessalon, that that was not done at his instance and with his connivance. I would say that it would have been the duty, in my opinion, of the Postmaster General to have had a very careful, formal and official investigation before he allowed this man to escape on any such plea as that. The Minister of Finance thinks these papers should not be brought down. We have heard something of reputations—how is the reputation of the postmaster cleared by smirching the reputation of some one else? That is the way in which the defence has been put forward to-day—by attacking the reputation of a relative.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then I do not know what the Postmaster General means if he does not mean that.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Not attacking.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not care whether you call it attacking or not; you are transferring admitted guilt from the postmaster to the postmaster's assistant, you are doing that without any formal investigation, and when you do that you remove, you attempt at least to remove the stain from the character of the postmaster by placing that stain upon the character of the postmaster's assistant. It is in the public interest that the facts of the case should be laid fairly before parliament. it would seem to me that it is due especially to the postmaster himself that the facts to which the Postmaster General has alluded should be laid before parliament, in order that parliament may come to the conclusion that he is innocent if he be really innocent, and that thus his good name may be vindicated before the people of this country. I have been dealing so far only with the question of criminal responsibility, because if there is criminal responsibility, it seems to me that the government ought to place before parliament very good and sufficient reasons why the matter has not been followed up. There is a very significant sentence in the report of the inspector to the effect that he was thoroughly satisfied that there had been an understanding between the postmaster and his relative who was also his assistant. I do not think a judgment of that kind, which was come to by the post office inspector after a careful investigation of the circumstances on the spot, should be lightly set aside by the Postmaster General if he expects these officers to do their duty in the future.

But there is another element in the case, which the Postmaster General has not touched at all, and it is this. Let us assume for the moment that the postmaster was not really guilty of the offence which has been laid at his door by the report of the post office inspector. Let us assume that the embezzlement took place without his actual knowledge, and that he signed these false returns without actually knowing that they were false, is there anything in the circumstances of the case from one end to the other which would justify the Postmaster General in re-appointing him? Was there no other man in that town who could have been appointed to this office? It seems to me that the Postmaster General has attempted a defence only so far as criminal responsibility is concerned, and that he has not offered one word to this House in extenuation of his conduct in again appointing this man to this office without any report vindicating that man's character, certainly without any report vindicating his official performance of his duty. It seems to me that my hon. friend the Postmaster General could not have done this unless pressure of a most extraordinary character had been placed upon him for that purpose. I believe that the hon. gentleman, apart from those very strong partisan feelings which I think sometimes actuate him too much, tries to carry on his department in a businesslike way; but surely in this instance there must have been pressure of a most extraordinary character placed upon him, otherwise he could not have done what he has done.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There was not the slightest pressure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That still leaves my hon. friend the Postmaster General in an indefensible position absolutely. Some

reference has been made to the postmaster at Kentvale, a man who was dismissed because he had Conservative proclivities, although my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) states that he took no part in the election. I have two other instances in mind—the dismissal of a postmaster at Upper Musquodoboit in the county of Halifax, because some Conservatives met at his house. Certain Conservatives, of whom I was one, were travelling through the county of Halifax, and we stopped at his hotel. Some Conservatives of the surrounding district met at his house in the evening. He had been dismissed two or three years before for alleged offensive partisanship, but had been reinstated. The post office was removed about a mile away, and he was told that his services would be no longer required. In the same county the Kent post office was removed about a mile for the alleged reason that Miss Kent, whose family are Conservatives, must be deprived of the position in order that a strong supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite could be appointed. We know the doctrine that was laid down by the First Minister in 1897, when this matter was discussed in the House of Commons. He simply said: If any man in the public service of this country makes himself an offensive partisan, an active partisan, that is to say, if he takes an active part in the politics of his country, then I shall give him his full time to devote himself to that particular matter.' Here is a man against whom is the record disclosed by my hon. friend from West Algoma to-day, who takes the most active part that could be taken in the public affairs of this country, who goes upon the public platform and speaks, not only in one election but in two elections, and my hon. friend the Postmaster General sees fit, upon the recommendation I suppose of those whom that man assisted, to re-appoint him with this record staring him in the face. Surely we are entitled to take the words of the Prime Minister at their face value. They do not mean, as I understand them, that a man may be an offensive partisan provided he works for the Liberal party, but that he can not be an offensive partisan if he works for the opposite party. Yet from time to time, ever since that declaration was made eight years ago, we have seen the principle worked out just in the way in which it has been worked out in this case. I concur in the statement of my hon. friend from North Toronto that these papers ought to be brought down. There is no need, it seems to me, of any secrecy in this matter. Whatever aspersion may be cast by these papers on the postmaster's assistant, cannot be greater than the suspicion that has been cast upon that person by the words of the Postmaster General this afternoon. I trust therefore that the papers will be brought down, so that we may see exactly the nature of the evidence which has led my hon. friend the Postmaster General to absolutely disregard the report of his officer, who inquired into and reported upon this matter.

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). With regard to the particular instance in question, I have nothing to say, because I am not personally acquainted with the facts. But the honourable and learned leader of the opposition, in the course of his remarks, made an allusion to the removal of the postmaster of Middle Musquodoboit in the county of Halifax, of the facts of which he does not appear to be cognizant. He alluded to this subject a year or so ago when bringing up the question of the wrongful dismissal of this officer on which occasion he stated that the postmaster at Middle Musquodoboit had been——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend misunderstood me, it was the postmaster at Upper Musquodoboit, Mr. Stewart, not Mr. Kaulbach.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. He alluded to both.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not allude to the one at Middle Musquodoboit.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. This very interesting locality will have the eyes of Canada turned upon it on account of this discussion to-day. The postmaster at Middle Musquodoboit was dismissed, but not on the first complaint that was made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not allude to him at all.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. And not on account of the assembly of the notables in that district to meet the learned leader of the opposition, not on account of the influx of political partisans in that district on that occasion, but it was because it had been proved by the affidavits of three or four reputable people that he had both canvassed for the opposition candidate and that he had taken an active part in the organization of that district on behalf of the Liberal-Conservative party.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will my hon. friend tell me if that is a worse offence than the misappropriation of public funds?

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. I will be able to tell something about the misappropriation of public funds too if necessary. Now with regard to the question of the removal of the postmaster at Upper Musquodoboit, that gentleman was retained in office although his partisanship was well known and was most offensive to a large number of the residents of that locality, who repeatedly wrote letters to members asking for the dismissal of that gentleman on the ground of

political partisanship. Affidavits were sent that this gentleman had canvassed a number of individuals pending that election, and had used his influence and his office as the rendezvous for the choice spirits of the Conservative party in Upper Musquodoboit. I resisted for a long time recommending the removal of that individual but when it became known that in addition to his partisanship he had used personal abuse both to a number of leading gentlemen in that locality and personally to myself to my knowledge, I took upon myself to recommend that that very objectionable individual to whom the learned leader of the opposition has alluded to this afternoon be removed from his office as an object lesson to others in the vicinity that they were not to use their position and office to damage the government of which they are servants and to abuse residents in the locality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did the abuse take place? I am very much surprised.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. The abuse took place—I did not know the man at all. I was paying a visit to that portion of the country, and the first thing I knew I was abused by that gentleman from a wagon while passing through the woods. I did not know him, but I found out afterwards that it was the learned postmaster of Upper Musquodoboit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman tell me when it took place?

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. It took place previous to the election of 1900.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He has been in office for four years since.

Mr. WILLIAM ROCHE. That only proves what I have said, that I am a long-suffering individual.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It has been the habit of quite a considerable portion of the public press of this country, and particularly of pulpit speakers, to make the statement that Canada is so utterly dead to any sense of decency in politics that no matter what is said on either side of the House is applauded. I think if some of those editors or reverend gentlemen had been in this House to-day and had seen the Postmaster General sit down as he did amid profound silence on the other side of the House, with not a single bit of applause, they would at least admit that crimes may become so great that even partisans will not approve of them. That was the case this afternoon. I remember last year when Sir Richard Cartwright was brought to task in the celebrated Jackson case—and I must join with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that the conduct of Sir Richard Cartwright on that occasion was rather to be admired than that of the Postmaster General—Sir Richard Cartwright said plainly and fairly that a crime had been committed and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) omitted the most important part of Sir Richard's statement on that occasion, that while a crime had been committed a greater crime had been committed by Jackson in letting it be found out. The Postmaster General will not admit a crime has been committed although the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. William Roche) who has listened attentively to the discussion when he rose to speak would not say a word in approval of the conduct of the Postmaster General in this case. The Postmaster General has had some admirers I think among the independent press in this country, but I think after the explanation in this case they would shudder to think of that hon. gentleman being at the head of one of the large spending departments of the government of this country. He is at the head of a department where two things can be carried on, a certain amount of petty grafting and a large amount of vindictiveness, and the country generally knows that there is no minister who has pursued with greater vindictiveness officials who are not friendly to him politically, than the Postmaster General since he came into office. The hon. member for Lancaster recalls the great Grimsby case which was mentioned last year. What was the man's offence in that case? He was standing at his door and hearing from a man coming down the street the result of the poll he said: If that is the case, Mr. Gibson is defeated. The Postmaster General who is so tender hearted to-day, without any regard for that man's family or feelings drove him out of his position. I need not recall many other cases where nothing but vindictiveness was stamped on the face as the sole and only reason for men being put out of office. Let us consider how the hon. gentleman regards the conduct of his own department in other respects. We had a case the other day. A post office contract expired—and I do not know how many similar cases might be discovered if inquiry were made—and without asking for tenders, although the 'Courier' had received only $140 odd, the Postmaster General undertook to advance his salary to $160 for this mail service in utter defiance of the law.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. What law?

Mr. BENNETT. The law that the Postmaster General cannot give what he pleases to a courier.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is there anything in the law which prevents my doing so?

Mr. BENNETT. Common decency, and I hope and trust that there is law in this country to say that the Postmaster General cannot give mail contracts at whatever

figure he thinks right. Had the hon. gentleman called for tenders, the work would have been performed at a cheaper rate than it was at first, but without any warrant or authority he increases the pay from $140 odd to $160 a year. And what is the reason? Because the man is one of the strongest partisans in that district. My hon. friend from Halifax has pointed out that because a postmaster permitted people to come to his house that is sufficient to make it a rendezvous and have him dismissed. In the adjoining riding of Simcoe they go on the platform with the approval of the Postmaster General and if he will dismiss him I will give him the name of a postmaster there——

Mr. LANCASTER. I shall give another.

Mr. BENNETT. He will not dismiss him because he is one of the hangers on. How does he deal with the patronage in his department? Thousands and thousands of dollars worth of supplies have to be purchased for the use of the department throughout the Dominion, thousands of dollars have to be spent for repairs of mail-bags. Are tenders asked for this work? Boots are required for the carriers in Hamilton. Why the hon. gentleman who represents Hamilton on that side (Mr. Zimmerman) has not influence enough apparently to have $400 worth of boots for the men in his own constituency in connection with the postal service supplied by a firm in that constituency.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. My hon. friend forgets that I have only been a member of this House a very short time, but I would like to know if the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has tried to get that patronage?

Mr. BENNETT. When my hon. friend on the Liberal side cannot get it what chance can there be for my hon. friend on the Conservative side?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have not tried to get it.

Mr. BENNETT. We have the fact that the Postmaster General does not think it beneath himself to take up to a little country town like Aurora, in his own constituency, thousands of dollars worth of patronage in order to strengthen himself. One would think he ought to be a little courageous especially when he represents what was supposed to be, until the last local elections, a Grit hive, and give that patronage to other ridings where it rightfully belongs. He tells us that no pressure was brought on him to have this postmaster reappointed. But let the House bear in mind the dates of his dismissal and reappointment. Mr. Dobie resigned on the 21st May, 1904, and was not reappointed until the 16th February, 1905. Does the Postmaster General expect any men of this House or any person in Thessalon or Algoma to be so supremely innocent or idiotic as to believe that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) was not continually pleading for the reinstatement of this official? Why, the evidence upon which he was reinstated was all before the minister when the minister dismissed him. There is not a word in that record in rebuttal of the statements made to Inspector Henderson. Mr. Henderson went to Thessalon and made a full inquiry. He found that the daughter of the postmaster there, who was his assistant, had given out of the till public moneys to her father. On one occasion she had handed her father $450 to buy a house. I need not traverse the ground of defence. The salary of the postmaster in a town of that size is paid every month. How then could the postmaster at Thessalon believe that there was $450 due him for a month's salary, when his salary is only $1,000 per year? On another occasion she gave him $172 out of the till to buy pulp wood, on another $200 and on still another $300. Why, in those sums alone there is $1,000 involved, and therefore how could the postmaster pretend, with any show of plausibility, that this was salary? The dates will show that these payments were all crowded together, and no doubt were made to meet certain exigencies not connected with the public service at all. But the fact of the matter is that in that part of the country such an offence is simply winked at. It has never been supposed that there was any administration of the criminal law in that section. Take the outrages committed at the Soo in connection with the elections there, when the very men to whom was intrusted the administration of the criminal law simply laughed at those offences and condoned them. It is notorious that the administration of criminal law in Ontario, particularly in Algoma, has been a farce. Mr. Dobey was a strong partisan and knew that he would have the support of the member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment), and of Mr. Wigg the local candidate, and of the criminal prosecutors in that district, and consequently felt quite certain that nothing would be done to him. And nothing would have been done if his case had not been brought to the notice of the House. I do not suppose that even after this exposure, the man will be dismissed. We had a somewhat similar case yesterday afternoon of an agent at Fort Macleod who put all the blame on his son, and in this case we have the postmaster at Thessalon saddling all the responsibility on his daughter. He should be dismissed for his cowardice if for nothing else. This incident gives a little insight into what is going on at Ottawa. Whether there have been other similar cases or not in the Post Office Department I am not aware, but I know from the public accounts that the Postmaster General distributes patronage in his own

riding in order to assist himself, and at the expense of the public. Go all over the province of Ontario, and you will see those large iron boxes placed on the different streets for the reception of letters and other mail matter. Does any one believe that those boxes are furnished at a fair price, that tenders are invited, and the contract for them given to the lowest bidder ? Not by any means. They are given out to the strongest partisans of the Postmaster General in the little town of Aurora, and are made in a small foundry there instead of being given out to public competition. These people last year were paid $3,500 for these boxes ; and year by year the Postmaster General, in order to strengthen himself in that riding, is giving out contracts for thousands of dollars worth of supplies without tender. The House has been furnished an example this afternoon of the tension which the Postmaster General's conscience can stand. I have had similar instances in many an election contest in the province of Ontario and am in a position to judge of the elasticity of the hon. gentleman's conscience.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have some remarks to make on the matter before the House.

Mr. FIELDING. It was understood that the House would not sit to-night, and if the hon. gentleman is not going to be long we might wait a little.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Better adjourn the discussion as there are others who wish to take part in it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only question before the House is the motion to go into supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The debate can be continued whenever the motion is again made to go into supply.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps we had better formally go into supply now, and then, when another day the motion is made to go into supply, the debate can be renewed.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING. We will not meet again to-night, owing to members being engaged elsewhere. I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the House meets again, I hope the Postmaster General will be able to bring down the papers on this subject to which reference has been made, in time for any further discussion.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will take the matter into my serious consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

Mr. BENNETT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 19, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 164)) to incorporate the Monarch Bank of Canada.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 165) respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 166) respecting certain patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 167) for the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—Mr. Johnston (Lambton).

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I beg to lay on the table the report of His Honour Judge Winchester on the investigation respecting the alleged employment of aliens by the Père Marquette Railway Company.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman explain shortly what the result of the report is ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The report finds that in a number of cases the Père Marquette Railway Company has imported aliens contrary to the Alien Labour Act. I think it would be advisable to have the report printed, and I would make a motion to that effect.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it the intention of the government to introduce any amendments to the Alien Labour law this year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No conclusion has been come to. That is under consideration.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I would like to inquire if there is any probability of my getting a return which I moved for some time ago, showing the number of permanent appointments made in the civil service since 1896 ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As the session threatens to be a long one, I think my hon. friend will have an opportunity of getting his return.

THESSALON, ONT., POSTMASTER.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Speaker, the leader of the opposition asked me yesterday whether there would be any objection to my laying on the table copies of the papers in connection with the Thessalon post office matter, which was under discussion yesterday. I told him I would think over the matter. I have done so ; I see no

objection, and I will have copies of the papers prepared and laid on the table at the earliest possible moment.

THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. H. LENNOX. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question. On the 22nd of February the matter to which I wish to refer was under discussion, and after it had been pointed out that there was no provision in the Railway Act, the right hon. gentleman said :

I must say that I have a confession to make to the House, and a confession that is not pleasant to me. I did not know that the commission was not only not empowered but not obliged to make a report. I have always understood that it was part of the duty of the commission to make a yearly report of their operations ; not only of the money which we gave them to spend as to how they have expended it—and for this we are responsible to parliament—but also of their operations, what they have done, what cases they have decided, so that the public could know exactly what has taken place. We have a right to that information, and if it is found after a conference with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways, who is more familiar than I am with the Act, that the commission is not bound to make such a report, I think we should enact legislation this very session to have such a report from the commission. I shall at once call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this. If the commission is not under obligation to make such a report it is due to parliament that it should be at once put under such an obligation.

I wish to ask the right hon. gentleman if that conference with the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways has taken place and with what result ? I ask this question as I do not see that any legislation has been introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that a report will be ready in a very short time.

Mr. LENNOX. What I asked more particularly was whether the Minister of Justice is of the opinion that there is a necessity for an amendment to the Act.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give an answer to-day. I do not know that he has expressed an opinion.

SUPPLY—THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a matter which came up on Wednesday. In reply to a question from me regarding the report of the Railway Commission, that hon. minister said :

I would say to my hon. friend that the report has not been laid before the House and the department is not in a position to lay such a report on the table, but as soon as I am in a position to do so I will submit it to the House.

Further on, when I called attention to the fact that a promise had been made, and that it was difficult to understand why the hon. minister did not carry out his promise, he said :

I think my hon. friend must be under some misapprehension as to any assurance that I gave him in respect to the placing of such a report upon the table of the House. I said that I would exercise due diligence in endeavouring to get that report and that I had been assured by the railway commissioners that such a report would be prepared. I have not received such a complete report. I was mixing up the two commissions. You are asking in respect to the Railway Commission ?

Mr. LENNOX. The Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not received that complete report yet, but I am expecting it.

As the hon. minister seemed to be under the impression that no definite promise had been made, I took occasion on Wednesday, to show that such a promise had been made at least two months previous. On the 3rd March the hon. minister then said :

I had a conference with the chairman of the Railway Commission, and he stated that the secretary of the commission was now preparing such a report. As soon as it is placed in my hands I will lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the hon. minister state any definite time when it will be ready ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not ask the exact date. Only to-day the chairman assured me that it was being prepared, but I did not ask whether it would be ready in a day or two. I assumed it would be ready in the near future.

Again speaking definitely on the 17th March, exactly two months ago, he said :

A report has been promised, and I hope to have it within a few days.

Not only on the two occasions I have referred to, but also on the 22nd February we were definitely given to understand that a report would be brought down without delay. In view of all these promises, it was rather extraordinary that two days ago the minister said he never did make any definite promise and was not in a position to make one. In fact the matter seemed to have slipped from his mind altogether. Not only is that the unfortunate position of things, but we have not yet had the amendment to the statute which the First Minister promised us on the 22nd February nor can we get any definite information about it. It is very unfortunate that this omission should have occurred in the Railway Act, but apart altogether from that Act, we would have expected the Railway Commission to have had a specific report ready before parliament met. Not only should we have from this Railway Commission a general report on that branch of the service which is costing the people so much money, but we should have a special

report from the late chairman of the commission (Mr. Blair) who made a special tour in the United States in order to acquire some expert knowledge of the working of commissions of this kind. The report of the Railway Commission itself as to all its doings and all its expenditure should have been in the hands of the Minister of Railways before parliament assembled and that report should have been embodied in the report of the minister. Yet we have the unfortunate condition of things that the minister was bound to admit two days ago that he knows practically nothing about the matter yet, that he has taken no definite action to procure definite information which the House required and as far as he is concerned it had practically slipped from his mind. Now having called the attention of the minister to it in this way I trust that some effort will be made to have this report laid upon the table of the House at once so that we may know what this commission is doing, particularly as it is a new departure, and we should be able to judge whether it is carrying out the expectations which those who framed the Act had in view at the time the Railway Act, 1903, was introduced.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). On Wednesday I stated that I could not give any definite assurance as to the time when the report from the Railway Commission could be expected. I had at that time in mind the fact that I had on a former occasion expressed to the House my hope that I would soon be in a position to lay on the table of the House the report of that board for the reason that I had been told by the chairman that such a report was in course of preparation. I have not yet received that report although I have looked for it on more than one occasion. I have however some assurance and hope that I will be able to place it on the table by Monday next at the latest. I of course am dependent upon the Railway Commissioners in the matter. It is not something under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals; I cannot force the commission to make a report, as it does not emanate from my department, and therefore I cannot be held responsible for its non-production, but I shall hope that it may be forthcoming at least by Monday next.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. On March 3rd this question was first asked, something over two and a half months ago, and now the minister admits that he cannot force the commissioners to submit a report to him. That is one very good, strong reason why an amendment to the Railway Act should have been introduced compelling the Railway Commission to make a report to this House. The people of this country are expending large sums of money for the purpose of having a Railway Commission, and that parliament is to be deprived of all control over that Railway Commission is something I cannot understand, and I think in view of the statement made by the First Minister the government are a little lax in introducing their amendment to the Railway Bill. In this particular instance, I think parliament is entitled to a report and that steps should be taken at the earliest possible moment to have the Act amended in that direction.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to his words on February 22. He says now that he has no control over these gentlemen, but on page 1532 of the Revised 'Hansard' he says:

> I am only endeavouring to point out what I consider to be the law. I am quite free to admit that there should be a report from the commission. I am quite in accord with what has been stated in that regard, and I think that the commissioners should make a report from time to time to the Governor in Council through the Department of Railways and Canals, for as my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) says, if this commission is not in any way connected with the government through the Department of Railways and Canals, he cannot see any other department by which it would be thus connected. I quite agree with him that the natural avenue and channel between that board and the government is through the Department of Railways and Canals, but it does not seem to me that the Act makes proper provision for that.

The minister on that occasion admitted that there should be a provision for a report and that immediate steps should be taken to force the commission if they would not act, and that such a provision should be introduced at once if it was not already in the Railway Act. We have had no intimation that any step has been taken towards a remedy of that very peculiar omission which occurs in the Railway Act.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite adhere to my expressions of a former date in connection with a report from that commission. I might state to my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) that he need not become suddenly impatient. There seems to be some weeks, at least some days before us, before the close of this session, and we must remember that there are quite a number of amendments under consideration; a Bill is now on the order paper making amendments to the Railway Act, and before that Bill goes through and is considered by the committee I think that it will be my duty and privilege to submit to the House some amendments and among these there may be found one that will cure the defect in the Act in connection with the report. We have been pretty well occupied during this session with work; at least there have been Bills that have received a little consideration, and I would not wish to interfere in any way with the progress of matters of that kind with any legislation affecting railways, but the Railway Department will have its turn in connection with legislation

and I hope my hon. friend will not be too impatient.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER. I do not think it is quite fair for the hon. Minister of Railways to suggest that the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is impatient in this matter. We have been here four or five months waiting for legislation from the government and have had only one piece of legislation which my hon. friend properly says has taken up a good deal of time. But that is not the fault of the opposition but the fault of the legislation which the government has introduced. It is legislation which is very controversial and very peculiar. This Railway Commission was appointed two years ago and for two years the Dominion of Canada has had that commission, but the people have had not a tittle of official evidence or information as to what that commission is doing, not one particle of information have the people of Canada as to whether that commission is doing anything like what was expected when it was appointed. I have a good deal of respect for the commission as a whole and for the individual members of it, but this is an instance where all public servants will do as they like if there is not some restraining or guiding hand in the shape of legislation or rules to govern them to which they must submit. Instead of lecturing the House and the hon. member who spoke in the interests of the people, I think the Minister of Railways or some member of the government should apologize to the House and the country for their laxity in this matter. It is not a matter that should be treated with levity. We have a large expenditure connected with this Railway Commission, and they were appointed to do work that is most important to the country. We do not know nor do the people of the country know at all except in cases where they have hunted up information for themselves,—sometimes at a good deal of expense, and always with a good deal of trouble,—what that commission is doing. They are not responsible apparently to the Minister of Railways or to the government in the matter of making a report. I do not see why there was not legislation introduced last session in this connection for this matter was known last session. On February 22 of this year as has been said, attention was drawn to it and the hon. member for South Simcoe then brought the matter up. The Prime Minister on that occasion said :

> I shall at once call the attention of the Minister of Justice to this. If the commission is not under obligation to make such a report it is due to parliament that it should be at once put under such an obligation.

That was on the 22nd of February of this year, and here we are practically three months later and nothing has been done. Now 'at once' might mean, I should think less than three months' time. Parliament is in session and I do think we ought to have a little more speed in this matter. To-day we were promised in a very cursory, almost off-handed way by the minister. that there will be some other measure in regard to the amendment of the Railway Act which is supposed to be dealt with this session and which is now on the order paper. It is certainly as important as any legislation that has been introduced by the government, or promised by the government. I do not think that the manner in which the Minister of Railways treats this House would inspire the public with much hope that the government are going to do any better in the future than they have been doing the last few years ; and if not, I think the censure of the people should be visited upon this government. I would urge upon the government, so far as I have any influence, at least I would request the government as representing my constituency in this House, to take immediate action. I do not wish to allow this occasion to go by without putting on record my protest and the protest of my constituents against the dilatoriness with which the government has treated this matter, the want of care, the lack of appreciation of the importance of the matter, which I think the government has evinced. This matter is one which demands a remedy at once, and we ought to have better assurance than we have yet had from the Minister of Railways that it will be attended to, and that the Railway Commission will be charged with the duty of making this report, either quarterly, half yearly or yearly, at all events at some set time, when these reports will become public documents and open to inspection by the public, so that the people can learn what is going on with regard to this matter, and all those other numerous matters that the commission has to deal with. The House desires to learn how the commission is working, and whether any other amendments are required in order to make it fulfil the intention of its appointment.

Mr. D. A. GORDON. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to a condition of affairs that I think requires his attention and the attention of the commission. I refer to rates that are charged by American roads entering Canada and passing through this country What we ask is that the same rates, the same conditions and the same privileges be demanded of them as they are obliged to grant to the people of the United States. I think this proposition is reasonable and fair, and I know it is one of great moment to the people of Ontario. The American roads entering Canada name what rates they like on commodities originating in the states for people in Canada, but when they enter Canadian territory they do not give proportionate rates. We ask that this matter be taken into consideration, and if the facts

justify it, that the matter be laid before the commission to be dealt with by them. Let me say a word with reference to the commission and its acts during the past year. If there is any one who is not familiar with the decisions that have been rendered by that commission I think he has himself to blame. I do not think there is a farmer in Canada to-day but knows of the sweeping decisions that have been made with regard to rates on cattle and rates on grain. The decisions given in favour of manufacturers in regard to rates, so far as those decisions are obligatory, have been of such importance that to-day the commission is swamped with appeals ; no less than 1,450 complaints have been placed before the commission since it was appointed, and the great bulk of them I think have been disposed of. The position of American roads running through Canada has been so well discussed that it is not necessary for me to refer to it at any length now. I hope, however, that the tariffs, the minimums, and also the classifications affecting shippers, will be looked into, and that they will be made applicable to conditions existing in this country, and we firmly believe that a solution will be found to the present difficulties and complaints that require to be remedied.

Mr. EMMERSON. In reply to my hon. friend, I may say that the question he has raised is one of very great importance, so much so, indeed that it demands earnest and prompt consideration. The particular point to which he has invited attention has been referred to on more than one occasion within recent weeks. I think there was some discussion with respect to it in this House. I can give my hon. friend assurance that the Department of Railways has had the matter under consideration, and has invited the consideration of the government to action in the direction which he has indicated. I trust that before the session closes, in connection with the amendments that are to be introduced to the Railway Act, there will be found a remedy for the grievance which he alleges to exist. I may say that my own view was that there was a provision in certain sections of the Act, notably section 273; but if it is found not to go far enough, I think it is the desire of this House to make a remedy complete and beyond question.

THESSALON, ONT., POSTMASTER.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Before you leave the chair—I see the Postmaster General is not in his place—I would ask the Prime Minister if, in bringing down the papers with reference to the Thessalon post office which the hon. gentleman promised a little while ago, he would see that the salary warrants issued by the postmaster up to the 31st of August, 1904, are brought down ; also that a statement showing the amounts paid to the postmaster on account of salary up to the 19th of May, 1904, be included in the papers laid on the table of the House for the information of the House.

Motion agreed to, House went into Committee of Supply.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). We will take up the supplementary estimates for the current year, these being balances that are required to wind up the affairs of the current year.

Civil government—Post Office Department—further amount required for contingencies, $1,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) any account of that ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). I do not know anything about the item. I have no doubt that $1,000 is a small item in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to inquire if any portion of this sum is required to pay the salary of this postmaster ? Just for the information of the hon. Postmaster General I will read a portion of a letter that has been sent to me. It is as follows :

Now, Mr. Taylor, I beg your kind indulgence for a few moments while I call your attention to the way in which the deputy returning officer and his poll clerk conducted the election proceedings at polling division No. 3, Kitley, where I was agent in your behalf. The deputy returning officer was George Milton Leverette, the village postmaster, and his polling clerk was Benjamin Franklin Stewart, a carriage maker. From the opening to the closing of the poll the deputy returning officer ran things with a high hand. Everything was trampled under foot. Oaths of office, the statutes and myself, not physically but officially, were trampled under foot and completely ignored. Never did I see such brazen defiance of law and right. It was plainly manifest that the Grit machine was doing business at the old stand as brisk as ever and had established a local branch at Frankville under management of the deputy returning officer and his poll clerk. To enumerate some of the violations of the law committed by these two election officials, I wish to say that the deputy returning officer in defiance of a protest from me placed the ballot box on the floor to the right of his chair ; when so placed it was behind the table and entirely out of the view of those present. I read the law to him, but he emphatically told me it was on the floor and was going to stay there and I might help myself if I could. All that was left for me to do was to seat myself on a chair beside it, which I did. Another thing, he said he did not have the required statutory dates to be inserted in the oath to voters, but I really did not believe him. Fortunately, however, I supplied this want by having them myself under certificate of the township clerk, otherwise I do not believe I should have been able to have sworn a voter at all that day. Again, he allowed his poll clerk to act as agent for your opponent, Gibson, in the absence of duly appointed agents. I protested, but was powerless. The poll clerk told a voter, one Frank Livingston, whom I

challenged, that I was doing dirty work, and was only trying to bluff him out of his good vote. Through these encouraging words of the poll clerk the voter took the oath and voted. To-day he stands a perjured man. Something more yet. The deputy returning officer put some private mark or number on the stub of the ballots besides the number he was entitled by law to put on the counterfoil. Here again, I protested, but was told that he was doing so and would continue to do so and I might help myself if I could. I asked to see that private mark or number, but was refused. Now, Mr. Taylor, if I could afford the expense I would go to Gananoque to see you personally about these matters. Something should be done. An example should be made of these two election officials because if not they will be bolder than ever the next time. The matter, however, will be left entirely in your hands. Many Conservatives here say that the matter should be attended to and that prosecutions should follow. As for the deputy returning officer, you can do what you like with him. You can bring his case up on the floor of the House next session or deal with him otherwise as you think best.

I would like to inquire of the hon. Postmaster General if any portion of this sum is to pay that man's salary. I draw these facts to the hon. minister's attention. There is his officer, a postmaster, drawing probably $1,000 a year salary, and yet he goes and acts as a partisan, ignores the law and conducts an election in the manner here described.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No portion of this item will go to pay the salary of any postmaster. There is in the estimates always an item for salaries. If my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) will turn to the estimates he will find that that is so. Having made an explanation and as this matter is not connected with this item I have nothing further to say, but if it is proposed to continue the discussion perhaps there may be some further question that would occur to my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to know if the hon. gentleman approves of this conduct on the part of one of his postmasters, and if any portion of this amount is to pay his salary will he spend some of it in conducting an investigation into the actions of one of his officers who has conducted himself in this way ? I should further like to ask the hon. gentleman, if the investigation shows that these statements are correct, will he dismiss his official ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I should think this is not the tribunal to deal with the conduct of men who are engaged in conducting an election. There is a way of reaching them under the election law. If I correctly heard my hon. friend reading that letter it was written prior to the meeting of the House and he has had it for many months in his possession. The law gives him a remedy. Every person who undertakes to act as an officer of the Crown in conducting an election is bound to conform to the law, and if he fails to conform to the law the law is within the reach of every person, my hon. friend and all others, and there are officers whose duty it is to prosecute persons who violate the Election Act. It is not the duty of the Postmaster General. It is the duty of the officers who are engaged in the administration of criminal justice to prosecute. I know nothing about the matter. I do not even know the name of the person, and it would be an extraordinary thing if I had to inquire into the conduct of officers as to the manner in which they might or might not have conducted themselves when they were appointed to positions having nothing whatever to do with their positions connected with this department.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend is quite right in saying that this letter was written some time ago, but this is the first opportunity I have had of dealing with the matter. When the estimates of the Post Office Department were taken up I embraced the first opportunity I had.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. We passed supplementaries months ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was not present when the items of the Post Office Department came up or I certainly should have referred to this matter then. Will the hon. Postmaster General allow one of his paid servants, drawing a salary of probably $1,000 a year, to accept a position as deputy returning officer at an election and violate the Election Act in a partisan manner as this postmaster has done ? I gave the hon. Postmaster General his name. It is Mr. Leverette, postmaster at Frankville. If public officials are at liberty to run post offices and to act as partisan agents the country ought to know it. The country authorizes him to employ these officials but he says he is not responsible for their conduct. He says that the hon. member can take proceedings under the law. There are the courts of law, but I want to take the proper course. I bring it to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General, and I ask him to deal with it, or let the country know that postmasters and all other officials under this government are at liberty to do as they please, that while being paid for their services by the country they may at the same time conduct themselves as offensive partisans.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I think it is no part of my duty as Postmaster General to inquire into the manner in which officials of my department may have conducted themselves, should they be appointed to such positions as those of deputy returning officers. I have not heard of this man's existence until this minute, and I do believe it has been the practice throughout Canada under all governments from time to time to make use of various officials for the proper conduct of

elections. If these officials in the discharge of their duties as election clerks, or poll clerks, or returning officers do not comply with the election laws they are amenable to these laws. It is not my duty to follow them in all their other spheres of life ; my duty is confined to seeing that they perform their duties as postmasters, and if they undertake other duties they become answerable to some other tribunal, and that is the tribunal to which my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) should appeal. This is not the place to try that question, and I think my hon. friend would be more in order by referring the conduct of this gentleman as returning officer, to his superior in that capacity who would be interested in maintaining the proper management of elections.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Postmaster General knows that he has dismissed a great many postmasters throughout Canada for alleged political interference, and only yesterday we had the case of a postmaster with a salary of $25 who was dismissed simply because he exercised the right of franchise. Here is a man with a salary of probably $1,000, and he can be as offensive a partisan as he likes, and when I ask the Postmaster General to investigate and have him dismissed if the charge is correct, the Postmaster General says he will not interfere.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) asked me if I would investigate the manner in which this gentleman acted as returning officer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, I asked the Postmaster General to investigate the charge that this postmaster has been an offensive partisan in not discharging his duty faithfully and in doing it in an offensive partisan manner. If that is true the postmaster should be dismissed.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman is evidently mixing up his grievances, and he does not make clear what he really desires. I understand from his letter and from his remarks that this officer is charged with two offences, but I thought the gravamen of the hon. gentleman's charge was that this postmaster had not properly conducted an election, and not that he was an offensive partisan in the discharge of his post office duties. The hon. gentleman referred to this man having placed a ballot box in some place contrary to law, and he seemed to dwell upon that feature of the charge. My remarks were directed to that, and I say that as to the manner in which he may have acted as an officer for the proper conduct of elections it is not for me to interfere. If there is a charge that he has contravened any of the rules of conduct for a postmaster it is my duty to investigate.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is all I ask.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. If the hon. gentleman will send me a charge against this postmaster in that respect I will have it investigated, but I would not feel at liberty to inquire into his alleged misconduct as a returning officer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have made my charge here and the Postmaster General will see it written down verbatim in 'Hansard' to-morrow, and every word that appears in 'Hansard' will be substantiated. This man has acted illegally, and I ask if it is the policy of the government to let their postmasters act as deputy returning officers in an offensive partisan manner ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Let us not misunderstand. My hon. friend mixes up his grievances.

Mr. TAYLOR. I mixed up nothing ; I read the letter.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. He asks whether or not it is the policy of the government to allow postmasters to act as deputy returning officers in an offensive manner. It is not the policy of the department to allow postmasters to assist in an offensive manner under any circumstances, either as deputy returning officers or in any other capacity, and I am quite willing to investigate that branch of my hon. friend's complaint. If there is a complaint that as a deputy returning officer this man contravened the election law, I do not think my hon. friend will expect me to inquire into that phase of his conduct. I am quite prepared to take my hon. friend's speech and the letter, in the light that I interpret it and so far as this man's conduct as postmaster is concerned I am quite prepared to investigate that.

Mr. LANCASTER. Will the Postmaster General tell us what he thinks about allowing postmasters to act as deputy returning officers at all ? The Postmaster General says that this House is not a tribunal for trying election cases, but I would remind him that it is a tribunal for trying the conduct of the Post Office Department. Does the Postmaster General want us to understand that he has no objection whatever of opportunity for money being embezzled cers ? I will leave out of the question for the moment whether this postmaster acted in an offensive way or not ; I will not consider whether it may be another case of opportunity for money being embezzled while the postmaster is not in charge of his office ; but I would ask the Postmaster General if he thinks that a postmaster should act as a deputy returning officer when in the discharge of his duties as such he must of necessity be away from his post office from about half-past eight in the morning until six o'clock on the evening of election day ? Does the Postmaster General think that is right ? The Postmaster relies upon the technicality, that he cannot investigate

this man's conduct as deputy returning officer but that he can investigate it as postmaster, and that being so does he believe that the postmaster should for an entire day be absent from the post office. We all know that the party in power selects these deputy returning officers from amongst men of their own political persuasion, but I will not press that particular phase of the question for the moment. I wish to know now from the Postmaster General if he approves of postmasters acting in a capacity which must keep them away from their post offices for an entire day ?

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. I am prepared to state here that the postmaster in question, Mr. Leverette, is a first-class man, and I say further that he is a man who would transact any business he has to do in a proper way. If he is a returning officer he is a man who will discharge his duties in a legal manner, and as postmaster or in any other capacity he will be found to be a faithful officer. But, to expect that a man who only gets a couple of hundred dollars per year for running a post office shall devote all his time to that office is perfect nonsense. Such a man must undertake any business that comes in his way. I have no doubt that Mr. Leverette when he does vote will vote Liberal, and vote against the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), but I am satisfied that he will be found to be honest and faithful in the discharge of any duties that are entrusted to him.

Mr. FINLAY. I can tell my hon. friends opposite that I have a case in my county of a somewhat similar kind to that which we are now discussing. In the town in which I live the postmaster is Mr. J. B. Pearce, a Conservative who has been twenty years in the post office, and I can prove that he went out and canvassed against me, and canvassed strongly against me too.

Mr. HAGGART. The Postmaster General since he came to office has established some very bad precedents which he now finds are embarrassing. The rule used to be that every postmaster except those in cities and towns had a right to be an active partisan in an election if he wished. Because he held a little post office worth $7 or $8 a year, he was not to be debarred from taking part on behalf of either the Conservative or the Reform candidate ; and I think that was the true principle. That principle has been infringed upon by the Postmaster General, who has dismissed this postmaster without a trial and after he denied being an active partisan. It was sufficient for the hon. Postmaster General to get a note from the member of the House saying that a certain postmaster had been an active partisan in the election, and he was dismissed. I have heard the Postmaster General asked in this House if there had been an investigation, and his reply was : No, it was a sufficient reason for him to receive information from the member representing the riding that a postmaster had been an active partisan. It is small politics for any representative of the government to interfere with that kind of officer. Except in cities and towns, postmasters have a right to be active partisans on either side if they wish, and there should be no interference with them by the Postmaster General or any other person as to how they voted.

Mr. TISDALE. I agree with what has been said by the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and I will tell you how this matter has been managed in the county of Norfolk up to the present time. The local member, Mr. W. A. Charlton, the late Speaker of the Ontario legislature, was the postmaster for many years at a small village called Lyndoch. He did not attend to the post office himself, but one of his clerks did so. Mr. Charlton always stumped the riding against me. I was applied to in regard to this, but I declined to interfere with him for any political act. I said that if any one had a charge to make as to the way the office was run, I would see that it would be investigated and dealt with. In two of my elections, another gentleman who was a postmaster, and is still postmaster, though his father ran the post office while he lived two miles from the village, was president of the Reform Association and an active opponent of mine. The same kind of application was made to me with regard to him ; but I declined to go further than to have an investigation made into any charge that might be made against him in connection with the work of the post office. We have never introduced this small politics into the county on either side. So far this has been the rule followed by this government. I agree with the hon. member for South Lanark that outside of cities and towns, where postmasters are paid for giving their whole time to the service, there should be no interference with postmasters. It is a shameful practice on either side in regard to these petty offices, and I would oppose my own party indulging in it, whatever anybody else might think about it. I would be opposed to it even in retaliation. In Norfolk we have strenuous politics, but we have never found it necessary to resort to that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Finlay) complains that a Conservative postmaster in his district took part against him in the election.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. He had a perfect right to.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, he had a perfect right to, as my hon. friend from Brockville says. When I came here in 1882, when a Con-

servative government was in power, there were a great many postmasters throughout my county who had taken an active part against me. One was the father of my opponent in two elections. He helped his son all he could; yet he continued to keep the post office and died in the service. I never raised a finger against him, because it was his right to do as he did. As my hon. friend from Brockville knows, the Newborough postmaster has also been an active partisan against me in every election; but I never asked for his dismissal, because he had a right to do as he did, and he is postmaster yet. But where a postmaster accepts another position, such as deputy returning officer, and carries into that his offensive partisanship, as this postmaster did, then I think it is time to complain. But the policy adopted by the Postmaster General, when a Conservative postmaster is complained against, though he does nothing more than vote, is to dismiss him without trial.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There is no such case on record, as a man dismissed because he voted. Every postmaster has a right to vote as he likes, and he has never been interfered with.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to give the case of a man who was dismissed simply for voting. The postmaster of Beauharnois, named Doutre, was dismissed because he voted. He never took any other part in the election, and there was no investigation into his case.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I must, as far as parliamentary rules will allow me, give an emphatic contradiction to the statement of the hon. gentleman. No dismissal has ever taken place anywhere except on my authority, and I have never given authority to dismiss anybody for such a cause. The circumstances are not what my hon. friend thinks they are.

Mr. BERGERON. It is very easy for my hon. friend to say so.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is very easy for the hon. gentleman to make the other statement.

Mr. BERGERON. I remember the discussion here at the time. There was no investigation, it was denied that the man had done anything improper, and he was dismissed purely and simply because he had voted Conservative.

Mr. FIELDING. How is it known how he voted?

Mr. BERGERON. It is supposed that he voted Conservative. That was not even proved, but that was the reason alleged at the time. He was getting $40 a year, and he is on the street now. When my hon. friend was talking of kind-heartedness, I thought of that case.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Governor General's Secretary's office—Clerical assistance, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $250; further amount required for contingencies, $2,000; $2,250.

Mr. FIELDING. These two items have been requested by the Governor General's secretary to enable the office to complete the transactions of the year. The first is for an additional clerk, and the latter is for the general contingent account.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is the new clerk?

Mr. FIELDING. A young lady who came out with His Excellency from England.

Department of the Geological Survey—To pay Frank J. Nicolas as editor of the publications, from December 5, 1904, to June 30, 1905, at $125 per month, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $858.87.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will explain this item, as I was in charge of the department before my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior took charge of it. Dr. Bell, the superintendent of the Geological Survey, represented to me that he was under the necessity of having further aid in order to advance the publication of the reports of the survey. Mr. Nicolas has had experience in that branch of work in England, and upon the recommendation of Dr. Bell that he was qualified and that the work was absolutely necessary, I authorized the insertion of this item in the estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. He has some technical knowledge?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I understood from Dr. Bell. I do not know Mr. Nicolas and have never seen him, and this was done on the recommendation of Dr. Bell.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it a permanent appointment?

Sir WILFRID. No; this is only to cover his appointment to the 1st July. In the supplementary estimates for next year there will be an appropriation for him also.

Mr. HAGGART. When there is a vote taken for these extra clerks in the Geological Survey, or any other department, there ought to be a report from the deputy head showing the necessity of the appointment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have such a report from Dr. Bell.

Department of the Secretary of State—to pay Peter J. O'Donnell for services as messenger from July 1st, the date of his appointment, to November 8th, 1904, at the rate of $500 per annum, $176.36.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a case where the officer is being paid for a short time prior to his passing the examination. He passed the examination, but was actually in the service a short time before, and this is to cover his allowance during that period.

Mr. SPROULE. Whose place did he take ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is not an increase in the staff. The messenger who had the position before left the service.

Board of Civil Service Examiners—to meet extra cost of examination, $100.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the cost of the whole board ?

Mr. FIELDING. The usual vote is $3,000, and this is an addition of $100.

Mr. BERGERON. It may increase like that every year.

Mr. FIELDING. It depends upon the amount of work to be done. It may increase a little.

Charges of management—Office of the Assistant Receiver General: Halifax, $300 ; St. John, $150 ; Winnipeg, $500; Victoria, $100; Charlottetown, $200; printing Dominion notes, $25,000 ; expenses in connection with the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, $1,800 ; $28,050.

Mr. FIELDING. These items nearly all arise from small increases of $50 each. There is one new clerk at Winnipeg getting $300 per annum, and a new clerk at Charlottetown at $600. The greater part of this item is for the expense of printing Dominion notes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any necessity for these receiver generals' offices at all ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes ; they supply the currency for the whole Dominion. It is necessary we should have a supply of currency on hand, and they are dealing with the banks all the time.

Mr. HAGGART. Could they not be dealt with directly from Ottawa ?

Mr. FIELDING. These offices are a great convenience. Centralizing everything at Ottawa is not always popular with the mass of people. These are in a sense government banks, and they supply the currency to the other banks. It is a great convenience to the banks to obtain this currency at the different offices throughout the Dominion and not have to send to Ottawa. The system was well thought by my predecessors, and I see no reason to change it.

Mr. U. WILSON. What is the cost at each point of these offices ?

Mr. FIELDING. The sums taken in the main estimates for these offices were as follows :—Toronto, $7,300 ; Montreal, $5,800 ; Halifax, $8,000 ; St. John, $6,900 ; Winnipeg, $6,500 ; Victoria, $4,550 ; Charlottetown, $4,900.

Mr. BERGERON. Who gets those amounts ?

Mr. FIELDING. Various members of the staff in these offices.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they government employees ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes ; but in Montreal the City District Savings Bank does the duty. With that exception, they are government offices everywhere.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not that business be done through the banks without costing us anything ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have never known of a bank willing to do business for nothing.

Mr. BERGERON. Could it not be done by the government bank—the Bank of Montreal ?

Mr. FIELDING. We would have to pay that bank for doing it.

Mr. BERGERON. This amounts to $25,000 or $30,000 a year in Montreal. Would it cost that much if done by the bank ?

Mr. FIELDING. The work in Montreal is very large and the responsibility very great, and where you have great responsibility you must pay for it.

Mr. U. WILSON. How many of these bank notes were printed ? I believe this is an addition to the appropriation in the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. In connection with the assistant receiver generals' offices, we have also the savings banks. There are two systems, and we are gradually consolidating them. There are what are called the government savings banks and the post office savings banks. Wherever the post office has a savings bank we are gradually arranging to transfer to it the accounts of the government savings bank. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. U. Wilson) asked about the cost of the printing of Dominion notes. The committee is aware that the business of the country, with regard to the circulation of these notes, has enormously increased, and there is a further reason why this vote has to be larger—and it is one that has always won the sympathy of the House—the desirability of having our currency cleaner than it used to be. I am glad now there is a very great improvement ; but, of course, if we are to retire the old notes and give new ones, the cost of printing is increased. In that way we are spending considerably larger sums than in former years. The expenditure for the last year for which we have the official return, the year ending June 30th, 1904, was $129,974, practically $130,000.

Mr. U. WILSON. But this is to finish this year.

Mr. FIELDING. In the main estimates we have an appropriation of $110,000, which with this $25,000 will give a total appropriation for the year of $135,000, against $129,974 actually expended last year, so we are allowing for a small increase in the year now current.

Mr. U. WILSON. How many have you had printed ?

Mr. FIELDING. We retired last year $8,000,000 of old notes and substituted new ones besides the natural expansion.

Mr. U. WILSON. Do you know in what proportions ?

Mr. FIELDING. The $1 and $2 notes are chiefly used. The $1 is the most generally used issue. The $4 note is also used to some extent.

Mr. HENDERSON. Might I ask the hon. minister if he has considered the question of doing away with the $4 Bill which is not generally approved of by the commercial community? The difficulty is that a portion of the four is so much like a one that a mistake is apt to be made in handling the money hurriedly. I think the matter came up last session.

Mr. FIELDING. I think at one time there seemed to be some ground for complaint that the appearance of the $4 note was not sufficiently different from that of the $1 note. We made some change in the form of the $4 note for the purpose of obviating this difficulty, and I have heard no complaint against the use of the $4 note recently. There was a complaint that sometimes the original $4 note could be confused with a $1, but I have had no complaint for some time and I think the notes are sufficiently separate and distinct in appearance to guard against any confusion.

Mr. HAGGART. Would my hon. friend give us a statement of the amount of notes in circulation and the value to the government of having these notes, what the interest amounts to ?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give that now, but before we come to the item in the main estimates which has yet to be dealt with I shall see that the information is prepared.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the minister could give us the average amount issued and we could draw our own conclusions.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount actually in circulation on April 30th of this year was $47,937,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Ones and twos ?

Mr. FIELDING. Ones and twos and fours. It also includes some of the large notes not often seen by the public, which are used by the banks and which are called legals.

Mr. TAYLOR. The $5,000 notes.

Mr. HAGGART. That includes the reserve the banks are obliged to keep in Dominion notes?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they have to use these notes to a considerable extent. The amount of our circulation has been increasing very much. In 1890, the Dominion notes in circulation were something over $15,000,000; in 1895, $19,000,000 ; in 1900, $26,000,000 ; in 1901, $27,000,000 ; in 1902, $32,000,000 ; in 1903, $39,000,000 ; in 1904, $41,000,000 and on April 30, 1905, $47,900,000. So my hon. friend will see the amount is increasing very largely.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the percentage you have to keep in gold for the purpose of redeeming them ?

Mr. FIELDING. Up to a certain sum we keep 25 per cent. We changed that sum a year or two ago. Up to a certain sum we keep 25 per cent and after that we keep dollar for dollar, so that for the larger part of our circulation we have gold to correspond.

Mr. HAGGART. I would like a full statement in connection with the general estimates as a matter of interest and curiosity.

Mr. FIELDING. I would be very glad to give my hon. friend the details then.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister give the names of the firms which print these notes?

Mr. FIELDING. They are printed entirely by one concern under contract. The work is done in Ottawa, and the printing firm is called the American Bank Note Company. It is a branch of the institution of that name in New York, but under our contract they had to erect a building in Ottawa. The whole business is transacted in sight of the parliament buildings, on Wellington street, and although the company bears an American name and has the authority and backing of the American institution, it is practically Canadian, as at least 95 or 98 per cent of the people employed there are Canadians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long will the contract last?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the contract will expire in 1907.

Mr. HAGGART. Are these notes printed in the same way as government notes and postage stamps ? Are they printed under government supervision? It is a very dangerous authority to grant to any printing institution any way it is done.

Mr. FIELDING. There is all supervision we can usefully employ. The matter has been carefully considered by the chief officers of the department. On one occasion I got the Auditor General to go down and examine the method employed, and in all cases we have been satisfied that all possible precautions are taken.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many officers have the government watching the work ?

Mr. FIELDING. The government have no officers now at all. Experience has not shown that it is necessary, but the whole method of printing, every detail from the beginning to the end, has been very carefully worked out, and our government officials have examined it and reported that it is entirely safe and satisfactory.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the safeguard then between the people and the Bank Note Company ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, the only safeguard is the method by which the business is done and the reputation of the great organization which is doing this for nearly all the governments of the civilized world. I had the matter carefully examined into by the deputy minister and the Auditor General and they were both satisfied that all the precautions they could possibly take are involved in the present system.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are the goods being handled in the same manner by the governments of other countries?

Mr. FIELDING. This concern at New York is making notes for banks the wide world over and is making notes for many countries. Some countries have their own printing departments. The United States circulation is printed at a government printing bureau. The English system I think is to have the work done by contractors. I do not think the English bank notes, &c., are printed at a government institution, but by private contractors. In the United States they have a printing bureau, but this company with headquarters in New York makes notes for banks the world over and for a number of countries. It is an old established institution of the highest reputation, and I have no reason to doubt that all safeguards that we could impose are in force now.

Mr. HAGGART. I had reason to inquire into the matter some time ago when I was in charge of the Post Office Department, and I found that in Great Britain and in all countries in Europe it is put under the charge of a certain department and then when the printing is done by contract as it is done in England, it is under the supervision of the Inland Revenue Department there and a most accurate supervision as to the paper and everything in reference to it is maintained. There is extreme danger in a company that has a contract with the government having an unlimited right of printing Dominion notes without the supervision of the government. The same thing refers to postage and inland revenue stamps, and I think there should be an efficient government supervision over them even when the work is done by contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I certainly believe that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has made a very wise remark with reference to having an official of the government look after the matter. I would ask with reference to the printing expenditure of $140,000, whether the minister has taken into consideration the advisability of the government printing their own notes ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that matter was discussed some years ago, and we thought that if we had a building specially constructed by the government, in close proximity to the department at Ottawa, in close contact with it, that would be the wiser system, and that was the system which prevailed when I came into office. So far as the system itself is concerned, it was found to work satisfactorily, and we thought there was no reason to change it. We required the contractor to put up a special building for the purpose, taking every precaution with regard to quality of paper, kind of paper and number of sheets. Whether we could make it any better by putting one of our own officers to live in the building, may be a question, but we have never had reason to believe we could make the system more efficient than it is. I grant that it is a matter of the utmost importance, and if there is a possibility of a more complete supervision we should endeavour to attain it. On more than one occasion I have thought the matter over in my own mind, and I have instructed my officials to go over the system and examine it thoroughly, I think on one occasion the Auditor General was with them ; they did so, and they were quite satisfied that all possible precautions were taken.

Mr. HAGGART. But suppose the supervisor, the head of the department, appointed parties for the purpose of defrauding the government, what possible check have you ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no system you can think of that will not in the end leave the responsibility with somebody. I doubt if any officer of the government we could put there, on an ordinary salary, would be a more responsible person than that great corporation is itself. I doubt if any officer of the government we could put there would give us a greater guarantee than that company gives by its standing reputation. If an officer of the government were put there on a salary of a couple of thousand dollars a year, he could still be corrupted.

Mr. HAGGART. But there should be checks on that person, the responsibility should not rest on one man.

Mr. FIELDING. No matter what you do, in the end some individual must be trusted.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Finance, in answering my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said that this company would put up a special building. There was a special building before. There

was a very good company that were doing this work under the late government, the British American Bank Note Company, working in a special building, but they were a Conservative concern. The new concern had no building and had to put up one, that is the whole matter so far as the building is concerned. Now the question of a guarantee is altogether a different one. I think the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is right in saying that there must be a very careful supervision over that work. We have read a great deal about things of that sort going wrong. The Minister of Finance says he has taken every precaution, no doubt he has taken great care, because he is in a way responsible to the country. I am glad to hear that the government are having a renewal of the notes oftener than in the past, so that we may have clean bank notes, ones, twos and fours. I am surprised to hear that it costs $130,000 a year to do that. I want to ask if there is not some redeeming advantage to the government in changing the notes in circulation. I am told that banks are very anxious to secure the circulation of their notes, is there not some way of compensating the government for the cost of renewing their notes, so that we may get something to the credit side of this $130,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not. Of course, a bank is allowed to issue notes up to its subscribed capital, and if it has a large amount of notes in its vaults unused and can get those notes afloat, the bank profits. The government would not profit by any increase of its note circulation because it has to keep within the limit fixed by law. In the case of silver, it would profit, because the intrinsic value of silver is much less than its nominal value, its face value. I am sorry my hon. friend referred to the old company ; it is unfortunate for him. The fact is that we did not take the contract away from that company ; we invited public tenders, and the company which made the lowest tender received the contract. The old company were not very satisfactory, and after their contract terminated the government brought action against them and recovered $50,000 in cash damages for breach of contract and got a verdict.

Mr. BOYCE. In changing the design of the $4 bills has the picture of the Soo locks been dropped ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think my hon. friend will find that interesting lock on the bills at present, it has disappeared. By the way, a criticism might as well have been offered on the fricture of the fish on the backs of some of the notes, because we had no guarantee as to what kind of water the fish were swimming in. However, the lock on the note now is a Canadian lock.

Mr. HENDERSON. Speaking of a guarantee of everything being properly carried on in the office where these bank notes are printed, to my mind the calling in of soiled notes to the extent of $8,000,000 a year is certainly a very great protection to the country, because, in so doing, if any forgeries were committed, they would readily be discovered. In the course of four or five years the entire issue would be called in, so that no very large amount of spurious notes would get into circulation until they were detected by the departmental officers. I am a little surprised to hear the Minister of Finance say that the issue of these notes is a matter of no profit to the country.

Mr. FIELDING. After the first limit is reached, the first $25,000,000. We increased it, I forget the figure to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now is it absolutely necessary that the Dominion of Canada, with all its wonderful resources, should be obliged to put up dollar for dollar in gold for this issue ? You do not ask a chartered bank to put up dollar for dollar of its issue, only a fractional part of that issue it put up. If a chartered bank were compelled to put up dollar for dollar in gold, I do not think there would be much profit in banking. Nor do I see the necessity of the Great Dominion of Canada being called upon to put up dollar for dollar, to hold gold in its vaults to redeem its bills. To my mind, the pledge of the Dominion of Canada is absolutely sufficient to warrant the fact that its money is perfectly good, and that it can be accepted by all parties, at all times, without hesitation. Then, I think we would have some profit on the issue of this currency. I am inclined to think this is a relic of past days, simply something that the government has copied from governments that have gone before. We know they have copied a good dead from governments of the past. I think this is a matter that the hon. Minister of Finance should take into consideration and that in this great wealthy country he will be able to come down in the course of another year or so and say that he believes that a profit can be made out of this circulation. If we are going to have a government circulation at all I think we ought to be able to make it at least pay its own expenses, to make sufficient out of it to pay for the printing of the government notes, and that to my mind could be done by dispensing with this system of holding such a large amount of gold for the purpose of redeeming notes which I think are sufficiently guaranteed by the credit of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is the gold held? Is it held by the Receiver General ?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) think it should be wise or prudent that I should tell him where all that gold is ? I think he should have confidence enough to believe that the govern-

ment has this gold. I would rather not proclaim on the house-tops where it is. I will be glad to tell him privately where it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. As a matter of fact is it held at all ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have very great doubt that it is actually held in gold.

Mr. FIELDING. If the effect of my answer is to create a doubt whether this amount is held in gold or not, I shall be obliged to tell my hon. friend. Seriously it does not seem a prudent thing to state where it is all held, but I will be very glad to give the hon. member private information.

Mr. BERGERON. If we pay $140,000 for the printing of these notes we must derive some benefit from the issue of them? We must have some compensation somewhere or else we would be engaged in a losing business. Where do we get the benefit from the issue of ones, twos, and fours ?

Mr. FIELDING. Suppose we do not get any benefit if the country requires it for business would it not be the duty of the government to provide this issue ?

Mr. BERGERON. Why do not the banks of the country provide that ? I do not see why we should spend $140,000 a year to provide notes of the denominations of one, two and four dollars when the banks could do it. I know that the banks are willing and axious to do it. Are we making money by the issue of these notes or are we loseing anything by the printing of them ?

Mr. FIELDING. When my hon. friend says that the banks are willing to do it, of course, the banks are willing to do it provided we allow them a larger circulation than we now give to them. If the banks want to do it all they have to do is to increase their capital and then they can issue notes right up to the extent of that capital.

Mr. BERGERON. They cannot do it unless you allow them to do it.

Mr. FIELDING. We would not prevent them. Whenever any bank has expressed a desire to increase its capital we have never raised any question. The banks no doubt would issue more notes if we wished it. The banks can only issue an amount equal to their paid-up capital, and that is not equal to the requirements of the country. Therefore, the difference must be supplied by the government.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend knows that the banks would be delighted to issue ones, twos and fours and, in fact shin plasters. I remember hearing that the banks would have been glad to issue these notes but that the government would not allow them to do so. The government insist upon issuing ones, twos, and fours. I do not see why they should not allow the banks to do so, especially when they are obliged to spend $140,000 a year, which represents a very heavy capital, for the printing of these notes. I would like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to place upon 'Hansard' so that the people will know it, the reason why we issue these notes when we have to pay so much for the printing of them and whether we are losing that amount of money every year as a result of this system.

Mr. FIELDING. The capital of the united banks of the country is not equal to the currency demands of the country if they issued notes in denominations of ones or twos it would make no difference if they only issued an amount up to the aggregate of the capital subscribed by the different banks.

Mr. BERGERON. What difference would it make if a bank were to issue ten ones instead of a ten dollar bill or five ones instead of a five dollar bill ?

Mr. FIELDING. The main point is that you have to supply the needed currency to meet the demands of the expanding trade and commerce of our country, and if you took the united subscribed capital of all the banks and issued an equal amount of currency you would find a stringency in the money market, because you would not have enough to carry on the business of the country. If the banks want to issue more notes all they have to do is to put up more capital. Whether a note is issued in the denomination of one dollar or five dollars makes no difference in this respect. The subscribed capital of the united banks of the country is not nearly enough to carry on the business of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it not a fact that the government of Canada are making a great deal of money in the issuing of these notes in denominations of ones, twos and fours ?

Mr. FIELDING. As I have already stated there is a point—it used to be $25,000,000, but we increased it a year or two ago—up to which we are obliged to carry a reserve of 25 per cent of gold. As respects that there is a profit to the country ; but after you pass that point, for every additional note you issue, you have to put up dollar for dollar and therefore there is no profit in it. We increased the limit in 1903 and that perhaps will meet to some extent the suggestion of my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). It used to be $25,000,000, but believing that with the growth and expansion of Canada, we could issue a larger sum on the 25 per cent limit we expanded that in 1903 to $30,000,000, and as the country grows that limit will be raised. There is a certain sum which we may issue with a reserve of 25 per cent of gold. As respects that there is a profit, but when

you pass that point for every dollar you issue you must have a dollar in gold against it and there is no profit on that.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the amount you are allowed to issue on the 25 per cent basis ?

Mr. FIELDING. $30,000,000.

Mr. HAGGART. That is $7,000,000 besides the $25,000,000. That makes $32,000,000.

Mr. FIELDING. It was increased by the Act of 1903 to $30,000,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That $30,000,000 you only have to cover by a reserve of 25 per cent ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct. By the Act, 3 Ed. VII, Chap. 43, respecting Dominion Notes, it is provided that :

The Minister of Finance and Receiver General shall always hold as security for the redemption of Dominion notes issued and outstanding at any one time, up to and including $30,000,000, an amount in gold, or in gold and securities of Canada, the principal or interest of such securities being guaranteed by the government of the United Kingdom, equal to not less than 25 per cent of the amount of such notes so issued and outstanding.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the country make enough money to cover the amount of $140,000 a year that is now being spent for the printing of these notes ? I want to know whether the country is redeeming this expenditure.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we do until we reach a certain amount. As respects the first sum there is a profit, but for every additional dollar we issue there is no profit.

Mr. BERGERON. If we are not making much out of it why should we not allow the different chartered banks to issue these notes? We look upon our banking system as a very good one and that being so why should not we allow them to issue these notes of the denominations of one, two and four dollars ?

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of convenience it is better that the banks should issue notes of a certain class and that we should issue notes of a certain class, but it would make no difference if they issued ten ones instead of issuing one ten.

Mr. BERGERON. If their circulation helps them as they say it does, why should we not give them this privilege ? There are some people in Ottawa who are making money only out of circulation. If that is so, by circulating $39,000,000 or $40,000,000 in ones, twos or threes, it would help them to increase not only their circulation but their capital.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not ?

Mr. FIELDING. Circulation does not help them to increase capital. Capital helps them to increase circulation. They must issue their circulation on the basis of their capital. If a bank has a capital of $1,000,000 and it has only $500,000 or $600,000 of notes out, if the business has only taken up that amount, it has then $400,000 which it can issue in money, and if its own business is not expanding it can loan these notes to another bank, but the moment it reaches the limit of its capital it must stop. That is where the government comes in and supplies the difference.

Mr. BERGERON. Cannot the Finance Minister find a way to compel the banks to issue clean notes, just as the Dominion is doing ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have not thought it necessary to do more than to generally indicate to the banks that they should pay attention to the cleanliness of the notes in circulation, and I think they are doing so. The Dominion notes in circulation are vastly improved in that respect, and I think the bank notes too. We have not taken any legislative power to compel the banks, but I have no doubt they will pay attention to the matter as a result of the discussion that has taken place here.

Mr. BERGERON. The Finance Minister says he will have some slight amendments to the Bank Act ; could not he propose an amendment to cover this point ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. BERGERON. I hear constant compiaint of the dirty bills circulated by the banks being injurious to health.

Mr. FIELDING. Most of us are so happy to get these bills that we do not quarrel about their shape and colour, but I trust the discussion to-day may induce the banks to give attention to the matter.

Mr. BERGERON. The Minister of Finance is of course not making any personal reference because the members are paid by cheques, the face value of which is very small I am sorry to say.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I assume it would not cost less to print a one dollar note than it would to print a ten dollar note, and if that be the case it would seem that the point is well taken.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course it makes no difference in the cost of printing whether the figure be a 'I' or a 'X' but it has been found a matter of public convenience that these small notes should be dealt with by the Dominion, and I do not think there is any complaint about it. With the extending business of the country the banks as a rule are able to find employment for their circulation on the basis of the present arrangement.

Mr. BERGERON. There is no complaint if we do not lose money in connection with it.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Minister of Finance has told us that there are $47,000,000 now in circulation ; has he ever had a calculation made as to how much of that is lost yearly through fires, &c. Does he think that seven millions of that forty-seven millions have been lost.

Mr. FIELDING. Once it is issued it is charged up as a part of the debt of this country and must always remain so until it is redeemed. Therefore, whether it is lost or not does not concern us. True it could never be presented, but it still stands in our books as part of the debt due by the Dominion. We never write off a note until it is redeemed and destroyed.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that a good share of the profit of the banks is due to the loss of notes in circulation ; there is hardly a fire that there are not some bills lost.

Mr. FIELDING. There was a question in olden times as to banks making profit in that way, but I do not think they claim to-day that they have a right to make such profit. Until a note is redeemed it is held to be a debt of the bank. In olden times there was a practice of writing off notes of that character, but I do not think that practice is followed by the banks to-day.

Mr. HENDERSON. Although the amount in circulation according to the books of the Finance Department is forty-seven millions, it may not be more than forty millions ?

Mr. FIELDING. There would not be so much as that lost.

Mr. HENDERSON. In the many years during which these notes have been in circulation I have no doubt that several millions have been lost. I would ask the Finance Minister to tell me, if he thinks it is perfectly safe to issue thirty millions on the basis of 25 per cent of gold, why is it not perfectly safe to issue fifty millions ? Where would be the difficulty ? What reason does the Minister of Finance give for not issuing the entire amount on the basis of 25 per cent gold ? If this were done it would remedy the complaint that the country is losing money by paying for the printing of these notes.

Mr. FIELDING. I fear that all the great financial authorities of the world will say that my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) is touching on dangerous ground. His proposition simply means what was at one time irreverently called the rag-baby scheme of currency ; grinding out the notes as fast as any one took them up and making money in that way. The financiers of the world have not regarded that system with approval. If Canada adopted the policy of issuing notes on the credit of the country without regard to limit, while we might have great pride in that as Canadians, the financial authorities of the world would not consider that our credit was thereby made good.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It has been suggested that of the forty-seven million dollars worth of notes in circulation possibly seven millions may have been destroyed. On the other hand is there not a possibility that several millions of notes now in circulation may be counterfeit ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not. I appreciate what hon. gentlemen have said as to the necessity of extra precaution, but I think we generally discover counterfeit notes very quickly. There have been a few instances and we have traced them and generally succeeded in finding the counterfeiters in a short time and putting them behind the bars. It is quite a long time since we heard of any Canadian counterfeit notes, and so far as I know there are none to-day. We have taken all reasonable precautions, but in the light of what has been said to-day it will be my duty to look into the matter to see if there is any other precaution which can be taken to prevent the possibility of the occurence of that which my hon. friends fear.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not possible for us to have a definite knowledge of the value of the Dominion notes now in circulation ?

Mr. FIELDING. We can only give to the public a definite knowledge as to the number issued. What becomes of them is beyond our knowledge and control. We are bound to asume for the purposes of accounts and public credit that they are existing somewhere, and so they stand on the records as a charge against us.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to the thirty million dollars in our treasury, of course I do not want to ask where it is at present, but I wish to know whether a large portion or any portion of that gold is deposited in the banks of this country, and whether we are receiving interest on it ?

Mr. FIELDING. No portion of this is held by banks in the way of ordinary deposits ; it is held in other ways. Of course we have our transactions with the banks in other respects and large sums of money are moving to and fro, but these moneys are not included in such bank accounts.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be a good thing for the Finance Minister to tell us now where that gold is kept.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course I am not personally interested in any way, but sometimes we hear the statement made, especially during election campaigns, that there is a chest here in which that gold is kept, and very often we hear it said on the platform that the Liberal candidate was up in Ottawa

and he got into the dark room where they keep the money and had his arms up to his elbows in the gold. This is an opportune time to know whether that is true or not. I do not believe it myself, but it might be as well to have an authoritative official statement from the Finance Minister.

Mr. FIELDING. What is that ?

Mr. BERGERON. There is an idea in the country that there is a chest somewhere here in Ottawa where you keep this large amount of gold, and speakers on the stump say : so and so is a thief, because he was seen in Ottawa with his arms as far as his elbows down in the gold. Of course the more enlightened of the electors think it is not true, but I would like to have an end put to the rumour. I imagine that the money must be kept in the banks. My hon. friend has gone too far in denials until now. He is bound to say where that money is, because he has changed the ideas of those enlightened people who say that there is no money in Ottawa—that it is all in the banks, and that the payments are all made by cheques. If there is any place here where gold is kept, he is bound to say so.

Mr. FIELDING. There are various reasons for not telling, and one is that I am most anxious to protect the reputation of my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. Those who are accused are on the government side, not the opposition side.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is thinking of the other government. It was not in that respect that I wanted to protect my hon. friend's reputation. After what has occurred, this display of my hon. friend's zeal to know where the gold is kept would lay him open to suspicion in event of any loss, and I think we ought not to put him in that box.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it is the duty of my hon. friend to let the public know.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see why $25,000 more is required than was estimated last year, because it surely must have been foreseen that we would require more Dominion notes.

Mr. FIELDING. The Finance Minister does not like to make his first estimate too large, because ministers generally are inclined to spend all you give them and want more. I know it is contended that the departments ought to take in their first estimates all that they want. The Minister of Finance sometimes cuts down the estimates of his colleagues, and tells them that if they want more, parliament will have to vote it in the supplementary estimates ; and that is found to be a wise arrangement. In this case he has applied it to himself. I have shown that we spent on Dominion notes a little less than $130,000 last year. Our appropriation for the present year is $100,000, to which we add this $25,000, making $135,000 for the service of the year, a small increase over last year. We must expect an expansion of this item every year.

Mr. BERGERON. Joking apart, I would like my hon. friend to say that there is not a cent of gold kept here in the vaults of the government but that everything is held in bonds or in banks. I think that should be said.

Mr. FIELDING. All the government money is held in places of safe keeping and in the usual places where it was kept when I became Finance Minister.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. minister should not leave people under the impression that there are vaults here where gold is kept.

Mr. SPROULE. I think my hon. friend is entirely too innocent if he thinks there are not ways of the 'heathen Chinee' type by which the government can get money when it wants to carry an election.

Mr. THOMPSON. This discussion has proven extremely interesting to me, as the representative of the only territory in Canada which exclusively produces gold. As I am going before this session closes to submit a proposition to the government to purchase all the gold that we produce in the Yukon Territory, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance if there is any objection to the government purchasing gold and giving therefor government certificates ? We produce somewhere in the vicinity of $10,000,000 a year.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter which will probably come up when we have our mint ready for operation. I do not think it arises at present in connection with any of our financial arrangements. But when the mint, the foundation of which is now being laid in Sussex street, is completed, we shall have to take that question up. While I would listen with respect to anything my hon. friend has to suggest on the subject, I would like to keep an open mind, so that we may consider it later.

Department of the Interior—further amount required for salaries and expenses of mines branch, $2,500.

Mr. OLIVER. This item is to provide for the printing of an edition in French of the report on electrical smelting of Dr. Haanel, who is in charge of the mineralogical branch. Dr. Haanel has visited Europe and made an investigation of the process of electrical smelting of iron. Provision has already been made for the printing of his report in English.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the geological department divided into two branches ? I never heard of the mines branch before ?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the mines branch is a sub-branch. The Geological

Survey does not take cognizance particularly of minerals, but the mines branch is to take special cognizance of minerals and mineral development.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not remember any legislation setting apart the mines branch.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no special legislation constituting a mines branch. Strictly speaking, it is not a branch of the Geological Survey, but a part of the Department of the Interior, designated as a mines branch just as any other department may designate the different features of its service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of the Interior tells us that it is to look after minerals. I would naturally suppose that the geological department would have the care and investigation of the minerals of the country.

Mr. FIELDING. The Geological Survey is devoted to the exploration and survey of the country; but, as the Minister of the Interior has said, this mines branch has reference to other matters, such as the smelting of ores, and Dr. Haanel was sent to Europe to investigate that subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. While on this subject I would ask the Minister of the Interior whether Dr. Bell has been gazetted as director of the survey? I sincerely hope he has. He has been doing a noble work for our country for many years.

Mr. OLIVER. No, he has not been gazetted as director.

Mr. HAGGART. Who is at present the head of the geological branch?

Mr. OLIVER. Dr. Bell is acting director.

Mr. HAGGART. No appointment has been made?

Mr. OLIVER. No appointment has yet been made.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it not about time? The position has been vacant for a couple of years.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not been conducting the department long enough to be able to give any information on that point.

Mr. HAGGART. I have known Dr. Bell, who is at present acting director, for many years. I know he has taken a great deal of interest in the Geological Survey, and I think he is the best man for the place.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have had a good deal to do with this department since coming to Ottawa, and have followed up Dr. Bell's work a number of years. I hope the minister will see that he is gazetted at an early date.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—

To pay Jules d'E. Clement the difference between the salary of a second-class clerk at $1,100 and that of a first-class clerk at $1,400 per annum for the first six months of fiscal year 1903-04 (revote) .. .. $ 150 00

To pay M. C. Doyle the difference between the salary of a junior second-class clerk at $1,000 and that of a second-class clerk at $1,100 per annum for first six months of fiscal year 1903-04 (revote).. .. .. 50 00

To pay F. H. Houde the difference between the salary of $500 and that of a junior second-class clerk at $600 per annum from July 1, 1903, to December 11, 1903 (revote).. .. .. 44 44

Contingencies—further amount required.. .. .. 2,500 00

2,744 44

Mr. HAGGART. Why did you not pay the amount when you had the vote?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is the result of a misunderstanding with the Auditor General.

Mr. BARR. Do you understand each other now?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We thought it would be settled, but it could not be settled except by a vote of parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. Did the Auditor General refuse to pass it because these men had not complied with the requirements of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No; it was purely and simply because the amount was left open for over a year on the refusal of the Auditor General, and, as a matter of justice to these civil servants, it was put in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. U. WILSON. Was it because the vote had expired that the Auditor General refused to pay?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These three officials had been promoted and should have been paid their full salary from the 1st July, 1903. The session lasted until October, and when they claimed their salary, according to promotion and the vote, the Auditor General refused to pay the six months from the 1st July to the 1st January. From the information I have, he made no objection in the case of the other officials who were in the same position as these three, and all the others were paid. The matter remained in this way the whole of the year 1904, until at last the Auditor General said: The year has elapsed; better have the amount voted regularly by parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman give us the Auditor General's letter on the subject?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no letter. It was a personal interview with the Auditor General.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely a refusal to pay on a recommendation from the department would not be made verbally?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am informed it happens very often that way.

Mr. FIELDING. These officials go and discuss the matter with the Auditor General.

Mr. HAGGART. That is an improper way. There should be correspondence. Where an amount is voted by the House and the Auditor General refuses to pay, we should have the reasons in writing for his refusal.

Mr. INGRAM. Was the controversy with the Auditor General on the ground that these men were not entitled to be classed as first-class clerks ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; it was a misunderstanding as regards how the payments were to be made, and the matter remained in abeyance the whole year. I am bringing it before the House on the advice of the Auditor General himself.

Mr. HAGGART. What about the $2,500 further amount required for contingencies?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have explained that the department having increased during last year it was impossible to provide the necessary contingencies. The department has nearly doubled since 1904, and of course we had no provision made for that.

Mr. HAGGART. What will this amount be for this year and what was it for last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The amount in the main estimates this year is about $20,000. This will bring the amount to $19,000, but there was an overdraft in the former year of $7,000 so really it is only $12,000. This was for accounts for the year previous that were left over and had not been provided for and this amount was taken from the vote of this year.

Mr. HAGGART. Then that amount should have been voted for the year previous.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $991.50 were carried over from the year 1902-3, and paid out of the vote for 1903-4, and the following amounts out of 1903-4 were carried over and paid out of 1904-5.

Mr. HAGGART. We do not want the details ; it is an extraordinary way of carrying on business, paying the deficiency of one year out of the following year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is because we do not intend to do that any more.

Mr. HAGGART. The proper way is to ask for a vote for the deficiencies of this year, and then if there is a deficiency from the year before we should have a vote but let the vote for that year cover it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is included in this.

Mr. HAGGART.

Department of Finance—further amount required for contingencies, $1,200.

To provide for the appointment of a second-class clerk, a barrister, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $200.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount already provided for contingencies in my department is $12,000. This vote includes a certain part of the cost of the temporary clerks for the year, and it includes printing, stationery and sundry small items. The last item is to appoint a second-class clerk. The gentleman is a practising barrister, who does not happen to have a civil service certificate but there is no question as to his qualification.

Mr. U. WILSON. What class of barrister do you get for $1,200 ? He can not be fit to be a judge according to the discussion we have had in this House ?

Mr. FIELDING. He is a young gentleman who has recently entered the profession and is going to act in the capacity of private secretary.

Mr. U. WILSON. He gets an additional salary for that.

Mr. FIELDING. Not at present; it is contemplated he may become private secretary and some part of the other allowance may go to him later.

Mr. U. WILSON. What is the other allowance ?

Mr. FIELDING. $600, which may be paid to different persons, and a part of that has already been given to others in the department, young ladies.

Departments generally—further amount required for cleaning, &c., $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is an increase in the general vote in the cleaning service, for the same reason as in the Department of Printing and Stationery. It arises from the increase in the allowance of wages to the charwomen.

Legislation, House of Commons, $94,794.18.

Mr. HAGGART. I received a note in reference to this item asking that it should stand.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course if my hon. friend wishes we shall allow it to stand, but I may say that some of the minor officers of the House who cannot very well wait for the money cannot be paid unless we pass this vote. We cannot pay them until we get a supply Bill, but every day's delay is a hardship. I hope my hon. friends opposite will appreciate that view and try to help us to get this through and get a supplementary vote.

Mr. U. WILSON. I think the Minister of Finance might easily arrange to get money enough to pay the working people ; I think it is a very great hardship.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman with the best intentions is giving very bad advice. I could easily arrange in an illegal way to get money but I do not want to do it.

Mr. U. WILSON. I remember when the members were cut off an arrangement was soon made. And if you can pay members of parliament, I think you could easily afford to pay the employees of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. There was no arrangement made by me. I treated the members the same as I do the charwomen. I waited until I had the legal right to pay them.

Mr. INGRAM. Last session was prolonged after June 30th, and by reason of that fact money was drawn to pay services around this building. It seems to me strange that because this occurred we are short now. Could not that difficulty be got over in some way without our having to be called upon every year to pass estimates like this? We have had this for several years past and it is causing a hardship.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course it is a question of the number of days the session may occupy and although we may have the best intentions that the session is to be short, sometimes unexpected things happen and the delay occurs. I am afraid every time we have a session we will have some cause of shortage. In view of the great expenditures of Canada the amount that we asked for in this way towards the close of a year is not large.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a small item but it is creating more hardship than any other item we vote.

Mr. FIELDING. That is true.

Mr. HAGGART. This $94,000 is an additional amount over the amount voted last year; that is a bad system of bookkeeping, $100,000 of a mistake for one House is too much.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We did not calculate that the session would be as long as it turned out to be. We had not calculated on the power of hon. gentlemen opposite to talk as they have done.

Mr. INGRAM. The trouble is that the First Minister has not brought down his legislation.

Mr. FIELDING. Remember that this includes not only the present session but everything that occurred after the 1st of July last year, because this is for the present fiscal year. So that really a part of the expenditures of last session came into the present fiscal year. We will let this item stand.

Exhibitions—further amount required, $40,000.

Mr. FISHER. This sum is required to finish up the expenditures at the St. Louis exhibition in the course of the fiscal year, and for the preparations for the Liege exhibition that is open and in operation. I had a vote of $200,000 for these expenses in the main estimates of this year. Out of that, as an expenditure on the St. Louis exhibition in the course of this fiscal year, we require nearly $100,000. As I have already explained to the House, we thought best to take some part in a trade exhibition in England last fall and the early part of the winter, for which we spent about $18,000, making $118,000. Up to the 1st of May we have expended on the Liege exhibition a little over $60,000, making the total about $180,000. That leaves us with $20,000. Now, outstanding accounts in regard to the Liege exhibition and other expenditures we shall have to make before the 1st of July, will amount to nearly $60,000. That leaves us with a deficit of about $40,000. In the main estimates for the next year I had $75,000 to finish up the Liege exhibition, as I explained, and some other exhibitions which we wished to take part in. I expect that vote will meet the requirements, but if I were obliged to draw on that vote to pay outstanding accounts before the 1st of July I would not have enough, and would have to ask for a supplementary estimate next year. I thought it was better to close up the work of this fiscal year completely by the present vote. I hope by so doing to avoid the necessity of any supplementary item in next year's estimates.

Mr. SPROULE. What expenses does this cover ?

Mr. FISHER. This covers finishing and closing up the St. Louis exhibition and the initial preparations, the buildings and so forth, for the Liege exhibition, which is now going on in Belgium. That was opened on the 27th of April. We now have our exhibits there and our officers at work. The only expenditure in this connection which I did not foresee was the expenditure for the purchase of some of the exhibits which were loaned to us at St. Louis—mineral exhibits and some exhibits of animals and game. These were so valuable and attracted so much attention that, after consultation with my commissioner, I decided to purchase them. We paid about $15,000 for minerals. I cannot tell exactly what we paid for the animal specimens. But I would like to mention to the committee that in consequence of what we have been doing lately we have to-day a very large class of permanent exhibits. These minerals I speak of can be used over and over again. We send them to Liege just as they were taken away from St. Louis. The same is true of the game exhibits and various other things—photographs, paintings, flags and so forth, of which I have a list here. We also possess a lot of our own show cases and packing cases which we use, and which are of a strong and permanent character, showing a total investment in these things of a perma-

nent character of nearly $60,000. We purchased these mineral specimens from the owners of the mines from which they came. Some of them we had to get ourselves; they were not on hand. We have an official catalogue of the minerals, showing the names of the mines.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Could the minister give us a statement of what he bought, who he bought it from, and how much he paid for it?

Mr. FISHER. I can do that, but it would be a pretty long statement if I were to give every specimen that we bought and the price.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Showing how that $60,000 was expended?

Mr. FISHER. The $60,000 does not cover minerals alone. I am speaking of permanent exhibits.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I want a detailed statement of the $60,000.

Mr. FISHER. I am reminded that in this $60,000 there is, for instance, one item of mineral show cases, $3,000, which were not purchased, but were made up by our staff at the exhibition. There are various kinds of shipping cases, amounting to $11,000, which were also made up by the carpenters. $12,000 out of that $57,000 represents lumber that we purchased ourselves, and hired men to make up the cases for the minerals. As I am informed, if we undertook to sell that to-day we could get more than that for it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is a most unusual purchase.

Mr. FISHER. I will just instance the last exhibition at St. Louis. We had a most magnificent exhibit of cobalt silver ore, an exhibit that has never been exceeded at any exhibition anywhere, and the ore itself is of greater value to-day than we paid for it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Where was it got?

Mr. FISHER. Near New Liskeard in the northern part of Ontario. We have also got now some quite unique specimens of mineral which could not be duplicated. They were found quite accidentally and we managed to get hold of them. We have some rather extraordinary specimens which attracted a great deal of attention and made the exhibit more effective than the ordinary value of the mineral itself would indicate. Animals and specimens of fur bearing animals we bought for the purpose of making up the game and fur exhibit. These are a little difficult to find. When we do get good ones and they are well set up they are of great value. The United States government tried hard to get our exhibit of fur-bearing animals at St. Louis for their Washington museum and they offered us about double what it cost us, but I said no, we want that for future exhibits. Animals of that kind are not easily procured. There were included in the exhibit a musk-ox, bull, cow and young one and I do not think there is anything of the kind in the world.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the object of paying such large sums for exhibits of this kind? What profit are they going to bring back to the country if no other animals of that kind exist? It is not going to enable anybody to effect a sale.

Mr. FISHER. While it would probably be hard to find any animals such as those we exhibited, we have still a very large number of musk-ox robes in this country for sale. It is quite a large business and we sell these things in a commercial way. But, when we make an exhibit to attract attention, we must exhibit something a little better than the commercial article. If we confined ourselves to the commercial article we would make a pretty good commercial exhibit, but we would not attract the attention of the ordinary sight-seer and to have the exhibit so commented upon as to serve as a valuable advertisement for the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some time during the past winter I was passing along Queen Street in the city and I saw a stuffed buffalo. Apparently it was either being brought back from St. Louis or was about to be sent to some other exhibition. Have we such a large number of buffalo in this country that it is necessary or advisable to spend large sums of money to make an exhibit to attract attention to our stock of buffalo with the view of providing a market for that class of animals? I am inclined to think that that time has gone past and it is more a matter of curiosity than a matter of commercial interest to the people of the country.

Mr. FISHER. I grant to my hon. friend that we have no buffaloes to sell. We have not even buffalo robes to sell to any extent, but when you are making an exhibit of fur-bearing animals, if you want to attract the attention of the ordinary exhibition visitor and the newspaper man who is describing the Canadian section, you must make it as varied and attractive as possible and you have to put in a good many things which in a commercial sense may not be valuable to the country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it is rather what the ordinary man would call a fake exhibit.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it is fair to apply that term to it at all. This exhibit at St. Louis advertised this country in a way which I do not think it had ever been advertised before. Personally I only

went to St. Louis at the end of the exhibition. I had heard very flattering accounts of the exhibits there and the sensation they were creating. I think some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House said something about that when the vote was up in the main estimates. I went down there rather feeling that these reports were too flattering, but when I saw the exhibits and saw the way that the people were examining them, taking an interest in them and commenting upon them, I felt that good business had been done in advertising our country in a general way. These exhibits have been undertaken by this government and carried out on a pretty considerable scale, I grant, very largely for immigration purposes. My hon. friend will perhaps smile and say that the exhibit of a buffalo will not attract settlers. I do not say it will in that particular instance, but at the same time the variety of things exhibited and the general effect of the exhibition do create an impression on people's minds which draws their attention to the country, gets them talking about it and attracts them so as to enable our other officers to reach them for immigration purposes. I have no hesitation in saying that the series of exhibits which we have conducted during the last seven or eight years has attracted very materially the enormous influx of immigration into this country.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think these exhibits should certainly be confined to such articles as the country is at the present time producing, and that we should not do anything to help people to come into the country when the particular article that attracted their attention is not to be found in the country after they do come here. It seems to me it would only lead to disappointment. I would favour very much making an exhibit of everything we can produce, but I do not see the propriety of making an exhibit of what we do not produce, simply for the purpose of making the exhibit attractive. I think there is no genuine policy in that course of procedure.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There was a large amount of money expended on the exhibition in Japan a year ago.

Mr. FISHER. Three years ago.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister gave us to understand that our trade and commerce with that country had wonderfully increased. Could the hon. minister give us an estimate of the increase in our trade with that country during the past year ?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the figures under my hand. I am told, however, that during the last year or 18 months there has been a very considerable increase in our exports to Japan. I may say off-hand from my own personal knowledge that the creameries of the Northwest are sending about ten times as much butter to Japan now as they did before the exhibition.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How about flour ?

Mr. FISHER. The export of flour has increased very materially also. I have not the same personal knowledge of flour as of butter, because butter has to come officially under the administration of my own department. But, I am also informed that the flour trade has very largely increased. There is a constant export of Canadian flour to Japan now which there was not before the exhibition.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Would the hon. minister tell us what each of these exhibitions has cost ?

Mr. FISHER. The Japan exhibition cost between $50,000 and $55,000 and the St. Louis exhibition about $320,000—$310,000 if we do not include what may be fairly charged to the purchase of these exhibits which were loaned to us but which since that we have prchased. I think nearly half of that may be charged to St. Louis. $310,000 was the expenditure in connection with the St. Louis exhibition up to the time of the purchase of the St. Louis exhibits. We expect that the Liege exhibition will cost roughly speaking, something over $150,000.

General statistics—to increase the salary of E. H. St. Denis to $2,500 per annum, $625.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I wish to draw attention to some little anomalies in the census report which I think are worthy the consideration of the minister. In making a division between the urban and rural population it would appear that large stretches of rural territory are taken into the urban districts in consequence of which I very much doubt if we have a correct estimate of the rural population as distinguished from the urban population. For instance, in the city of Ottawa we have 3,000 acres of territory with a population of 59,000, but in Fredericton, New Brunswick, with a population of 7,000 we have 10,000 acres. of territory. Probably that is due to some particular method of laying out the municipal boundaries by which a large area of rural district is included in the municipality, and in consequence of which the urban district would get credit for people who live on thousands of acres in the rural district. I think some method should be adopted whereby we would be able to get the population of the cities and towns distinguished from the population of the rural districts. In Emerson, Northwest Territories, with a population of 840 there are 5,000 acres of territory ; in Winnipeg with 12,000 acres there is less population than in Ottawa although the area of Winnipeg is four times greater ; in Portage la Prairie there is a territory of

11,000 acres and a population of less than 4,000. It would seem to me that many outlying townships must have been included with the town itself in such cases as these, I would like to have some definite information in the census so that we may know what the actual rural and urban population of Canada is. Then, when the question came up on the Autonomy Bill, I could not find the figures for such towns as Calgary, Edmonton, Regina and other places, although I felt it was important that we should know the size of these places. In Calgary east there are 15,000 acres, in Calgary north 79,000 acres, in Calgary south 22,000 acres, in Calgary west 63,000 acres, so that apparently a very large stretch of country is taken in and the rural population included with the urban population. The census should show the actual figures for the towns themselves. I take a great interest in this matter, and I would like to be able to turn to the census report and find what the actual population of a city or town is. Outside of four large cities in British Columbia I cannot find the population separated. I cannot find the figures for the other provinces in the corresponding columns in which they are given for Ontario and Quebec. In New Brunswick there is a small place like St. George, with an area of 130,000 acres, enough for a whole county, and the area of the town of St. Andrews is given in somewhat the same way. I find this anomaly all through the census report. I am not finding any fault, but I would suggest that in taking the population of the Northwest Territories next year, more attention should be paid to this matter so that we may be able to get the actual urban and rural population.

Mr. FISHER. I am glad my hon. friend drew attention to this point and I will have it looked into and see if we cannot have it remedied.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 138) an Act respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to 'The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.'—Mr. Piché.

RELIEF OF CLARA BIDWELL McDERMOT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 152) for the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—Mr. Campbell.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is a very peculiar case, and I think the Bill ought to stand until the Minister of Justice is present. I have read the evidence, and I am bound to say that I do not think the preamble is proven. I am quite satisfied that no judge of experience and no intelligent jury would find this respondent guilty of the allegations which are said by the preamble to be proven on the evidence printed and laid before the House. One does not like to discuss the details of these cases in public more than is necessary; but we have a public duty to perform. The whole evidence is that of two women, who notoriously and openly state their reasons for knowing to be that they are disreputable characters, and their statements are positively denied on oath by the respondent. He puts his oath against theirs; and, on reading the evidence, I am forced to the conclusion that it is very doubtful indeed whether this man ought to be found guilty under the circumstances. It is a very serious thing to divorce anybody, much more serious, I think, than many of us suppose, and has a bad effect on the country. We are in the habit of letting these Bills go through this House simply because the Senate has passed them. I am probably as guilty as any one in that respect. We do not pay one-quarter of the attention to them that we ought to do, or contemplate the seriousness of what we do. Here is a man with three children who call him father, who is entitled to their respect if he is innocent of this charge, but who, if this Bill passes, will be deprived of his rights as a father, as well as his rights as a husband, and who will be disgraced in a very serious way. I suppose most of us would rather serve a term in the penitentiary than be under the disgrace that this man will be under if we pass this Bill. We must treat this case as one requiring substantial and strict proof. There is no evidence on which any judge or any intelligent jury would convict this man of the offence charged against him. I have not been approached by anybody or been asked to oppose this Bill. This is my own action as a legislator, and I say that if we grant this divorce on such evidence as we have here, we shall open the door to a most terrible state of affairs. There is not a respectable man in this Dominion who will not be subject to blackmail and the worst sort of treatment if this evidence is held to be sufficient. There have been similar cases to this one, but corroborative evidence has always been required. This is a case in which two accomplices of the very worst character, upon their own evidence, have induced the Senate to assume that this man is guilty. He denies their statements under oath, comes all the way from British Columbia for the purpose, cross-examines these witnesses; and we must come to the conclusion that his story is more likely to be true than theirs. No intelligent jury ever convicts a man of a crime on the evidence of accomplices; and if they would, they would always be charged by the judge that such evidence must be corroborated. This is a serious matter, not only for this man, but for everybody in this country. I am pro-

bably less favourable to divorces than many people: I recognize, however, that there are cases in which divorces should be granted under our laws, but they are extreme cases, and should admit of no doubt. In the absence of the Chairman of the Private Bills Committee, who considered this Bill, and also of the Minister of Justice, who, I think, should look into it, I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This is a very unusual course to take on a Bill of this kind. I admit that the evidence, like the evidence in all cases upon which we grant divorces, is not of the very highest character. This case has been tried by the Senate, who examined the witnesses and had an opportunity of hearing their evidence, and who unanimously came to the decision that the case was proven, and reported the Bill to us. Not only have we the evidence of these persons, but we have the conduct of this man, of whom my hon. friend speaks as a very exemplary husband—a man who left his wife and three little children and went off to British Columbia, where he remained for fourteen or sixteen years, and who, on his own evidence, in that time did not give $400 to support them.

Mr. LANCASTER. They were not needing money.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If they had needed money, they would not have got it from him. I do not know this woman at all, but I have it from the very best persons in the country that she is one of the most respectable women in the whole district, and the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Christie) is aware of that fact. She has raised three children, now grown to manhood, without any help from her husband. They are a most highly respected family, and I do not think any man, on reading the evidence, could fail to come to the conclusion that the Senate was perfectly right in unanimously passing this Bill. Any man who would leave his wife and family for sixteen years and let them drift as best they could, is no father and no man at all, and should not receive any consideration from this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Supposing this man did what the hon. gentleman alleges, that is no ground for divorce; and it is quite clear on the evidence that his money was not needed because she returned the sums he sent her and did not want to have anything to do with him. There must be some reason why this woman, who has been wedded all these years, should want to get rid of her husband now, and we ought not to undo a marriage for the purpose of letting her marry again unless there are beyond question proper grounds for a divorce. The woman returned the money this man sent her, she returned the $100 payments, and there is no evidence that she suffered for want of his money. The charge made by the hon. gentleman against this man is one we should not listen to. We are not here as judges granting alimony to this woman. What my hon. friend alleges would be a reason why a judge might decree judicial separation and grant alimony, but we are asked to absolutely divorce this man from his wife and children, and we are asked to do it on the evidence of two most disreputable characters, whom he contradicts on his oath. I cannot see what objection my hon. friend can have to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) looking into the evidence and passing upon it before we come to a decision. This House is not going to prorogue to-morrow or next day, and the Minister of Justice will have plenty opportunity to see whether the position I take is a sound one. My hon. friend's desire for undue haste would rather indicate that the view I take is the right one. I am willing to have delay until the Minister of Justice looks into the matter. Surely my hon. friend can trust the Minister of Justice; and if the minister is convinced that I am wrong, then the Bill will pass.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My hon. friend is very anxious to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice when it suits his purpose; but I notice that when the Minister of Justice does given an opinion, my hon. friend is not disposed to follow it. Another allegation he makes is that this woman returned $100 which her husband sent her. True she did, but the fellow never sent it to her until proceedings had been commenced for a divorce. It was only then that he sent her any money and he had deliberately refused to send her any for years previously. Why, the admissions of this man himself as to the company he kept and the places he visited and his general conduct corroborate the evidence given by his wife. How are you going to contradict the evidence given by other witnesses? You will not get any respectable woman to give evidence as to the places this man frequented, and those who did, knew nothing about Mrs. McDermot and never saw her and gave their evidence in a straightforward manner. Of course the husband denies it, but he also denies Mrs. McDermot's evidence. The only witness he brought are two brothers-in-law of his own, and they testified that he was a very nice young boy when growing up, and one of them admits that the point on which he was brought to testify—that is with reference to Mrs. McDermot—occurred twenty odd years ago and he could not remember anything about it. I have no interest in the Bill other than that it was placed in my hands, and I have the best authority for believing that this woman is one of the most respectable in the whole country and raised a nice respectable family. Under the circumstances, I do not think there should be any hesitation in

granting her divorce from this man who deserted her.

Mr. BOYCE. The request of my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) is, it seems to me, under the circumstances, exceedingly reasonable. It will be five or six weeks, perhaps two months, perhaps more before prorogation takes place, so that there will be ample time to have the evidence thoroughly reviewed by officers of the government competent to give a judicial opinion upon it, and therefore I do not see why my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) should object to the request made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). It is of the last importance that we should exercise the greatest care before pronouncing a dissolution of the marriage tie. Canadians, I believe, are a righteous and moral people, who desire that the moral foundations, which are the basis of a good and God fearing nation, should be strengthened; and if we should exercise the haste urged upon the committee by my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell), we would be aiming a blow at the very basis of those Christian principles which should govern our divorce proceedings and would in that way be inflicting a blow on public morality.

I have looked at the evidence in this case. I am a lawyer and so is my hon. friend from Lincoln. I have had some experience in the dissection of evidence both in civil and criminal proceedings, and the hon. member for Centre York, while he is a man of great shrewdness and great business sagacity, is not accustomed to the dissection of evidence, to the careful analysis and weighing of evidence, to ascertain what is sufficient to satisfy the burden of proof in a civil or criminal case. The hon. member for Centre York must bear this in mind that before the decree can be passed in a case of this kind there must be not only evidence of guilt of the legal infidelity which is charged, but there must be overwhelming evidence of that guilt, there must be such evidence of that guilt as would satisfy the ordinary mind that the presumption of innocence is entirely overcome. My hon. friend from Lincoln reminds me of the principle that the evidence should go further, that it should satisfy the minds of the members of the committees of the two Houses through which the Bill is obliged to pass, that there is no reasonable doubt at all about the innocence of the person charged with this grave offence. Before we dissect the particular facts which have been referred to, let us look at the procedure, the very admirable procedure which is one which makes for the protection of all classes and for the preservation of a high standard of morality in the state. The evidence as well as the Bill come down from the higher chamber to this House. For what purpose? Surely for the very purpose referred to by my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), that every member of this House, as is his duty, is to read that evidence and if he thinks it falls short of the remedy sought in this preamble he should have an opportunity of stating, as the hon. member for Lincoln does now, that in his opinion the evidence does fall short of that and that the committee ought to go slowly. The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) has not that legal knowledge, that legal capacity of weighing evidence—I do not profess to be superior in that respect, I do not profess to have that business sagacity and shrewdness which characterize my hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell)—but I do say that it is my opinion that there might be a good deal stronger evidence in this case and yet the committee might hesitate before coming to the conclusion that the grave charge made has been fully upheld. Now to show that the hon. member for Centre York is pursuing a wrong line of argument in this case I would point out to you that the line that he has taken does not touch, except in one or two minor instances, the root of the charge as recited in this preamble. My hon. friend has referred only to the questions of legal cruelty and desertion, facts which are not grounds for the granting of any divorce in this country, and which are not set forth in the Bill either. They are merely evidence of collateral circumstances, evidence which might well have been excluded by the committee, but evidence which certainly, taken alone, cannot have any weight whatever with respect to the matter under consideration by the committee of the Senate.

The fact that the witnesses are of the same disreputable class is surely a circumstance to be taken into consideration. Surely it is not the intention and is not to be the principle laid down by this committee in this case that whatever evidence comes down from the Senate is to be passed by every member of this committee as absolute and undoubted evidence of the guilt of the accused. Surely we have functions to perform, the responsibility of which we cannot shirk and if we say that upon that evidence there is a doubt then I say it is our duty to face that question boldly and investigate and if there be a question then surely no person can be hurt by the very reasonable request of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) to refer the evidence with the Bill to the Minister of Justice asking him to consider the matter and make a report in this case, so that dissection and discussion of the details is not necessary in this committe but we may have the report of the law officer of the Crown, a gentleman skilled in that work who will give the committee the benefit of his judgment, a judicial judgment and one which cannot fail to enlighten the committee one way or the another. It would be futile and I think unpleasant to discuss this matter in committee here, nor would it be pleasant or serve any good result, but to refer the evidence with the Bill back to the

Minister of Justice and to ask his opinion and to ask him to lay his report before the House would be a step in the right direction and be travelling along safe ground and on safe lines.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is a course which in all my experience in this House, extending over many years, I never saw or heard of before. In all the Bills that have been passed here this is the first time that objection has ever been taken in this House and the course suggested, that we should refer this to the Minister of Justice to weigh the evidence is unprecedented. What are 216 members of this House for if they cannot read this evidence and come to a conclusion themselves ? It has now been before the House for the last two weeks, it passed the Senate committee unanimously, it passed the Upper Chamber unanimously, it passed the Private Bills Committee of this House without any objection, and now it comes before this House after the evidence has been in the hands of every member for two weeks or more and forsooth this hon. gentleman says his legal mind is not capable of weighing and deciding upon this evidence and he wants to refer it to the Minister of Justice for a judicial decision and for a report, and the other members of this House were not of a legal and judicial mind, not capable of deciding this question and should not give a vote upon it because they have not the legal training. And I myself have not the legal training to decide whether this Bill should be granted or not.

Mr. BOYCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Now I think that this is a childish, I think it is frivolous, the most frivolous argument ever advanced in this House for a man of the ability of the hon. member for Lincoln, or the hon. member for Algoma, to seriously propose to refer this to the Minister of Justice for a judicial decision upon the legal point. What legal point is there about it ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The legal point is whether the evidence here is legally sufficient to warrant the stain of guilt that is sought to be put on this man.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is to decide that ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not a proper question for the law officers of the Crown to decide ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is that not for a jury to decide.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a question that he can decide.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I can decide it according to my conviction and according to my own ability. I do not require a legal mind. The Senate heard that evidence and they decided unanimously. The Private Bills Committee of this House heard the evidence, and decided to pass this Bill, and now it comes up for its third reading. We are called upon to decide it in this House, and we must decide it, we cannot shirk our responsibility. The only point that is raised is as to the character of these witnesses. I say that the character of these witnesses, according to the evidence that has been submitted, will stand on a par with the evidence of the man who swears he was telling an untruth. I say that the character of the man who says that these witnesses are not reliable, is such that he himself is not a credible witness, his conduct and his course for the last fourteen years put him exactly on the same plane as these witnesses, and I would believe them just as quick as I would him.

Mr. BOYCE. Then my hon. friend will probably concede that the evidence in favour of innocence is equal to the evidence in favour of guilt.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Not at all. The evidence in favour of guilt is overwhelming. To my mind there is no evidence at all on the other side, except of this party who opposes this Bill. He brings no witnesses at all in his favour during the twelve or fourteen years that he lived out in Golden. Does he bring any one from there to prove that he was not frequenting these houses ? On the contrary he admits it, and there is no evidence except his own ; and when you take into consideration his course, the unmanly, the almost inhuman course he has pursued for these fourteen years in leaving this woman and her three children to provide for themselves—I say when a man like that comes up to give his evidence it should not be believed by the members of this House.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I desire to say that I have known Mrs. McDermot since she was a child. She belongs to one of the best families in our county, I never heard a word of reflection cast upon her. She has raised these three children for fourteen or sixteen years, I think he has been in the west for fourteen years, and was separated from her for a year or two before he left Port Perry. Her three children are as nice girls, as well behaved girls, as well brought up girls as there are in the county of South Ontario. Mrs. McDermot is as fine a woman as there is anywhere. There is not a word to be said against her, she has the sympathy of every person there. I am satisfied that this parliament never granted a divorce better justified than this one.

Mr. LANCASTER. With all deference to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Christie), I cannot agree with him, and I do not suppose I will have the sympathy of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) in any case. But I beg to say to these hon. gentlemen that when they ask for a divorce because Mrs. McDermot is a woman of most excellent character, they offer no ground at all why she should

have a divorce. We cannot open a door for that kind for divorces. Where will this country come to in twenty-five years if we are going to grant divorces simply because some woman has been disappointed in regard to her husband, and comes here and asks for a dissolution of her marriage because she made a mistake when she married ? The whole social fabric of the country would go to pieces. If the hon. member for Centre York had a constituent who was being treated in this way, I am sure he would say that the Bill ought not to pass. Because he has got the Bill in his hands, as he says, he thinks he should ask this House to pass it, although he admits that he knows very little about the case. The hon. member for Centre York asks why this Bill should be referred to the Minister of Justice any more than any other Bill ? Simply because it is a most extraordinary Bill, it is an extraordinary request to ask this House to pass a Bill on such evidence as is before us. I have read the evidence in all these cases since I have been in this House, and this is the first Bill I have felt called upon to oppose. Although some of these Bills went through on what I thought was scaly evidence, I never felt before that it was absolutely necessary to oppose a Bill, I never before found the evidence so glaring insufficient as in this case. It is because of the extraordinary nature of the case, because of the most peculiar and insufficient grounds and evidence upon which this Bill is sought to be passed that I say to my hon. friend that he ought to take the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and I am not putting him into the hands of any political enemy when I ask him to take the opinion of the Minister of Justice upon this question. Surely he will have as much influence with the minister as I would have, in convincing him that this Bill ought to pass. This is not a matter of party politics, no party question about it, it is merely a question of passing proper legislation. I must say that when the member for Centre York puts his opinion against the ability of the Minister of Justice to pass upon this question, he is asking us to go a little too far. It may be all very good talk to give to some audience in the backwoods in some part of Ontario, but I do not know of any part where that appeal would amount to very much. But I do think seriously that what the hon. member for Centre York wants, if he is honest, and I am satisfied he is, only misguided in his application of honesty—but if he really wants justice to be done in this matter, he can surely expect to get justice at the hands of the Minister of Justice. The Minister of Justice will not make a secret report, no one suggests that he should tell us whether we have a right to pass this Bill or not. But what I suggest is that the Minister of Justice should look into this Bill, look into this evidence, and then come to this House and discuss it with us if necessary. Nobody suggests that we are to be throttled, that we are not to have any opinion about this matter. But we would like the Minister of Justice to give his opinion upon it, and after we have got it we will still go on and deliberate as to what we should do. My hon. friend says that the character of this man is not as good as the character of these witnesses. The Minister of Justice will disagree with him. The character of the man is sworn to by two perfectly reputable witnesses. These two wretched women are self confessed wrong doers, self confessed accomplices of this man, they have been living in immorality for years, depraved women of the worst kind. They acknowledge they are not respectable. Surely their oath is not as good as the oath of a man who denies that he has done wrong, who it is acknowledged is the father of the children whose mother is his lawful wife. Surely the oath of this man is as good as the oath of these people who admit themselves, out of their own mouths, to be most depraved characters. He does not acknowledge that he did wrong, he is not as bad as they are. Surely the member for Centre York will see the difference between the man whose statement is absolutely consistent with his good character, as well as with his innocence——

Mr. CAMPBELL. His good character ! What do you make of his conduct ?

Mr. LANCASTER. His own statement is absolutely consistent with a good character for all that he is charged with and for all that must be sufficient to justify a divorce. I do not wish to put upon ' Hansard ' all the language of this report, because it is not necessary. But if my hon. friend will read the preamble of the Bill he will see that the only charges made against this man as grounds for passing this Bill, are the very things he denies. The other things which my hon. friend speaks about as showing that this man is perhaps not as careful to look after his wife and children as my hon. friend is or as I am, still, are not grounds for divorce, or, evidence against the man's character in regard to what he is accused of.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I say that they go a long way to contradict his own evidence especially when these statements are corroborated by two or three witnesses.

Mr. LANCASTER. If my hon. friend consults the Minister of Justice, or any other sound lawyer in this House, he will tell him that it does not go a hair's breadth in the direction he speaks of. It has nothing to do with it. A woman cannot secure a divorce because she has not chosen to live with her husband for so many years, and because her husband may or may not have given her as much money as she thought she ought to have. If she has a case in

that respect she can go into the civil courts and claim alimony. She has no right to do anything else, and she has no right to say, that because I can convince the hon. member for Centre York, or any other person who is not in the habit of weighing evidence and therefore innocently, enough will do an injustice to somebody, that I have been wrongly and harshly treated in regard to a matter which is not a statutory ground for divorce that must be laid against him and that must be taken as a ground for divorce in connection with the evidence which was given, evidence which in my opinion is perjured evidence. If my hon. friend had had any experience in courts of law he would have known that judges always charge juries, when people acknowledge their characters to be bad, that their oaths are not worth considering, standing alone. They will charge the jury that the evidence of such characters is not to be taken unless it is corroborated. It is all very well for the hon. member for Centre York to say that justice will be done by granting this divorce. He has no right to do that. He has to consider society's welfare. He cannot divorce a husband from a wife or a wife from a husband on a certain kind of evidence and refuse to divorce another husband from his wife or wife from her husband on exactly the same evidence. There might be dozens of cases brought for no other purpose than the most terrible blackmail against almost every respectable married man who does not find it possible to live at home every day on just such evidence. All you have to do is to bring here a couple of these disreputable women to swear against any respectable man in this country and we must grant a divorce and break up the home and family because these two acknowledged disreputable characters will go before the Senate and swear something against that man, swear against a man who has never been convicted of any crime, who has not a bad character, who has never been prosecuted for anything, who has a good record and who has lived a proper life. My hon. friend shakes his head. Is he going to be a fair judge? Is he going to say that a man has not a good character who has never been convicted of wrong?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do you think it is right to stay for fourteen years and let your family shift for themselves?

Mr. LANCASTER. Suppose he lived long enough to be away 114 years, what has that to do with it? Why did she not go and live with him?

Mr. CAMPBELL. It has a good deal to do with it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It shows my hon. friend's capacity for granting divorces. If that is the way we are going to test the question whether we shall divorce men from their lawful wives or wives from their lawful husbands, I do not think the hon. gentleman should undertake to support any measure because he shows that he is not competent to discuss the question. Two clergymen, absolutely respectable men, no question about their respectability, swear to this man's good character. My hon. friend says that one of them had not known him since his boyhood. He has not read the evidence very carefully. One of these clergymen was up there and saw the man in his store, knew the character of the man at the time he was doing business and at the time he was supposed to have committed this heinous offence. Are the oaths of these clergymen not to be taken against the oaths of these women of disreputable character?

Mr. CAMPBELL. These two clergymen were his own brothers-in-law who saw him at the store but they did not follow him to the place at all. They only saw him in the store.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have heard of special pleading. Here is the double distilled quintessence of special pleading. Here is an hon. gentleman who wants to discuss the question on every other ground than the issue that is before the House. Here is an hon. gentleman desiring to draw us away from the Minister of Justice who would look at this calmly and appealing to us on a sentiment of a most frightful kind, in granting or withholding a divorce which we all know is a most serious thing. The hon. gentleman has said that there is a good case in his opinion against this man. I am going to talk for a minute or two as I would to a jury if I were defending this man. Just see what we are coming to. Against this man appear two most disreputable characters who for years have been living on the proceeds of their vice. They say so themselves. There is no defamation in saying that because it is their own statement. That is the way they qualify themselves as witnesses; in fact, it is the way they qualify themselves as experts in this case. These are the only people who state anything against this man. They are bad characters on their admission, the most disreputable characters to have in the country, women of the most vicious kind, women who are dangerous to any community, breaking the law every day of their lives and liable to go to prison if they can be convicted and if the authorities are smart enough to prosecute them. On their own statement they have been guilty day after day of having led an immoral life. That is their character. Talk about their character being as good as his.. He does not admit that he is that kind of man. On the contrary, he denies it. He is backed up by the fact that he is a respectable merchant doing business in a community where these people are drawn from on behalf of this

woman, who for some strange reason wants to get a divorce from her lawful husband. In that same town she could have found dozens of men to swear to the bad character of this man if it were so. If she had called that kind of evidence, if she had brought respectable people before the committee of the Senate, I could have listened with some patience if they had stated that his character was not as good as theirs. But, she does not do it, she does not bring a witness to show that this man is not to be believed on oath, but he puts into the box two men of the highest character, clergymen, who swear to what he was when he was a young man, and one of whom was out there in the place at the time he was supposed to have committed this offence with these outrageously disreputable women. Where is the excuse for the hon. gentleman saying that one's character is as good as the other ? Where is the protection for any respectable man who is not always surrounded by three or four witnesses able to prove an alibi ? What is the proposition of the hon. member for Centre York?—that if he was not guilty he should have proved it by some one else. Can the hon. gentleman prove where he was a year and two months and a day ago yetsterday ? Can he prove where he was fifteen months ago on a certain Wednesday at eight o'clock in the evening ? It is all very well to say he should have done it ? Could my hon. friend do anything else but what this man has done ? If any one made a false charge against my hon. friend such as that which has been made against this man could my hon. friend have done anything else but what this man has done ? We have to take this thing seriously. We have as much right to suppose that this evidence was given against yourself, Mr. Speaker, or myself, or the hon. member for Centre York and ask ourselves what we, absolutely innocent, would do or expect in the face of that evidence. What could we do but tell the truth as this man has done? If he were guilty would he come all the way down here from British Columbia without counsel and pledge his oath as he has done? If he were guilty of perjury he could be convicted on the evidence of these same two witnesses.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why does he not prosecute these women ?

Mr. LANCASTER. What earthly good would that be to the poor man after he was divorced ? A lot of satisfaction it would be, after a man is taken away from his wife and children, and after he and his children are disgraced for ever, to prosecute these outrageously disreputable women. When the honourable and learned Judge Britton was a member of this House he introduced a Bill providing that divorces should be granted by the courts of the land and not by parliament. As I was personally not in favour of divorces, I took no part in the discussion on that Bill, but if we are going to grant divorces in such cases as this, then by all means let us have divorce courts which will decide these matters judicially and on sound principles. My hon. friend from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) might have disposed of this matter according to my suggestion, but perhaps he forgot that by the rules of the House we will only have to prevail on him for three minutes longer in order that we may have a wider opportunity for discussing this matter and getting the Minister of Justice to throw some light on it, as the committee must then rise anyway.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is evident you want light.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend may be in a great hurry to divorce this wife, Clara Bidwell McDermot, from her husband, George Burton McDermot ; he may think it is a very wise thing to rush this legislation through, but I say again, as I said fifty minutes ago, that the consideration of this Bill should stand over until we have the opinion of the law officers of the Crown. I trust that even at this late hour, even now when the hour for private Bills is about to expire, he will accept my suggestion. I do not want to be unduly contentious with my hon. friend (Mr. Campbell), and I trust he will consent that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. If he will not consent, then so long as the lamp holds out to burn we will endeavour to bring pressure on him. He says we should not shirk the responsibility, but that is exactly what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) is doing. He is endeavouring to shirk the responsibility by rushing this Bill through without allowing the House to seriously consider the matter.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You want to shirk the responsibility and throw it on the Minister of Justice.

Mr. LANCASTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) has no right to say that. If I wanted to shirk my responsibility I could remain silent and let the Bill pass, but I assume the responsibility of pointing out what I think is wrong in this Bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If you are opposed to it, vote against it ; why do you want to talk it out ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman thinks it is all right for a member to vote for or against a Bill and not give his reasons. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House who may think that good policy, but on this side even so much of a back bencher as the member for Lincoln thinks it right to state the reasons why he opposes a measure. It may be supposed that I oppose this Bill because I am not in favour of divorces, but, Sir, I recog-

nize that the statutes of Canada require us to grant divorces in proper cases, and, so long as that is the law of the land, I will vote for divorces in proper cases. But this is not a proper case, in my opinion, because the preamble of the Bill states that about the month of April, 1901, this man did certain things, and it declares that the petitioner has proved the allegations in her petition. In my judgment, that preamble is not borne out by the evidence.

The hour for private Bills having expired, the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

St. Lawrence river and canals—reducing shoals west of Cornwall, $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Where are these shoals, and how much altogether will it require to do the work ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The work consists in dredging shoals, one opposite Hooper's creek, one mile west of Cornwall, and the other opposite Archibald's point, about one and a-half miles west at the head of the canal and connected with the mainland. The contract was entered into with W. J. Poupore & Company. This $5,000 is required to pay off the contract, the whole contract being for $30,500.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this the first expenditure on it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. A contract was let last year, when an amount was voted towards the work, and this is the balance to close up the contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much has been expended on the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is estimated that there will be expended up to the 30th of June $30,500, and that will complete the work. In the main estimates of 1904-5 we had $25,500, which left the balance of $5,000.

Rapide Plat canal—enlargement of upper entrance, $4,200.

Mr. EMMERSON. This completes the work.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The final estimate for the whole work was $81,500. There was paid up to the 30th of November, 1904, $79,063.40. That left a balance due of $2,437.52, which, added to the drawback of $1,268.53 makes $3,705.05, which with the engineer's staff salaries, $500, makes $4,200.

Mr. HAGGART. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. EMMERSON. P. H. Gilbert was the contractor. The original contract was let in 1900. There were three tenders, and Mr. Gilbert's was the lowest.

Soulanges canal—steel bridge at power house, $500 ; construction, $36,500 ; total, $37,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. The $500 is to cover the additional cost of the superstructure. $4,000 was voted in the main estimates, and the total cost will be $4,500. The $36,500 is a balance due to Manning & Macdonald, who had a contract for construction. The contractors are making claims against the department, but this is all that the department recognizes.

Mr. HAGGART. What was Manning & Macdonald's total contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total payments on the 13th section to the 31st of December, 1904, amounted to $682,407.75, that is covering a period of years. The amount remaining unpaid is $34,182.52, making the total amount about $717,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister tell us how that compares with the estimated cost by the department when the contract was entered into ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is in excess of the original estimate.

Mr. HAGGART. How much ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My engineer cannot give me that amount.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it more than double?

Mr. EMMERSON. Somewhere in the vicinity of $50,000.

Mr. HAGGART. It must be more than that. The amount expended on this contract is in the neighbourhood of $720,000. That would leave the estimated cost by the department $670,000. It would be interesting to the House to see how near the actual cost of construction came to the estimate by the engineers.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not got that information, and my chief engineer tells me he does not remember what the original estimate was. It was an estimate made many years ago, I am not personally familiar with it, but in the judgment of one of the officials the cost was between $50,000 and $60,000 in excess of the original estimate.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I suppose the hon. gentleman would not object to furnishing that estimate at a later date ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly not.

Welland canal—to deepen portion of long level, $52,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How it is that the estimate was exceeded this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was estimated that we would expend about $150,000 this year, but the contractors made greater progress than estimated and it requires $52,000 to continue the work and pay the drawback up to the end of the current year. It is

estimated that the two months work will amount to $25,000 for each month, and there is a drawback of $10,000, making $60,000 in all. We have on hand $8,000 of the $150,000, so that the amount required is $52,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Does this finish it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. With what is in the main estimates, this item of $52,000 will finish the whole contract, so my chief engineer informs me.

Mr. HAGGART. How much will you have in your lowest water navigation on the long level ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At normal level we will have seventeen feet.

Mr. HAGGART. But at low water ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Fifteen feet.

Mr. HAGGART. That is a foot deeper than the navigation on the locks ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you make the total expenditure on that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $530,270.

Mr. HAGGART. That does not cover all the expenditure in deepening the long level?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there was expended up to the 31st December, 1904, $390,270 on this long level.

Mr. HAGGART. Then this is an expenditure of $700,000 for the purpose of putting this level to what it ought to have been originally when built ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $530,000.

Mr. HAGGART. With the amount to be expended ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $540,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When will the work be completed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is supposed to complete the work within this fiscal year.

Trent canal—to complete survey, $25,000 ; damages by flooding, $7,000 ; $32,000.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the minister give us a concise account of the two different lines—the survey line to Port Hope and the line following the Trent river down, and which he thinks is the most advantageous ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have surveyed three lines, one to Cobourg, one to Port Hope the other to Trenton. The final report giving a comparison of the different routes has not been received. The work is not yet completed. In order to meet the liabilities incurred during this current year, we will require $25,000 for the surveys on the Trent Valley system. I am not in a position to give to the committee even the judgment of the engineer, in consequence of the survey not being completed and a final report not having been made. This matter was started by the department with an open mind, and I hope to have an exhaustive and thorough report from the independent engineer—a gentleman of eminence in his profession—and as soon as that report is received, I shall lay it on the table.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much has been expended on the survey thus far ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to the 1st April, $16,259.

Mr. HAGGART. I should judge that the hon. minister has had the reports of his own engineers on the different routes ; and there has been a survey of that portion of the canal which was intended to suit the people in North York. What was the result of that survey ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the report from the engineer. We have had reports in the department with respect to the different routes, and these have been laid before parliament from time to time. This has not been laid before parliament. There was a general complaint on the part of the different parties interested or the different committees that these surveys were not exhaustive in all instances, and I have even heard it alleged by hon. members in this House that sometimes the engineers who had made these surveys did not do so with an open mind, that they were biased and I promised the House last session that a survey would be made by engineers who would stand entirely indifferent as respects the different communities or localities interested, and in pursuance of that promise this survey was commenced. I am not in a position to furnish the House with the information inasmuch as the report has not been presented as the work is not completed.

Mr. HAGGART. There is in the department the report of the engineer in charge of the Trent canal who had surveyed both routes, and his report was strongly in favour of the Bay of Quinte or Trenton route. The minister has had no report since that from the engineer in charge of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The report from the independent engineer has not yet come in.

Mr. HAGGART. Is an engineer at present employed by the government for the purpose ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, Mr. Watt was employed to survey the proposed routes, the Port Hope route, the Cobourg route, the Trenton route and at the other end, the Simcoe-Georgian bay route and the Aurora route.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you had any report on the Aurora route ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not yet; there is no final report as to the result of the surveys.

Mr. HAGGART. When will the other lift lock be finished to enable them to get into the waters of Lake Simcoe?

Mr. EMMERSON. It will be completed for the opening of navigation next season.

Mr. HAGGART. Then there is to be continuous navigation for what length, the whole of Lake Simcoe and down to where?

Mr. EMMERSON. Down below Peterborough to Rice lake.

Mr. U. WILSON. When were the surveys authorized by the government to Cobourg and Port Hope?

Mr. EMMERSON. At the last session when a vote of parliament was asked.

Mr. U. WILSON. I suppose you had come to a decision before you asked for money to survey these routes.

Mr. EMMERSON. To make all possible surveys and take into consideration the whole question, to furnish such evidence as would be of value in finally determining the route to be adopted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. With reference to the November campaign had Mr. Aylesworth any authority from the department to tell the people in the riding that the Trent Valley canal would go through Port Hope?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was not even aware that Mr. Aylesworth made any such statement. I might mention also that my attention was called by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) to the possibility of a route by Brighton and I gave instructions to have that investigated and if it was found at all feasible to have it surveyed.

Mr. HAGGART. I think that now the elections are all over the department might accept the opinion that was given by the engineer in charge, that there is no doubt whatever that the only practicable and feasible route is the Trenton route, and that you should use all the money you have on it in the construction of the canal instead of spending it on useless surveys.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no doubt my hon. friend is sincere but I have heard words uttered by my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Ward) who is not, I am sorry to see, in his place, that are entirely contrary to the views expressed by my hon. friend. There are differences of opinion and I should hope to have such information placed before me as would enable me to form some judgment of my own and I shall be very pleased to coincide with either my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) or the hon. gentleman from Durham (Mr. Ward).

Mr. HAGGART. I am only forming my opinion on the engineer's report.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When does the minister expect a report of these surveys?

Mr. EMMERSON. In the early part of this season.

Lachine canal—enlargement and improvements, $12,000; slope walls, $32,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. We ask in the main estimates $24,000 and we are now asking to complete $12,000. This amount is to cover the payment of drawback, increase in quantities and extra work for Cote St. Paul and Brewster's bridges. There was an increase, the bulk of it on earth excavation. The material was found to be of a very unfavourable nature. There was also an increase in the amount of cribwork. A portion of last year's vote lapses. This work was done by contract, Quinlan & Robertson are the contractors. This completes the work. One of these bridges is at Cote St. Paul, and the other called Brewster's bridge. They both replace old bridges.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the object of separating vote 51 from vote 53, seeing that they both refer to the Lachine canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. One is capital, the other is current expenses.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Give us some idea of the extent of the enlargement of the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. These were bridges across the Lachine canal, new bridges replacing old ones that had become decayed, and the opening was widened.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The words are 'enlargements and improvements.'

Mr. EMMERSON. That was for widening and opening the canal. This work is done by contract.

Mr. HAGGART. How much does the cost exceed the estimate of the department when the contract was entered into?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total expenditure in connection with this work up to the 1st of April, was $158,882. We are asking for $12,000 more. I have not the exact figures, but there was some excess.

Mr. HAGGART. The contract was based upon a lot of items.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was a schedule contract. There were two contracts, both relating to bridges. One contract was let to Quinlan & Robertson, that is the one at Côte St. Paul bridge, and the other was let to John Quinlan. The excess over the estimate was about $12,000 on the two contracts, and that was largely due to the character of the excavation.

Mr. BERGERON. The bridge at Côte St. Paul was an ordinary wooden bridge, has it been changed into a steel bridge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there two locks at Côte St. Paul, or only one? Was the old one enlarged?

Mr. EMMERSON. The old one was enlarged and the span was increased in consequence. The old bridge was necessarily a shorter bridge, and in consequence of the enlargement the old lock had to be increased in length.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the minister know what is the size of the new lock made where the old lock was? Is it large enough to receive ocean vessels, as it was proposed to make it?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are now 270 feet in length, and they were 245 feet. The depth of water is 14 feet on the mitre sill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was that contract let by tender?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. It is a schedule contract, and is work that necessarily had to be done in the interest of the canal. The estimated cost of the whole work when these two slope walls are finally completed is $235,000. But this work has necessarily to be done within a very short time while the canal is unwatered, in the spring. So much is done each season. It is done by tender and contract, and the lowest tender has been accepted in all cases.

Mr. BERGERON. That must have been done during the last month when the water was out of the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is right.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that there was not enough money to finish it?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are only asking for $13,000 during this year.

Mr. BERGERON. That is additional to the amount in the main estimates.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the main estimates it was $13,000. It was expected that we might not do very much during this year but the conditions were favourable and we instructed them to do the work.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount?

Mr. EMMERSON. $45,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that complete the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; it will go on for five or six years. A certain proportion of the canal will be sloped each year under the specifications.

Mr. BERGERON. It is only at the locks it is sloped with cut stone?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all along the whole bank of the canal.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not all done in cut stone?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not cut stone; it is dry masonry and rip-rapping.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it done by the yard?

Mr. EMMERSON. By the cubic yard.

Mr. BERGERON. How much is it by the cubic yard?

Mr. EMMERSON. For dry masonry $5.50, and for rip-rap repairing $2.40.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this season's work finished?

Mr. EMMERSON. That portion that is ordinarily under water is attended to when the canal is unwatered in the spring, and from now until the 1st of July that which is above water will be attended to. The total estimated cost of that during this current year is $45,000. We only took an appropriation in the main estimates for $13,000, and therefore we are asking for the balance for the current fiscal year of $32,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How can work of that kind be done by contract? I understand that it is generally done by the employees of the government and those who work on the canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BERGERON. How can you carry on the work for five or six years by contract?

Mr. EMMERSON. They tender at schedule prices, so much per cubic yard for concrete, so much per cubic yard for dry masonry and so much for rip-rapping.

Mr. BERGERON. It is always the same contractor?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the first work that these gentlemen have done.

Mr. BERGERON. This year?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes; the contract was let some time last summer.

Mr. BERGERON. To be done this spring?

Mr. EMMERSON. A certain portion of it to be done this spring, and next year there will be another portion of it done.

Mr. HAGGART. Was not most of this work done when the canal was constructed?

Mr. EMMERSON. This work became necessary by reason of the deepening of the canal. When they deepened the canal the old work was destroyed; it broke down.

Mr. HAGGART. This is renewal work?

Mr. EMMERSON. Practically renewal work caused by the deepening of the canal.

Mr. HAGGART. How is the work standing where it was put in after the canal was deepened?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is standing very well, so the chief engineer says.

Mr. BERGERON. How long is it since the Lachine canal was deepened ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About nine years.

Mr. BERGERON. Has this work been going on ever since ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; there has been a certain proportion of this work going on since then. Delormier had the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand Delormier was furnishing the stone. He had a quarry.

Mr. EMMERSON. His contract was for the other as well. He had to furnish the stone because he had a contract for the other.

Mr. BERGERON. On what part of the canal ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Between Côte St. Paul and Lachine.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that part finished ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That part is not finished. The south side has not been touched.

Mr. BERGERON. It may be kept on like that for ten years more.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be a pretty large sum if we expended it all at one time, but it will perfect the canal to have the work done.

Mr. BERGERON. It costs $45,000 this year, and it will be about the same thing next year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that for the work that was let under contract to Quinlan & Robertson it is estimated that the total will be about $235,000. They are doing $45,000 worth of it this year.

Mr. BERGERON. That means about five years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this rip-rapping from the top of the rock excavation, or does it go down to the bottom ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It goes down to the bottom.

Mr. HAGGART. Rip-rapping at the bottom where it is in rock excavation ?

Mr. BERGERON. The work is only a few feet on the top.

Mr. EMMERSON. They lay a concrete foundation in the bottom where there is rock, and this is in order to sustain the slope of the sides above.

Mr. HAGGART. Rip-rapping at the side of the canal generally commences from the top of the rock excavation. There is a great deal of rock excavation on the Lachine canal, and if the rip-rapping was put in properly the deepening of the canal would not affect the rip-rap at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. As a matter of fact, I am informed that it did affect it, and that it fell down.

Mr. HAGGART. It should not have done so. You can deepen down the prism of the canal and the rip-rapping should only commence from the top of the rock work. It must have been very badly done, or there must have been something wrong about it, because the rip-rapping should never go down to the bottom of the rock excavation. It should only commence at the top. It is extremely curious. To my knowledge, a lot of the excavation for the Lachine canal is in rock, and that the rip-rapping should go down to the bottom is impossible. Rip-rapping commences at the top of the prism or of the rock excavation ; and if it were put in properly, the deepening of the canal would not interfere with it at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand it, in some places it was found to be necessary. In other places it only goes from the top of the rock excavation, as my hon. friend very properly says. In all cases where it was possible to do it in that way it was done. The chief engineer tells me that in certain places it was found to be necessary to go to the bottom and to lay a concrete foundation.

Cornwall canal—to purchase and fit up concreting apparatus, $2,400.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you want this on the Cornwall canal for?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is for all the St. Lawrence canals from Prescott to Cornwall. The total estimated cost is $6,230 and we previously voted $4,100.

Mr. HAGGART. Does that include a crushing apparatus?

Mr. EMMERSON. A boiler, engine, stone crusher, concrete mixer, two derricks with engines and the erection and installation.

Mr. HAGGART. It will cost as much to remove it from one place to another as to do the work.

Lachine canal—underpinning wall, basin No. 2, $10,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This wall was falling in and the work can only be done when the canal is unwatered. The estimate was $17,000 ; we took a vote of $7,000 and we ask for the balance.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the engineer's estimate for the whole work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $17,000 and we previously took $7,000 thinking we would only do that amount of work up to the end of the fiscal year, but it was found possible to complete the work. The officers of the department found they were wrong as to their expectations.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the work completed now?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. How was the estimate of the department wrong?

Mr. EMMERSON. The items are as follows: excavation, 2,000 yards at $1.15 per yard; concrete filling, 2,000 yards at $4.50 per yard; timber for supports, 2,000 lineal feet at 25 cents; planking for facing, $416; cement, $4,000; engineering, $784; total, $17,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of that timber?

Mr. EMMERSON. The plank facing would be utilized and the timber for the supports would be in the stores of the canal.

Mr. BERGERON. It was a matter of complaint in the Curran bridge case that there was a great deal of timber used for the same purpose and it disappeared.

Mr. EMMERSON. This might disappear in the same way, but there are officials there to look after it and it will not disappear if they do their duty.

Mr. HAGGART. This $10,000 completes the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that winds it up.

Widening tail race—to pay contractor O. L. Henault for extra time, $514.60.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that this poor contractor did not get paid?

Mr. EMMERSON. The total payment up to May 1, 1904, final estimate was $9,234.60. The contractors claimed a much larger amount than the vote, but the chief engineer allowed $514.60. The following are the items allowed by the chief engineer: cutting down and removing piers, $180; assisting government employees, $88.50; furnishing 34 yards of displacement, $45; supplying 22 tons of crushed stone, $24.80; supplying 22 tons of Potsdam stone, $33; iron, $53.80.

Mr. BERGERON. The appropriation is for extra time and according to your statement you are paying for work and material?

Mr. EMMERSON. That must be a clerical error.

Mr. BERGERON. You had better change the wording of the item then.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will change it to 'extra work.'

Mr. BERGERON. The engineer passed on this amount and decided it was correct?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but of course the contractor put in a claim for more.

Mr. BERGERON. I have no doubt about that; they generally ask more expecting to get less.

Improvements to flume on power house, $3,500.

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for?

Mr. EMMERSON. This work is rendered necessary on account of the proposed operation of the locks by electric power. The present power will probably be sufficient to drive all the machinery.

Mr. BERGERON. Since when have the locks worked by electricity?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are only getting ready for that. This work is necessary to enable us to do it.

Mr. BERGERON. When will that be in operation?

Mr. EMMERSON. We hope very shortly, some of the gates will be fitted this summer, and all of them, we hope, by October.

Mr. BERGERON. When you have that work done, what are you going to do with the eight or ten men who are employed on nearly every lock?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know whether this will be a labour-saving machine or not. It may be necessary to dispense with the services of some of these gentlemen.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the use of electricity result in a saving in expense?

Mr. EMMERSON. It expedites the traffic. I will not say that it will be possible to dispense with the services of the men, because, while the vessels go through with greater expedition, they have to be guided in their passage, and men are necessary for that purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. On the Soulanges canal there are very few men employed, and with the electric system we could dispense with half the men employed on the Lachine canal to-day. Will this apply to the old locks or only to the new?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it is found to be a success, all the locks will be operated in the same way. I do not know that the use of electricity on the Soulanges canal has obviated the necessity of having men. The experience there is that only expedition is obtained, and not a lessening of the cost, because men have to be constantly on the watch as the vessels pass through.

Lachine canal—lock gates, suspension, $4,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is for changing the hanging gear of the locks. The present hanging or suspension apparatus is not satisfactory, in the judgment of the officials of the department, because it is very easily put out of gear. Stone cutting of races, protection beams, and other necessary work will cost $3,000, and iron beams for the gates will cost $1,500. There are five locks to be gated. The system adopted is the same as is used on the Ottawa canal, which is giving every satisfaction.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of the invention of Mr. Manny ? Is it being put on every gate ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is being put on many.

Mr. BERGERON. Has it been found a success ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what the officers say.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it to lock the gates after they are shut ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is to protect them from vessels knocking against them.

Mr. HAGGART. In going down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Going up.

Mr. HAGGART. Do the vessels do any harm to the gates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They do a great deal. We had an experience on the Welland canal where three gates were sent to glory.

Mr. HAGGART. Was the vessel going up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. If that improvement had been on those gates, would the accident have happened ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chief engineer thinks that while it might not absolutely prevent accidents, accidents will be less likely to happen.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it be good policy to put it on every gate ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are trying the experiment on the Lachine canal first and then will consider the advisability of asking a vote to put it on all the canals.

To complete paving of Mill street, $2,200.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does that cost altogether ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About $49,581.

Mr. BERGERON. Besides this amount ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the total will be over $50,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this on government property ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the government owns Mill Street.

Chambly canal—culvert St. Theresa Island, $2,500 ; culvert at Deneau's farm, $2,000, $4,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this a new culvert or repairing an old one ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a culvert on St. Theresa island, Iroquois river. There were culverts there before. The total expenditure is $12,383. It was let by contract to a man named Finn, but he did not complete his contract, and the canal staff have been obliged to complete it.

Mr. HAGGART. You charged it against him ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that complete the whole thing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the cost of the culvert at Deneau's farm ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We expended $3,059 in 1904, and are asking now $2,000 more. The total cost will be about $10,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is this for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is for the purpose of carrying a stream under the canal.

St. Ours landing wharf, $4,500.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is a renewal of a landing wharf below the locks, which has been in existence a very long time, and requires to be renewed. We require $4,500 to complete. The amount voted before was $6,000.

Mr. HAGGART. How is it your engineers get so far astray in their estimates?

Mr. EMMERSON. The superintendent engineer reports that a certain amount of work can be done which is larger than was expected, and on his report we ask for a vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that complete the whole thing ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the minister sure he did not promise, when he got the vote for $6,000 that that would complete the work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Speaking from general custom, I would say I did not. But if the question were asked at all, I would have asked my chief engineer and no doubt would have answered just as he told me.

Mr. HAGGART. If the minister made the statement that $6,000 would complete and it is costing $10,000——

Mr. EMMERSON. I would apologize on the spot.

Trent canal—completion of work of lowering floor of lock, $2,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this in connection with the new lift-lock?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the lock below Peterborough which was built when the canal was originally built.

Mr. HAGGART. That would be about seventy years ago. Is this one of the old locks that is now owned by the Ontario government? Is it one of the locks not conveyed to the Ontario government.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. This is right at the town of Peterborough.

Mr. HAGGART. Will this render this lock available for the present system of navigation proposed on the Trent canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the object of it.

To complete new dam at Peterborough lock, $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to complete the new dam. The work is let by contract to a Mr. Burnet. $2,955 was expended up to the 31st of December, 1904, and this is to complete it. We asked $7,000.

Mr. HAGGART. This $2,000 will complete it?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total cost?

Mr. EMMERSON. $7,000.

To pay claim Geo. Matthews Company for damage caused by water, $600.

Mr. EMMERSON. This amount is to pay a firm at Peterborough damages for injury to their goods caused by the raising of the waters of the Otonabee river in consequence of the government's works in building a new dam at Whitlaw's rapids. The cellars were flooded and a quantity of fertilizing material and bacon damaged. The claim was investigated by the engineer and was substantiated by his report. The matter was referred to the Justice Department, and they advised a settlement and it was deemed advisable to pay the price demanded rather than have litigation in view of the opinion of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HAGGART. One would think that the engineers in building the dam would know what damage would be caused above it and would have advised the people to remove the goods.

St. Peter's canal—dredging, $1,500.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is this contract let by tender and if so, what is the price per yard?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is not by tender. This is down in Cape Breton where it is almost impossible to get a dredge. There are none there and we had to convey one from Sydney. We paid so much per day for the dredge which we got from the Dominion Coal Company and the conveyance and cost of the work has certainly exceeded the estimates made by the engineers.

Mr. BOYCE. Do you pay for the towing?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. How much?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a dispute. We paid $68 a day for the dredge; that included the towing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give us an idea of the amount of material that was moved by this dredge?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, we have no such estimate.

Mr. BOYCE. Was the price so much an hour?

Mr. EMMERSON. So much per day.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the depth and length of the clay that was removed?

Mr. EMMERSON. There were two shoals at the St. Peter's canal which obstructed its navigation.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the extent of it?

Mr. EMMERSON. There were about $3,000 to $4,000 expended.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the department satisfied that the work is done properly?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, the only dispute is as to the time occupied in taking the dredge from Sydney to the canal. There is a dispute as to the number of days. The work was necessary in the fall of the year and they contended that the time occupied in transporting the dredge should be included, the ten days occupied in that way. It was finally settled, the officers of the department agreeing upon the matter; it will cost, including the towing, about $3,500.

Mr. HAGGART. The amount you got last year was $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, we are asking more.

Mr. BOYCE. Who has the work?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was under the supervision of the man who had charge of the canal. The Dominion Coal Company rented the dredge.

Mr. BOYCE. Was the Dominion Coal Company the owner of the dredge?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. And the department paid the coal company?

Mr. EMMERSON. The work was done under the instruction of Mr. Devereaux. He is an official of the department, and has charge of that.

Mr. BOYCE. Was the work last year done under the same conditions?

Mr. EMMERSON. This was all done last year.

Mr. BOYCE. Was there any advertising for tenders?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is nothing in the shape of a dredge there at all, the nearest dredge would be in the city of St. John. The government have no dredge at their disposal.

Mr. BOYCE. That would be the converse case to the Port Arthur case, where there were dredges and nowhere else, and no advertisements were published.

Mr. EMMERSON. Inquiries were made. This work was very urgent, navigators were making complaints, and the officials of the department had instructions from me to make inquiries in all directions to see what could be done towards getting a dredge to do this work. We could not find a dredge in any of the departments, and we were finally obliged to take this dredge at Sydney belonging to the Dominion Coal Company.

Carillon and Grenville canal—guide piers, $1,017.

Mr. EMMERSON. These guide piers are at the head of these two canals. The contract was let in 1901 to Martineau Sons & Lemoine. The work is completed. The amount of the contract was $19,788.55, and this is a balance to complete.

Mr. HAGGART. Is this for extras ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No ; it is a part of the contract.

Mr. HAGGART. It is a wonder you did not ask for the amount last year to finish the contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will explain. These contractors had a claim in the department, this balance was in dispute, and this amount was finally adjusted by the chief engineer.

Mr. HAGGART. This is over and above the contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, it is included in the contract ; but the contractors made a greater claim. In the final estimate they put in claims, as a rule, for more work, and there is always a dispute as to the quantity. A dispute arose in connection with this contract, and it was finally adjusted by the chief engineer, and under his certificate $1,017 was agreed upon.

Welland canal—to pay Stephen Vanderburg for time lost, injured while on duty, two-thirds time, 196 days at $1.75 per day, $228.86.

Mr. EMMERSON. This man was engaged at the Port Maitland lock and was injured by falling into the lock, on the 6th of August last, and is still laid up in consequence.

Mr. LANCASTER. What was the special work he was employed at ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They were repairing the floor of the lock while it was unwatered.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was it because of any negligence of his fellow-servants, or was it his own fault ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe it has been the custom for years to give indemnities in similar cases. The matter was submitted to me, and, in view of the course that had been followed, I decided to ask for a vote of parliament for the amount. I am not acquainted with the details, I could not say just what kind of work he was doing, or as to whose fault it was.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not finding fault with this, but I just wish to know the policy of the government, if, when a man is injured while at his work, they pay an indemnity without bothering to inquire, like an uncharitable corporation would, as to whether it was his fault or the fault of somebody else.

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not pay. We inquire and then submit the matter to parliament. This has not been paid. It cannot be paid until parliament votes the amount. Of course, as I understand it, the custom has been to look into each individual case and if a man is injured on duty an allowance of a certain percentage is granted unless it is the fault of the labourer or workman. In that case it is not considered.

Mr. BERGERON. And there is no discrimination between Liberals and Conservatives ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. BOYCE. It is granted irrespective of whether there is negligence attributed to the government or not ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is granted if the man is not negligent.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it is a mere accident ?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it is a mere accident.

Mr. BOYCE. You do not consider it necessary to make out a prima facie case?

Miscellaneous—salaries of extra clerks, copyists and messengers, other than those who have passed the Civil Service examination, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $1,000.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the total amount you have expended this year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $4,000.

Lachine canal—repairs, $10,205.

Mr. BERGERON. Where would these repairs be ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These are several items that arose in connection with the working of the canal and the making of repairs for the season. I can give the dif-

ferent items. We replaced wooden by cast iron mooring posts on locks and approaches at a cost of $4,230.

Mr. BERGERON. That must be an unforeseen expenditure ?

Mr. EMMERSON. These were repairs of which the department had not been advised at the time the main estimates were prepared.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was there in the main estimates for this work ?

Mr. EMMERSON. $55,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Then that would be $65,000 instead of $55,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of repairs are these ?

Mr. EMMERSON. In addition to the posts there were the following: Underpinning crib at lower approach to lock 4, raising Wellington bridge, removing and renewing broken pivot, four 150 ton hydraulic jacks, four 25 ton hydraulic jacks for raising large bridges, building line fence and sidewalks at Côte St. Paul, clearing site of Wellington basin leased to the Moorehouse Coal Company, removing dross and stone stored for repairs and concrete wall on the south side of the tail race of the waste weir at Côte St. Paul.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that our own waste weir or the waste weir from the mill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is one of the waste weirs at Côte St. Paul in connection with the lock.

Beauharnois canal—repairs, $4,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the government going to keep that canal in operation ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We have to keep it in operation. It is used to a certain extent and while it is not very important as a canal it seems to be necessary to keep it up. There are some water-powers on it. I have not been able to reach the conclusion that the canal should be abolished as a canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend been approached in regard to utilizing the water-powers on the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. The matter has been up from time to time. There have been applications made to the department from a good many sources, from corporations and individuals, for water rights. I have not been able to determine the question or look into it as I would like to. I do not know what course should be pursued.

Mr. BERGERON. There are a few vessels passing through it. It is not a very costly work, as I understand, as there are very few men employed on it. It is important however to keep it in repair as long as it is not costly because I can see that before long, if the hon. gentleman examines the subject, he may come to the conclusion that it would be a good thing to grant the right to use the water-powers. It would be an immense water-power, because there is about 80 feet of a chute. The canal is not in operation to-day to any great extent but it requires to be kept in repair because otherwise it would go to decay very soon.

St. Peter's canal—repairs, $500.

Mr. HAGGART. Where is the other item for canals ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend want to discuss it now at this stage ? I expect to have it in the supplementaries for the coming year.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be discussed on the supplementaries for the coming year.

Farran's Point canal—to complete the acetylene gas plant, $300.

Mr. HAGGART. Surely you are not putting acetylene on this canal where you have so much power to generate electricity ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is isolated; this was done some time ago and the vote is to complete.

Mr. HAGGART. Why, two or three miles of wire would connect it with the other canals. It seems to be an absurd expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. This was not done in my day.

Mr. HAGGART. Is it to light the canal?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. Then I would advise the minister to fling it out and to connect with wires from his electric plant.

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly will look into it; it is five miles from the Cornwall canal and about ten from the Rapide Plat.

Mr. BERGERON. Has a gentleman named Painchaud, of Montreal, written to the Minister of Railways with regard to an invention he has for making acetylene gas safer?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have had several aplications respecting improvements, but I do not remember the names.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that Mr. Painchaud's process will prevent the accidents which have recently occurred?

Mr. EMMERSON. Application has been made to the department in connection with the lighting of cars on the Intercolonial Railway, stating that this improvement is better than Pintsch gas and that the Canadian Pacific Railway were installing it.

Welland canal—lowering head of lock No. 1, $10,000.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the necessity for this work?

Mr. EMMERSON. The breast wall and foundation at the head of lock No. 1, was originally built about one foot too high, and it requires to be lowered in order to maintain fourteen feet navigation in the event of the retaining wall between the old and new canal giving out, as is very likely to happen at any time. The estimate is $10,000 and after the work is completed the retaining wall will not be required.

Mr. HAGGART. Is that the total amount?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the total estimated cost.

Mr. HAGGART. Did we not have a vote for this before ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. This is down at Port Dalhousie. Is not the government spending money every year to keep that retaining wall in repair ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We had to repair the retaining wall as long as it remained, but now we are going to abandon that wall.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much per year has it cost to repair that retaining wall?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is considerably out of repair now and before it gives out we want to do this work so as to obviate the necessity of any further repairs.

Mr. FISHER. There are one or two items for the Department of Agriculture which I would like to get passed to-night.

Mr. HAGGART. We did a good night's work for the purpose of getting through at 11 o'clock, and the explanations of the Minister of Agriculture are generally so brief that he might keep us here till 1 o'clock.

Mr. FISHER. I will undertake to make my remarks very brief.

Mr. LANCASTER. There are several gentlemen absent who did not expect the agricultural estimates to come up.

Mr. HAGGART. This is about the most interesting subject that comes before us and we would like a full House to hear the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. PATERSON. I have two or three small items in the customs.

Mr. HAGGART. Your items pass any time as a matter of course.

Mr. LANCASTER. We can not make fish of one and flesh of another.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. What are you going to do on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. After private Bills we hope to proceed with the Autonomy Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 22, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. T. GREENWAY moved that the fourth report of the Select Committee on Agriculture and Colonization be concurred in. He said : I might explain that the committee had before them Mr. Clarke, of the seed department, who gave what they considered very valuable information regarding the investigation which had been made into the quality of seeds and into the dealings in seed. The committee ordered the usual numbers of printed reports to be distributed in the usual way—16,900 to the members, and 3,000 for the Department, and 100 for the use of the committee. The information was considered by the committee exceedingly valuable and which should be distributed as quickly as possible. For that reason they ordered that this number of copies should be printed forthwith and distributed with the same number of copies of the statute regulating the sale of seeds which we passed this session, and I may say that I think the information obtained from Mr. Clarke proves conclusively the necessity for some such Act.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I beg to move :

That an order of the House do issue for the production of the interim report of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway together with the maps and drawing of the lines located.

Motion agreed to, and interim report presented.

Mr. FOSTER. How far does that go ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From its inception down to the 31st March.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We will have an annual report hereafter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Act provides for an annual report, and that matter is referred to in the report from the commission.

On the table of the House will be found location maps of the different surveys made.

Mr. FOSTER. As this report is only in typewriting, I think it would be well that the minister should move that it be printed.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am going to have it printed and distributed. I move that the interim report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission now presented be printed.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH OXFORD AND LONDON BYE-ELECTIONS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have to inform the House that His Excellency the Governor General has been pleased to appoint the Hon. C. S. Hyman Minister of Public Works. The writs for the elections in North Oxford and London have been issued, and nominations will take place on the 6th June.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to a rather circumstantial report that is going the rounds of the newspapers which I would like him to read, and if he would be kind enough, to make some statement with reference to it to-morrow—I do not wish to precipitate any discussion of the point to-day. It has to do with the scrip issued to the half-breeds. The principal point of the report, which is being widely dstributed, is this: At first the decision of the half-breed commission was that half-breeds who were then resident in the United States should not be allowed their scrip. Afterwards, and not long ago, an Order in Council was passed providing that residents of the United States who had been Canadian half-breeds were to be allowed their scrip. Subsequently a clause was added to the Order in Council making it possible to locate the lands without the personal attendance of the half-breeds. Some inquisitive people found out what was going on. And so this half-breed scrip has been gathered up, as far as possible, for a mere song, and very valuable lands have been or are being located by the fortunate gentlemen who were inquisitive and are said to have found out. Altogether, it is a matter which I would like the minister to look into and give a statement concerning it to the House before anything else is done about it in the way of discussion. The hon. minister will find the report to which I refer in the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of May 17th. I will send him a copy which he can return to me.

Mr. EMMERSON.

COMMISSION ON FISHERIES

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. G. W. GANONG. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to bring to the attention of the government a matter of very considerable importance affecting a large portion of the people of the county of Charlotte.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If my hon. friend (Mr. Ganong) will allow me: The House will be moved into Committee of Supply as soon as we have finished preliminary business, and he will have an opportunity then to speak.

Mr. GANONG. That may be to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Do not private Bills come first?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but they are not supposed to take very long.

Mr. FOSTER. But they may.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon.friend (Mr. Foster) knows that it is very irregular to bring up matters of this kind on the Orders of the Day, and that the regular and proper way is on a motion for Committee of Supply. My hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) will have every opportunity to speak when the motion for Committee of Supply is moved.

Mr. GANONG. I may not be present.

Mr. FOSTER. We were pretty staunch upholders of the doctrine the Prime Minister advocates before 1896, but we did not make much progress with it. As it is uncertain when we shall go into supply, perhaps my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not press his objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am powerless in the matter. My hon. friend (Mr. Ganong) is within his technical rights—not his constitutional rights—in moving the adjournment of the House to discuss the matter. But it is contrary to all parliamentary rules as we understand them. If it is a matter of urgency, one which cannot wait, of course, that is different. But, if it is a matter of ordinary business, it should be brought up on motion for Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. This is urgent.

Mr. GANONG. I think the matter I wish to bring to the attention of the House is one of urgency. And I think the ministers who have charge of it should lose no time in looking into it. I bring the subject up because of some recent newspaper correspondence and also because of the presence of the steamer 'Constance' in Charlotte county waters—I believe, under the control of the customs—and because of

the recommendations made by the landsmen who were appointed as commissioners to investigate the fishery business. Unfortunately there never has been a Minister of Marine and Fisheries, so far as I know, who has taken enough interest in the Atlantic fisheries to go around there and make a personal investigation of the conditions under which they are carried on. These fisheries form one of the greatest industries we have in Canada. The total receipts from our fisheries are no less than $23,000,000 a year. Still, they have not received anything like the attention they should have received from the minister in charge of the department. However, after considerable discussion it was decided in 1903 to appoint a commission on the subject. We might reasonably presume that the members of that commission would have some qualifications for the business for which they were appointed, that they would be gentlemen who would be able to form intelligent ideas of the fisheries and the conditions surrounding them, and would take ample time to make such inquiries as were necessary in the interest of the fishing community. The duties of this commission, as I understand it, covered the dog-fish problem, the sardine business and the lobster business—at least it was so stated in this House by one of the commission. The fishermen began to hope that they might have their business properly looked into. But when the personnel of the commission was announced, they gave up all hope of such a thing. What was the personnel of the commission? Colonel Tucker, a retired military man, who unfortunately, is quite deaf, was the chairman, Mr. A. J. S. Copp, M.P., representing Digby county, N.S., and a lawyer, was one member. Later on, I believe through some considerable stress, the department put upon it Mr. Armstrong, of St. Andrews, a newspaper man, and Mr. Bowers, of Nova Scotia, with Mr. Venning, an official of the department, completed the commission. Thus, we had on this commission two M.P.'s, one ex-M.P., and ont would be M.P.—the gentleman I had the pleasure of defeating in 1896. This was the personnel of the commission. Now, I have nothing to say against the ability of these gentlemen. They have great ability in cetrain lines. Colonel Tucker, besides his genial qualities, proved in 1896 that he had an excellent bank account. Mr. Copp also has proved his ability. In the last election he proved his ability to down the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who had put up a candidate in opposition to him. Mr. Armstrong has proved his ability, because he has had no difficulty, as a newspaper man in a political way, in following all the turnings and twistings of the Liberal party since 1896, going back on all the pledges and promises they gave prior to that date. These are the qualifications possessed by this commission that was to decide on questions involving the interest of 40,000 or more fishermen, a business yielding $23,000,000 yearly. Now, as I say, I do not question the fitness of these gentlemen for some other business. But I do question, and question very greatly, the fitness of any one of these gentlemen for the position to which he was appointed; and I think their report, if carefully read, will satisfy any one that the recommendations they made show that they were wholly unfitted for the duties they were appointed to perform. Why, Mr. Speaker, fishermen along the shores have considered it one of the greatest farces on record that these gentlemen should come down there to carry on this investigation. And I can give evidence from their own report, a little further on, to show how farcical it has been.

They looked upon it as what it was; the appointments were made simply to help out a gentleman or two in connection with the coming elections which were anticipated after the session of 1903. If we look in 'Hansard' of 1903 at page 13653, we will find that Colonel Kaulbach pressed very strongly for this commission and gave good reasons why it should be appointed, but at that time we had the member for Digby making some statements—some mis-statements I should say—statements that were not borne out in fact and statements that he has not had the grace or decency to retract since, statements maligning the fishermen of the county of Charlotte, which I have the honour to represent, and to which I propose to refer categorically a little later on. What were the conditions that led to the outburst of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Copp)? The fishermen of the county of Digby have been in the habit of coming to Charlotte county harbours for bait; they have endeavoured to do just as they pleased in Charlotte county waters, and if a Charlotte county fisherman had fish in his weir they would offer any price they chose for the fish. They would go around the mouths of the rivers as I have seen them at the mouth of the Magaguadavic and with dip-nets take little fish two or four inches long and carry them away in millions to Nova Scotia to use them for bait. They did more; they came over to Charlotte county waters and ploughed up the beaches in every way, robbed the beaches of the clams, robbed them to such an extent that in one of the islands in Passamaquoddy bay, you can at a distance see what looks like chalk cliffs, almost as large as the cliffs of Dover, simply from the clam shells that these gentlemen have left there. To such an extent was this done that the people of Charlotte had to petition the local government of New Brunswick, and that government had to pass a law to prevent them stealing all the clams there were in Charlotte, and to-day they cannot

do this simply because they must have a government license to take clams. But they must have some revenge, and they chose apparently their representative to wreak it on the fishermen of Charlotte.

Now just look at the conditions. In 1903 this hon. gentleman made the statements which I propose to refer to maligning the fishermen of Charlotte, prejudging the case and making mis-statements and still he is appointed on a commission that is supposed to be impartial. That is actually the condition. It reminds me of a man named Welsh who years ago lived in my county. A murder had been committed and he walked all the way to the shire town, some 20 miles, to get on the jury. He said he knew the man deserved to be hanged but he wished incidentally to draw the $1.50 a day for jury fees. This hon. gentleman says they are a dishonest people there. He does not ask for a fee but he caters for votes in his own county in the next election, and he goes on talking without any knowledge of what he is talking about. In one case he says that all the sardines are caught at Grand Manan when any one who knows anything of fishing in that district is aware that they are not caught there, but in the inner waters of Passamaquoddy bay. There are other mis-statements to which I shall also refer. I need not apologize for referring so frequently to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Copp) because he was the dominant influence all through with the commission. Anyone who reads the report will find this to be so, and it is done simply to make himself popular at home irrespective of the actual rights of the case in the county of Charlotte. I would not like you to take my opinion alone, and I shall quote you the opinion of another gentleman. We had some discussion on this subject in this House in 1904 and on page 6991 of 'Hansard' Mr. William Ross, then member for Victoria, Cape Breton, made some remarks. When referring to the qualifications necessary for the commissioners he said :

> Do not suppose, Mr. Speaker, that I aspire to be placed on the commission myself. I have a sufficient sense of my own ability to lead me to decline the offer if it were made to me. If the Minister of Railways and Canals wished to appoint a commission to deal with a difficult railway question he would appoint eminent engineers for that purpose.
>
> Mr. COPP. Do I understand the hon. member to say that he wished to serve on that commission ?
>
> Mr. WM. ROSS (Victoria). I said that I had sense enough of my own inability to fill that position, and that I would not accept it if it were offered to me ; and that, I think, would have been the proper course for my hon. friend to pursue. . . . My idea of a commission would be one composed of men trained all their lifetime to the business of fishermen.

And not lawyers. This is the opinion of Mr. William Ross then one of the representatives from his own province, of his lack of qualification to be on that commission. There is another incident to which I wish to refer in connection with Col. Tucker to show the ability of that hon. gentleman and the great interest he has taken in the fishermen. Down at Grand harbour, Grand Manan, where they made a flying visit—in fact they came in one afternoon, called some of the citizens together and said they were going to leave that evening, and the citizens advised them that if that was the way they were doing business, they had better go at once, whereupon they decided to remain over a day—one of the most profound questions he asked, one that he said should be embalmed in 'Hansard' or in his report was as to how many scales there were on a herring. It is a most remarkable thing that no one had ever determined this number or put it on record, and this gallant colonel at last inquires for that information, which would be of so much advantage to the public.

But, Sir, this commission was appointed in 1903 and they showed exceeding activity that fall—it is perfectly marvellous what activity they showed There was some little reason for it, if you will remember that the first meetings of this commission were almost coincident with an expected election. If the Grand Trunk Pacific had not held up the government in 1903 for a better bargain we would certainly have had an election that year, but there seemed to be some trouble, some hitch, they did not put the money into it, I believe the first time. The commission made some few excursions down around the islands, but they suddenly called them off as soon as they found there was to be no election. I shall take their report and look it over. The Order in Council was passed on November 14, 1903. The scope of the inquiry as stated was to look into the dog-fish question and the lobster and sardine fisheries. They started out at once for the Magdalen islands, but on that trip Mr. A. C. Copp, was not with them as the report says. He was probably preparing for the election at home. Having completed their investigations at the Magdalen islands, they proceeded to North Head, Grand Manan, in the county of Charlotte. They reached that point on December 8th and held a meeting. The next meeting was at Grand Harbour on the 9th. Just fancy going over all the fishing interests there and not even having an opportunity of going over to examine the fisheries at all in these great tidal waters, inquiring of the fishermen here and there their opinion in regard to the fisheries.

On the evening of the 9th——

And that is rather peculiar.

—a delegation came over from Campobello——

And they were supposed to go to Campobello——

—to consult the commission in regard to the lobster fisheries——

And thereby hangs a tale. This was a delegation representing Yankee canners who wanted licenses to can lobsters in Canadian territory. On the 10th they held a second meeting at Grand Harbour and they then completed their investigation. They had not commenced to deal with the question that was assigned to them, but the election had gone by and it could not work particularly to their advantage to go to other points. I think Captain Pratt let them out a little, because he said that the weather was very rough and these landsmen perhaps could not stand the swell of the sea. It was all the better for them, because, if they wanted to interview the fishermen, rough weather was the time to do it in. If the weather is fine the fishermen are around the coast attending to their business. They did not go over to Campobello. They were not allured by what Senator Byron would describe as the sun kissed waves of Passamaquoddy bay. They would have had a delightful trip in the government steamer but they did not cross the bay. They did not go over to Campobello, or Deer island, the home of the sardine fishery. If they had published this report they would not have secured a vote from one of those islands. They did not go to Seal Cove, or to White Head, two other very important fishing stations on the island of Grand Manan. Then, on page 3, they say that they resumed the inquiry in the following September just before another election was due to come on—September 3. I will not weary the House by going over the whole of the material they have here, but I may mention that on September 23 they reached Seal Cove, Grand Manan. They got through there very rapidly and then they proceeded to Lord's Cove where they held a meeting on September 24. See how rapidly they got through there. They were hustling. On the same day they held a meeting at Welch Pool, and then they went to Back bay on the mainland and held a meeting on the 26th. On the same day they held a meeting at Wilson's Beach. Next day, September 27, they were at Beaver Harbour. Then they took a little excursion to Eastport to be entertained by the Sea Coast Packing Company, and on the following day, September 29, they finished at St. Andrews. This completed their inquiry as far as the sardine business alone is concerned which represents an annual business, according to their report, of $454,000 and a total business to the Charlotte county fishing interests running well up to $1,000,000. In this cursory way these gentlemen finished up and decided what was best in the interests of the fishermen in that section. I do not want to deal with this whole report. But, they make one statement which I have here and which I shall read. The report tries to prove that the catch of sardines is depleting and ruining the fisheries. But strange to say there are at the present time more young fish in Passamaquoddy bay than ever before in the history of the country. That fact is the basis of one conclusion at which they arrive. See what a wise one it is :

In the face of the enormous catches of small fish for the manufacture of sardines, which have been annually made for the past twenty or thirty years, it is difficult to believe that the adult fish do not exist in relative quantities in outside waters.

I should think it would. I do not know how they expected to get these young fish in myriads in the inside waters, but this is one conclusion they have come to and if there are such immense quantities of young fish in the inside waters there must be a few old fish in the outside waters. I want to give the House a few calculations that these gentlemen have put on record, and which are well worthy of consideration, but before doing that I wish to take up a matter in connection with the speech of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) and that I may do him justice I shall read from his speech which is to be found at page 13,653 of 'Hansard,' 1903. He states one very evident fact, I should think, to almost any one when he said that fishermen in order to fish must have bait. Then he makes another statement that——

The fishermen of Nova Scotia, particularly of St. Mary's bay——

That is his own little barn-yard over there in Digby——

—and the Bay of Fundy, secure the most of their bait from Grand Manan, Campobello and Passamaquoddy bay.

That is probably quite true. Then the next statement he makes is that the—

Sardine industry . . . should be worth millions of dollars to the Dominion.

Well, we only wish it were worth more millions of dollars, but if you read the report and the figures that I propose to give you presently you will see the manner in which this hon. gentleman proposes to make it worth millions of dollars. The next statement he makes, and it is one which I think it would be difficult for him to prove, is that :

The herring industry of the United States is wholly in Canadian waters.

He had not then been down along the coast. A gentleman was not very well prepared to go on this commission if he knew no more about the herring industry of the United States than to make a statement like that on the floor of this House. Then, he referred to Lubec as being the head centre of the sardine industry. Lubec and Eastport are the two great towns manufacturing sardines. The capital stock of the companies, he says, engaged in that

industry would be from one to two million dollars. However, in his report he places the amount at $585,000. He also states that the sardine herrings run four to six inches in length, when, as a matter of fact, the average sardine herring is about seven inches in length running all the way from five to nine inches. Then, he says that :

> The fishermen are sending tens of thousands of casks of herring out of Canadian waters across to the American side.

—that belong to us and that ought to be secured for bait for our fishermen. If he will agree to take tens of thousands of hogsheads of bait the fishermen of Charlotte county will catch them. He can get the whole product of Charlotte county for bait if he wants it. There is no question about that; but he cannot send a stray vessel now and again to take out bait and expect that the Charlotte county fishermen are going to sit down in their boats and wait until the next one comes along. The Charlotte county fishermen understand their business and they have found a market in Eastport and Lubec. Is there any reason why they should not send their catch to Eastport and Lubec ? I should glory in the day when we could use all the Charlotte county fish for bait for we could supply this world and another one I believe with all the bait required. Are we to be confined to sell bait to St. Mary's bay fishermen only ? Here is another statement by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Copp). He says that our fishermen are actually prevented from buying herring in Canada by a syndicate of American canners who bind the weir fishermen of New Brunswick not to sell a single hogshead of bait or herring to any one except themselves. I would like to know where the hon. gentleman got that information ? He made that statement in 1903, and I have in my possession here a copy of the contract made by the weir owners in 1900, and there is this special clause in it :

> That in order to carry out the terms and conditions of this contract the party of the first part will comply with all the requirements of the fisheries laws of the Dominion of Canada and the province of New Brunswick.

Further on :

> It is understood and agreed by and between the parties hereto that this contract shall not be construed to prohibit the party of the first part from selling to any person or persons, company or companies, engaged in the packing of sardines in Canada such portion of the product of the weir herein named as shall be desired for packing purposes in any Canadian factory for sale outside the United States, or selling to farmers for fertilizing purposes, where authorized by law to do so, and to fishermen for bait.

That is the first contract, and the later contract made in 1905 has the same clause in it allowing them to sell to the fishermen for bait. Therefore that statement maligning the fishermen of the county of Charlotte has no foundation in fact. The hon. gentleman also states that some of the fishermen even offered $60 a hogshead. Oh, but the fishermen of Charlotte county would like to have the picture of that fellow who offered $60 for a hogshead ; it would be a rarity. If the offer had been 60 cents we would not be surprised, but when a man came over and offered $60 for what they were selling in the United States for $4, then it would be a rarity to have a picture of the man who offered $60 for a hogshead. The hon. gentleman also deprecated the idea of granting licenses to weirs. What is the reason for granting the licenses to weirs ? It is not for the revenue that the government gets out of it because the license only amounts to $5, but it is simply that the government may have control, the same as New Brunswick had to control the clam beds in order to keep the St. Mary's bay fishermen from taking off the clams ; nothing more, nothing less. The hon. gentleman states that some woman who actually lives in New York has control of a weir license down there and that she lets it for $2,500 a year. Well, if he looks into it I think he will find that that woman complies with the provisions of the law. As I understand it, any person owning real estate contiguous to the waters where fish are caught has the first right to make an application for the erection of a weir, and I have no doubt this woman owns the property on which that weir is situated. I judge it is immaterial whether or not she happens to live for a year or two in New York. She could dispose of the products of that weir just as she wished. The hon. gentleman also states that the weirs are all owned by a few people. I had a good deal of difficulty in getting the government to give me a return of the number of people who did own them, and if he looks at the return which is on file in an office up stairs he will find that there are a good many people who own weirs in these waters. Then, he spoke on the question of a license being issued for the paltry sum of $5, but as I understand it the government are not issuing these licenses with any idea of receiving any great revenue from them. There are weirs built in this section which cost from $1,000 to $4,000 and there have been instances in which the owners have not even got the $5 return out of them, so erratic are these fish which run one year in one direction and another year in another direction. So much for those matters, however, as I wish to do the hon. gentlemen justice. Now I would like to come down to this computation in the report which says that it is calculated that fully 80 per cent of the catch of sardines is out of the Charlotte waters. I think that probably was true prior to 1904, but we will accept that statement as correct. Then the report says :

> Taking this estimate of 80 per cent, the following results are shown : 80 per cent of the

number of cases packed in the above county in 1904 would be 1,138,602. 80 per cent of the value of the pack would be $3,503,082.40. The price paid by United States packers to Canadian citizens would, at $4 per hogshead, be 40 cents per case, which would make the amount paid by the canners to Canadian fishermen $454,640, leaving $3,048,442.40 as the difference in the cost of the raw material, and the value of that raw material manufactured, all of which benefits would have been derived by the citizens of Canada, if the raw material had been manufactured in Canada.

Well, that is first rate, but what would the hon. gentleman have done with 1,136,602 cases of sardines if he had them packed? He could not have sold them in Canada for twenty years. The present pack used in the Canadian trade annually is less than 50,000 cases altogether, and still the hon. gentleman suggests that all these fish should be packed in Canadian waters. Then, these gentlemen go on to show how rich we would be if we would only carry out their suggestions in this report.

> In 1897 there were packed for sardines 500,000 barrels. Each barrel contains 10 buckets, that is, 5,000,000 buckets, each bucket containing 500 fish. If these fish were allowed to mature each bucket would make a barrel of herring.

Then they get very liberal and they say, well, if this estimate is too large let us divide it by two:

> If this estimate is too large, allow 250 fish to the bucket and this would give 2,500,000 barrels of 10-inch herring, which at $2 per barrel would be $5,000,000 instead of $400,000 at $4 per hogshead paid by the sardine factories.

Think of it Mr. Speaker; why a Klondike is nothing to that; just down in that little section of Charlotte county this report proposes to turn these herrings into 2,500,000 barrels. Oh, we could have fish then every day in the week. Half a barrel of fish for every inhabitant in Canada would be packed in Charlotte county then, and if their first estimate is correct there would be a barrel of fish for every man woman and child in Canada, but we would like to know where the market is going to be. Well, I do not know how the gentlemen on that commission figured on it unless they figured on putting a string on each of these small fish that comes into Charlotte county waters, and saying to it; go out and take a little recreation and get fattened up and we will pull the string and get you back again and pack you. And the hon. gentleman thinks that this should be done in the interest of the St. Mary's bay fishermen. That they should just come over and say to the sardines: Come in shore now; notify the whales, the sharks, the porpoise, the cod, the hake, the halibut, and every other fish that they must not touch them, as that they have to come back and be caught for bait by the St. Mary's Bay fishermen. One suggestion is about as sensible as the other. Let us go on with this report. That was in 1897. Then they come up to 1904, when they say the catch was double that of 1897, and the value was more than twice as much; so that while Charlotte county lost $5,000,000 in 1897, it lost in 1904 $10,000,000 because we did not know how to carry on our fishing business, and these learned gentlemen come down there and tell us how we ought to do it. I imagine that there will be more fish caught this year, and that our fishermen will get richer, at least in imagination, after reading this report, even than they were with last year's product. Really I should like to have our friend from Digby employed down there. If he should come down and play the mermaid, and sing these siren songs to the fish and bring them in shore, it would be a most desirable thing; because the fish play off shore after they grow up. You can find in the reports every where plenty of large fish off shore, and if we had some of these sweet songs from this commission, which would draw the fish to the shore, it would be an excellent investment for this country. You may talk to the immigrant of the wealth of the west or of the Klondike, but you should say to him: If you want to get rich, come down to the county of Charlotte, if you can only be sure that you can induce all the sardines that have grown into large fish to come in when you call. The report attempts to prove a scarcity of the large herring is due to catching sardines, as if an infinitesimal amount of this great food fish, not only for man but for other fish in the ocean, as all fishermen know, could in the least affect the product when every ocean is known to be full of herring. You can take Mr. Cowie's report itself, or the report of any fish industry in England, Scotland, Norway or Holland, and you will find that the same thing obtains. In one year the fish will be very plentiful, while in another year, without any apparent cause, there will be very few. Why, the commission's own report proves this. They have quoted from Mr. Pedley's report covering fifty years, in which it is stated that when herring are very plentiful in the Bay of Fundy they will not play in shore; they are in deep water, where the fishermen cannot get at them. Prof. Prince makes a similar statement. I have here a quotation from Prof. Prince in regard to the effect of the dog-fish, showing that it is not the killing off of the small fish that is diminishing the larger fish, but that the dog-fish is really accountable. Prof. Prince says:

> The direct harm that a plague of dog-fish can do is well nigh incredible. Thus in 1882 the pack of cured herring in the Shetland Isles was 134,000 barrels, whereas in 1888, owing to the presence of dog-fish, the total quantity fell to 99,000 barrels, and in 1889, even lower, that is, not more than 47,000 barrels or only about one-third of the pack two years before and repeating therefore an enormous total loss.

Showing that there are other causes apart altogether from the catching of the

small fish for making the larger fish scarce. Besides, as they say, there must be large fish outside when there are small ones inside, and there were more small fish inside last year than has ever been known before in the history of the business. But, Sir, instead of these gentlemen going at the work in a reasonable way and destroying the dog-fish, the silver hake and all other fish that prey on the herring, they propose to kill off the fishermen of Charlotte county or else force them to go to the United States to earn a living, as it can easily be shown the present regulations will do. Talk about diminishing the herring, why, in England it is not an unusual thing for 20,000 hogsheads of herring to be landed at Bristol in one day. But this has no effect on the quantity of herring at all. The sea is absolutely full of these great food fish; Providence has provided them on purpose that they should be food both for man and for other fish. In 1896, we had a greater run of herring in the county of Charlotte than was ever known before within the memory of man down there. At a weir at Whitehead, Grand Manan, 300 hogsheads were taken at one time. It seems almost incredible; but that was the record catch of the county. The fish were selling that year, fine large herring, at $1 a hogshead of 10 barrels, the lowest price in many years. You can imagine how plentiful they were. They were never so plentiful before, and they have not been so plentiful since. Sometimes I have wondered what the reason was. You know during the last election we heard of the gracious acts of the right hon. the First Minister in making more wheat grow and in bringing all the benefits that have come to the country under Liberal rule. Why did he not turn his eyes towards the county of Charlotte and make the fish come in shore? One suggestion is as sensible as the other. If the right hon. gentleman is responsible for the falling off since 1896, he certainly ought to apologize to the people of the county of Charlotte. Herring, I presume, are the most erratic of any fish. Some of our Nova Scotia friends would perhaps apply this erratic habit more to the mackerel fishery, because there is more invested in it. Sometimes the herring strike the shore at one place, sometimes at another, usually in summer, but frequently in winter. Some of the best fishing on Grand Manan is in winter time. But the herring are absolutely erratic. Nobody can tell when they will come or when they will leave. Last year in St. Andrew's harbour the herring were so thick that you could take them by dipping in a fish net—there was no need of a weir—while in the river St. Croix there was hardly a fish to be found.

The year before the river was teeming with fish and St. Andrew's harbour only had a fair amount and some places along the coast had none. This shows that a good deal depends on chance, and that when fishermen invest their $2,000 or $3,000 in putting up weirs they have to take the chances of the fish striking the weirs where they happen to build them. The fish are very erratic. It is past the wit of the best investigator to determine why they vary their spawning grounds from year to year as they do. They come in schools and without a leader. They seem to start with some God-given impulse and all go in the one direction. Even when these schools are broken up by whales and dog-fish, that same impulse brings the school together again, and they go on looking for their spawning or feeding grounds in whatever direction they may be. Under such conditions it is perfect nonsense to state that the sardine business has any effect on the catch of the larger fish in and around the Bay of Fundy, or the coast of Nova Scotia, as implied in this fishery report.

I would like to quote a few of the recommendations in this report. Take recommendation No. 1, I would like to have them on record, because I believe the government will be ashamed of them some day:

> That in view of the fact that the United States government imposes an import duty on fish entering the United States when carried in British bottoms, and that as a consequence, all the fresh herring carried to the United States factories are in United States bottoms, in order to escape the United States duty, and in view of the further fact that these United States boats are allowed to enter Canadian waters for the purpose of obtaining these fresh herring without reporting regularly at customs, the Canadian custom laws be enforced in respect to the United States boats carrying such fresh herring from Passamaquoddy Bay, in the same manner as in all other ports and waters of Canada.

I am glad to say that Mr. Armstrong had the grace to dissent from this, because he was the only one on the commission who actually knew the condition of affairs down there. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs will understand what that condition is because he frequently has had it brought to his attention. The fish in tidal waters run with the tides. They run very much more frequently in shore at night and on dark days than they do on bright days. What is the result? The result is that nearly all the fish in the county of Charlotte are caught at night. Ninety per cent of them are caught at the night tides. What is essential after you have caught the fish? Read Mr. Bower's statement. In Great Britain they use steamers instead of the old trawlers. Why? Because they must get the fish rapidly to market. The fish caught in the waters of the county of Charlotte are caught at night, and to be of any value they must get to the factory at the earliest possible moment, or as soon as the factory starts work in the morning. That would be absolutely impossible if you made

these fishermen go to the Customs House, because if you know anything about tidal waters you will find that it is no picnic getting around in them with the tide running seven or eight miles an hour and perhaps an adverse wind as well. In the past, through the courtesy of the government and probably without legal right, the fishermen were allowed to take their fish and deliver at Earlport without being obliged to go to the custom house for a clearance, and that was conceded because they could not have got through the custom house before the fish were spoilt. Now these people propose that every boat must enter and clear at the customs. That simply means that the fishermen will have to cease fishing because the fish will not keep. The fishermen have been in the habit of reporting to the customs every two or three days. There is no export duty, and the matter is simply one of furnishing statistics. But now this commission suggests that every time a boat comes in or goes out, it must report at the custom house—a thing absolutely impossible under the conditions in these tidal waters. I am glad Mr. Armstrong objected to that, because he was the only man on the commission who knew anything about the question. Then comes recommendation No. 2, which would be the death knell of the fishery business.

That an export duty be imposed on all fresh herring exported from Canada into the United States in United States bottoms, equal to the import duty imposed by the United States government upon the same article when imported in Canadian bottoms.

Mr. Armstrong again dissented, he being the only man who knew anything about the conditions. An export duty would simply mean the closing up of the fisheries and driving our fishermen to the coast of Maine. A great many are going there as it is. Take these factories at present located at Eastport. I know the conditions precisely. The first man who started the business was Mr. Julius Wolfe, of New York, and the industry was located there because of the fact that plenty of fish were contiguous to it. All along the American sea-board there are plenty of fish and weirs are being built there. There are three hundred now west of West Quoddy, near Lubec, and the circulating of this very report will tend to increase the number. As a result our fishermen will be employed to build and fish those weirs, and we will lose that class of our population. At Jonesport and Boothbay there are one or two factories, but the majority have centralized around Lubec and Eastport. These people have no desire to leave, but once they do leave it will mean good-bye to the Charlotte sardine factories. I know of one concern now that has an option on a site for a factory at Jonesport for $20,000; and once the transaction is closed they will build a factory there and employ our fishermen. Last year they put on steam trawlers to bring the fish up the coast. Sixty per cent of the fish are caught in our waters and forty per cent in American waters. Our fishermen are not in a position to change their methods of living and go to the prairies of the great west because their education does not fit them for the life out there, so they will gravitate down to the American coast and we will lose some of the best citizens we have in this country—men of the very highest type, not one per cent of whom are illiterate. We have the very best schools in New Brunswick according to the report of the inspector. Yet if the drastic measures recommended in this report be adopted, we will drive that splendid class of citizens out of the country, while at the same time this government is spending a million dollars this year to bring into this country classes of people, many of whom are undesirable, and two-thirds of whom are illiterate.

At the same time, if this is carried out, they will drive away probably from 3,000 to 5,000 men from our county, the best citizens we have, I do not care in what portion of Canada you go. Now, there was a letter in one of the St. John newspapers suggesting that the American canners would come into Canada and pack sardines. Why should they? We have plenty of canners. I happen to know about the canning business, for I have a number of good Liberal friends who are engaged in that business—Mr. J. Sutton Clark, of L'Etang; Messrs. Connors Brothers, of Black's Harbour, and Mr. Henry Lord, of Deer Island. What could the American canners do if they came over here and established factories in Canada? They could not find a market in Canada and they could not take the product over to the United States against the duty of $2.50 a case. A statement appeared in the papers that Mr. Pike, of Lubec, Maine, had said that he would come over here if the export duty was imposed. Well, I have here a copy of a St. John paper, in which appears a letter from Mr. Pike himself refuting that. That letter is as follows:

LUBEC, Me., May 11, 1905.

To the Editor of the 'Sun':

Sir—My attention has just been called to an alleged interview with me published in your paper of March 30. The statements credited to me are so different from the opinions which I hold that in justice to myself I feel it necessary to reply to them in as public a manner as they have been circulated. I remember the occasion of my visit to St. John in the latter part of March, and a conversation I had there with a gentleman whose name I do not know, in which the recommendations of the fishery commission were briefly discussed, and I emphatically stated, as I believe, that the sardine or herring business of the counties of Charlotte and St. John would be ruined by carrying into effect the recommendations of the commission; and I did not suggest that the situation

could be relieved by the extension of the Canadian canning business, or that I would build a factory in St. John. Being fairly familiar with the business both in the United States and Canada, I would have been very foolish to do so, as the Canadian market is fully supplied with canned sardines by the excellent factories now in operation there, and our experience in the United States, where, with a population of seventy or eighty millions of people, we have been unable in thirty years to increase the annual sale beyond about one million two hundred thousand cases, together with the fact that a large portion of our output is consumed by the foreign element among the working people of the larger cities and by the poorer people in the Southern States—classes as yet almost unknown in Canada—

Except by the Minister of the Interior, I fancy.

convinces me that it will be very many years before there is a demand in your country which cannot be supplied by the canners now doing business there; and I was not likely to say that the erection of factories in Canada would have any effect in relieving the situation in which the fishermen of the two counties would find themselves should the recommendations of the fishery commission be carried into effect, or that I had any intention of building a factory in St. John.

While I am, sincerely yours,

J. C. PIKE.

It may be said that this gentleman has every interest in fighting the report of this commission. But we need to look at the question from our own standpoint. We have fish to sell, and we have no market for them. Until that market develops through the efforts of the government, which are suggested by the commission further on in the report, I believe the people of Charlotte have a right to sell the product which the Almighty has placed within their reach, as they have been doing for the last fifty years—or thirty years, to my own knowledge.

Now, I am aware that a small section of our county—I want to do justice to all parts of it—has petitioned, as I understand, though the petition was not sent through me, for an export duty. In 1897 we formed a fishery association in Charlotte county, and at that time it was strongly advocated to have an export duty put on large herring—say herring of 10 inches and upwards. I believe some petitions from the island of Grand Manan have been sent in in favour of an export duty on fish. There may be some who hold the opinion that such a duty would be a benefit. But the great majority of the people of Charlotte county are absolutely against such a measure applying to sardine herring. And, had this fishery commission report been published in West Isles and Campobello before the last election, the government would never have known that there was such a thing as a Liberal alive. Now, recommendation No. 3 is as follows :

3. That every legitimate effort should at once be made by the government to secure for Canada the manufacture of raw material from the sardine fishery, and with a view of the general development of the fisheries of Canada, that a bureau be established in connection with the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and that agents be appointed to such populous foreign centres as may be deemed admissible, the special duties of whom to be the ascertaining and securing of outside markets for the product of the Canadian fisheries and the dissemination of information regarding the trade possibilities of Canada in respect thereto.

I think that is a most excellent recommendation, and I hope that the government will take it up. And when the time comes when we can handle our own product, there is no man in Canada who will rejoice more than I shall. Because if there are protectionists under heaven, I believe that I can claim to be one of them. I have no sympathy with our friends in the United States. I have lived alongside of them for the last thirty or forty years. They are good neighbours in many respects, but they are looking after their own interests all the time. Do not let us, by any foolish or inconsiderate action, cause the ruin of our own industry. To put an export duty on these fish would be just as sensible a thing as for the United States to put an export duty on corn coming into Canada. Some people in the United States might argue : You fellows in Canada now buy our corn, but we will make you buy your starch and your glucose from us. They have the corn which we have not. We have the herring which they have not. It would be just as sensible for them to have put an export duty on corn to force the manufacture of starch and glucose there as for us to put an export duty on fish to force the canning of sardines to be done in Canada.

Recommendation No. 4 declares that the present fee of $5 on weir licenses is too low. Well, I would like to hear the argument by which that statement is supported. If the license fee were imposed for revenue, there might be something in that idea. But it has never been so considered. I do not think there has ever been such a suggestion, except as emanating from the minds of these gentlemen. And what did they say this license should be ? They recommend that the fee should be from $20 to $60. And why $20 to $60 ? Why not $500 to $1,000 ? One would be just as sensible as the other. And how would you regulate it ? A weir this year will yield $5,000 and next year not a dollar according as the fish may run. Would you base the tax on the amount the weir yields ? It is a senseless suggestion, and I am satisfied it is no use discussing, because I am confident that no wise government would think of adopting it, and discussion of it would be a mere waste of time.

Recommendation No. 6 is as follows :

6. That in view of the disputes arising in connection with the measuring of sardine herring when being offered for sale at the weirs, it is desirable that a standard measure should be adopted and they would recommend that

the Inspector of Fisheries be instructed to furnish the department with such measure.

I can very well support that, because in 1897, 1898 and 1899 I advocated the same thing with the Minister of Inland Revenue, and at one time had him so far convinced that I anticipated that he was going to prescribe a standard measure. The difficulty was that many of our fishermen had their fish measured in baskets. Well, a basket is rather an indefinite thing, it may contain half a barrel or it may contain a barrel. Lately, I believe, they are measured in tubs, which are supposed to contain half a barrel. The fish are so plentiful that the fishermen are not particular. But the man buying the fish is looking for the largest measure, because the more fish he gets the better credit he has at the factory for which he obtains his fish. We should have a standard measure. I very strongly support this recommendation.

Now, those are the chief recommendations upon which I have touched. But, Sir, I do not want the House to think that I am the only one who seems to be interested in this affair in New Brunswick. It has been brought up in this House, but I wish to show you how much interest has been taken in it in that province. No less a body than the New Brunswick legislature, composed of 46 members passed a unanimous resolution against these recommendations. I propose to read that resolution as I want it to be on 'Hansard.' It cannot be said that this is a political affair, so far as New Brunswick is concerned, because the government there is in sympathy with this government and besides that the hon. gentleman who moved it is one of our most staunch Liberals, the Hon. Geo. F. Hill, one of the representatives of Charlotte, moved the following resolution:

Whereas, it has been brought to the attention of this legislature that the fisheries commission recently appointed by the government of Canada have submitted to the government the following recommendation:

(a) That an export duty be placed upon sardine herring.

(b) That the customs laws with regard to the entering and clearing of vessels be strictly enforced against the sardine boats.

(c) That the present weir license fee of $5 be increased to a minimum figure of $20, with a maximum of $60.

(d) That no new weir licenses be granted.

And whereas, this legislature is satisfied that the enactment of these recommendations would practically destroy the sardine herring fishery of Passamaquoddy bay, upon which the fishing and trade population of Charlotte county, in the province, largely depend, that until an ample market has been secured for the product of this fishery to take the place of the market the fishermen of said county now enjoy in the United States, it would be unwise to impose an export duty or take any action to disturb existing conditions; that the only immediate effect of such a duty would be to divert the fishery and the profits of the same from New Brunswick and its people to the state of Maine and the fishermen of said state; that in respect to the entering and clearing of boats engaged in the sardine carrying trade, this business cannot be successfully carried on if a strict interpretation of the customs laws in that regard be insisted on; that any increase in the weir license fee would prove a burden which, owing to the erratic movements of the fish, would prevent many of the poorer fishermen from continuing their licenses, and that the non-issuance of new weir licenses would shut out many young men from the shore fisheries of the province and compel them to leave the country or resort to illegal fishing, and that the condition of the fisheries does not warrant any such restrictions.

Therefore be it resolved, that this legislature place on record its disapproval of the recommendation of the fishery commission above set forth, and respectfully urge upon the government of Canada that, under the conditions existing in the sardine fishery, the enactment of the said recommendation is not advisable, and that such enactment would be attended with incalculable injury to a large portion of the population of the county of Charlotte, one of the most important sections of the province of New Brunswick.

And be it further resolved, that a copy of this resolution, signed by the clerk of this house, be forwarded to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and that a copy be likewise sent to the Secretary of State, with a request that the same be submitted to the Governor in Council.

On this resolution Hon. Mr. Hill spoke as follows:

I would like to add a few words to what is contained in the resolution, but I do not intend to go into details, as my colleagues from Charlotte have a better knowledge of the facts than I have. I shall therefore confine myself to a general result of these recommendations. First, as regards the export duty, it is expected that it will amount to three-quarters of a cent a pound, or seven dollars a hogshead. The average price of sardines delivered to the factory people at the weirs is four dollars and sometimes when they are plentiful it goes down as low as two dollars. That being so, it would destroy the sardine business in Charlotte if this export duty should be imposed and it would also injure St. John. All the weirs that have been erected for this fishery would become of no value. Tens of thousands of dollars have been expended on these weirs, and they would become useless, for the Dominion market is not large enough to justify the erection of large sardine factories in Charlotte county. Then as regards the strict enforcement of customs regulations against sardine boats. The sardine is a fish that is easily injured and which keeps but a short time, so that to require these boats to report at the custom-house, which might be miles away, would cause so much delay as to impair or destroy their value. As these reports are made merely for statistical purposes, it ought to be sufficient if they reported once a week. Few people have any idea of the extent of the sardine industry in Charlotte or of the amount of capital invested in it. The fisheries of Charlotte have an annual value of about a million and a quarter dollars and probably one-half of this comes from the sardine fishery. This large business would be destroyed if either of these recommendations were carried out, and we would be driving away

our young men to foreign lands. Already too many of our young men go away to better their condition and this would drive them out in larger numbers. St. John county is interested in this matter, and about two years ago a large number of sardines made their appearance in the harbour of St. John. Our fishermen followed them and although they were each fined $15 by the St. John police magistrate for not taking out a license, it paid them well, for they took $25,000 worth of fish. All these boats took back from St. John large stocks of goods which they purchased there, so that their presence was not unwelcome. The islands of Charlotte contain as intelligent class of people as you can find anywhere. A people whom we can not afford to lose. They are a healthy and hardy race, and the day may come when the mother country may need their services for the navy. As Kipling says in one of his poems, 'And you called on the younger people, the men who can ride and shoot.' We all know that the control of the sea is what makes a world power, and one hundred of these hardy men are worth all the Russian Jews that have come into this country for years. As to the policy of imposing an export duty, the same thing has been proposed with reference to Manitoba wheat in the interest of the millers, that the people of Manitoba are not in favour of it. This law if enforced would cause a great deal of illegal fishing, for to enforce a law you must have public sentiment behind you. But when regulations are obnoxious to the whole body of the people they are certain to be evaded, and illegal fishing could not be prevented. It would not be well to bring about such a state of affairs. These people feel that as their fathers settled on the rocky shores of these islands a century ago for the sake of the fishing, and built their homes there, it would be unjust for the government to say now that they shall be forbidden to enter into the heritage of their fathers.

Mr. Hart said in bringing up this matter the other day I did so with the idea that it was a subject of great imoortance, which affected all parts of the province. I feel that all the members of this house should have an opportunity of considering this matter well, and I think there should be no opposition to this resolution. We do not wish to find fault with the members of the commission, but when we have men on the islands who are so much interested in this industry, I think that one of them should have been placed on the commission. If the report of the commissioners should be acted on it would result in the death of the weir fishing. The export duty proposed would be from 100 to 150 per cent on the cost of the fish, so that the fish could not be sold to advantage. The enforcement of the customs regulations would be equally objectionable, for custom-houses are only open during the day, and where fish are taken after four o'clock it would be 18 hours before they could be got to the factories. The fish taken in Canadian waters belong to the same school as the fish taken in American waters, and the catch in the American weirs has been increasing. If the Eastport canneries could not get their fish from Canadians they could buy them from American fishermen. This business gives employment to a great many people and stimulates every other industry. It is one that should not be rashly interfered with.

Mr. Hart knows well what he is talking of because he is a large dealer in groceries and sundries in the town of St. Andrews and is well aware just how valuable the proceeds of that industry are to the town in which he resides.

Mr. Osman also expressed his approval.

Mr. Clarke said: To one familiar with the sardine fishery the justice of this resolution must be very apparent, and I trust it will commend itself to the good sense of this house. The sardine fishery employs large numbers of people on the islands, and I have no doubt that from three to five thousand persons depend upon it for their means of livelihood. There is no other source from which these people can seek support. The evidence submitted to the commission gave absolutely no warrant for the recommendation made. The fishermen of Nova Scotia say that the catch of sardine interferes with the large herring fishery, but there was no evidence to support this statement. It is well known that schools of fish are very erratic in their movements, and the variation in the catch is due to this cause. The winter herring which were once very plentiful disappeared for fifteen years and then turned up again just about the time the commissioners were making up their report. The fisheries of Charlotte have not been injured by the sardine fisheries, and the catch is larger now than it was ten years ago. There is no large market for sardines in Canada. Indeed the only large market is the United States. The imposition of these regulations would ruin the fisheries of Charlotte county, and the people of Charlotte almost to a man are opposed to them. There is no more reason for an export duty on sardines than there is to any other natural product of Canada.

The resolution was then put and carried unanimously.

So that you will see, Sir, that there is a very large body in New Brunswick opposed to the findings of this Fishery Commission, and not the least the local legislature, from whose proceedings I have quoted. I think I have dealt probably sufficiently with the sardine business and now I want to take a shy at this lobster business, because, as I said before thereby hangs a tale. I turn to page 25 of the recommendations here and reading from clause 1, I find that the size limit in St. Mary's bay—of course that is the particular place that is looked after by our friend from Digby on the commission—and all the waters of Charlotte county is recommended to be nine inches. They recommend that the size limit of lobsters for the whole of the Bay of Fundy and St. Mary's bay be nine inches. There was some dissent. Mr. Bowers, being the only man who has had experience in fishing, dissented. Colonel Tucker, who has been the friend of the lobster, as the hon. gentlemen from St. John city and county know, dissented and with good reason. The evidence is absolutely given in this report of the increased output of lobsters in the county of St John where a ten and a half inch limit was imposed in place of a nine inch limit. What was the object of adopting a nine inch limit? Simply that the factories could be opened again. There are not enough ten and

a half inch lobsters to run the factories and if there were they are worth more as live lobsters than as canned lobsters. You cannot take lobsters into the United States less than ten and a half inches in length. The factories with a nine inch limit can get everything below ten and a half inches and in this way get a sufficient supply. The St. Mary's bay lobster catchers carry a great many of their lobsters over to the Grand Manan factories. They recommend in the first section of this report that the limit of St. Mary's bay and Charlotte county be nine inches. This report was not published before the election. But here, is the last clause and I will read it so that you may be able to see how it coincides with the first one :

Your commissioners would urge the advisability of raising the size limit in all the waters from Halifax west to the international boundary line——

Including St. Mary's and the Bay of Fundy.

—to ten and a half inches so as to secure uniformity of size in all that district, with a view to the preservation of the lobster industry.

What is the recommendation for St. Mary's bay and the Bay of Fundy ?—Nine inches.

Mr. DANIEL. Except St. John county.

Mr. GANONG. There is no exception made ; as far as this suggestion is concerned it is a recommendation. But, if you read the whole of the report here you will see that they stultify themselves, because there is no reason given for the first recommendation at all. I put an inquiry on the order paper on February 6th, 1905 as follows :

1. What is the present legal limit of length for lobster that may be caught in the waters of the Bay of Fundy, between Point Lepreaux and the United States boundary ?

What was the answer ?

1. 9 inches.
2. What was the legal limit of length of lobsters on October 1st, 1904, in these waters?

Answer :

10½ inches.

3. If any change in the limit has been made, on what date was the change made, and on what date were the local fishery officers in that district notified of said change ?

Answer :

October 24th, 1904.

Just before the elections. I need not read further. What was the reason given in a conversation that I had with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) in the corridor before another gentleman who witnessed it ? I said to the minister during the session : Do you suppose to allow a limit of nine inches as reported in Charlotte county waters ? He said : I will leave it to the commission. I would be a fool to take it out of the hands of the commission. Armstrong claims that if I made it nine inches he would beat you in the election. These are the statements which he made. It was not a private conversation, because there were other parties present. Well, was this report sent in ? No, the report had not got in. He was going to leave it to the commission. The report was not in when this change was made October 24th because, on November 28, 1904, I had this letter from the minister :

November 28, 1904.

Dear Sir,—I have your letter of the 21st instant, remarking upon rumour in connection with the finding of the fisheries commission, which has recently been engaged in investigating conditions of the fisheries in the Bay of Fundy and contiguous waters, and in reply I may say that the commission has not yet submitted this report to me.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) R. PREFONTAINE.

G. W. GANONG, Esq., M.P.,
St. Stephen, N.B.

They had not submitted their report, but he had report enough in regard to the lobsters to change the limit. They became alarmed notwithstanding the assistance given by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and they telegraph to the minister that if they wanted to get any votes on the islands they must have a nine inch limit for lobsters. Why ? Because they wanted the Yankee canners to help them out in their election, the most important lobster canners being Yankees. They had a ten and a half inch limit previously, but as a result of the representations which were made telegrams signed by the minister, or by his orders, were carried all over the county of Charlotte stating how good the government were going to be to the lobster fishermen there. It was simply a political move. There can be no question about that at all. No man can gainsay that. Then, let us have a look at the canners. I asked a question as to who had applied for and received licenses to can lobsters. Here is the reply :

None were issued in 1904.

Why ? Because there was a ten and a half inch limit. In 1905, the following applied for licenses :

J. Ingersoll, E. A. Holmes, Connors Brothers, Burnham and Morrell, J. W. Wooster, Frank Macdonald, P. P. Russell, L. C. Guptill, D. S. Gaskill.

And the following were granted :

3. J. Ingersoll, E. A. Holmes, Connors Brothers, Burnham & Morrell.

Well, that looks well enough to you, Mr. Speaker, and to hon. gentlemen in this House, but who are these people ? Burnham & Morrell have one of the biggest

canning factories in Portland, Maine. They are American citizens. Mr. E. A. Holmes is one of the largest sardine canners in Eastport and is an American citizen. Our own citizens are turned down while Yankees are granted licenses to can lobsters. I know at least three of these gentlemen that were turned down; they had plants to do the business but they did not have the pull. The government wanted to use the American canners for their money and their influence to carry the election which was held there last year. Our genial friend Colonel Tucker is somewhat opposed to this, and although he signs the general report I read this concluding remark from his protest:

> With all this accumulated evidence before you I trust that you will see your way clear to establish a ten and a half inch limit in the Bay of Fundy for lobsters, and thereby check the destruction of immature fish which has caused such a serious decline in recent years in this valuable industry.

Colonel Tucker bases this statement largely upon the fact that a small lobster that produces eggs at all will not produce over 20,000 or 25,000 eggs, while a mature lobster will produce from 80,000 to 85,000 eggs. But outside of that there is the common sense view. If you were to capitalize the lobster business of the Bay of Fundy and put sensible men as directors to run it, how long do you think they would continue to sell anything below ten and a half inch lobsters? It would be considered absolutely folly to do so; you would send them to a lunatic asylum if they did. We know that anything below ten and a half inches brings an average of three or four cents while a lobster above ten and a half inches—to which some grow in one year and some in two years—will bring from eighteen to thirty-five cents, according to the statement of Colonel Tucker. Not only that, but because we are differently situated from Prince Edward Island the law perhaps would not be as satisfactory over there, for we are right within easy touch of the United States market where there is an absolutely unlimited demand for large lobsters of ten and a half inches and upwards. So far as this change to nine inches is concerned, it is absolutely ridiculous and as a matter of fact it results in a great injury to the lobster industry of Canada. Where are the lobster fishermen to-day? They have their traps ready but they cannot tell but that the Minister of Marine may say to-morrow: shut up boys; it is ten and a half inches. They only had the ten and a half inch regulation in Charlotte county for I think about two years at most when for political reasons the government shifted it to nine inches. When is it coming back to ten and a half inches? If the Yankee canners do not dominate the government I should not be surprised to see it come back to ten and a half inches inside of the next twelve months. The urgent cry just before the elections was for a change, but the question not only interested the gentleman running in the county of Charlotte; it interested the gentleman who ran for the county of Digby as well, and if somebody knew about this lobster limit, don't you think somebody knew about the recommendations in the sardine business also? I think there were a few people travelling around the county of Digby who were saying: Oh, Copp is going to get at them; they are going to put an export duty on sardines. And so the government did not dare to bring down the report of the commission until after the election, although I think the dodge was worked pretty well in Digby. It was not worked in the county of Charlotte for while the question came up as to the limit of lobsters there was no talk around Deer island and Campobello about the export duty on sardines; they did not let the fishermen there know they would make this recommendation: which could force them to abandon their homes there and go to the United States in order to get a living. It seems clear that the whole question is now up to the Minister of Marine and our friend the Minister of Customs, so far as the sardine industry is concerned. The people down there want to know what these ministers propose to do and they want to know at once. The fishing season is on down there to-day, and the people do not know the moment the steamer 'Constance' is liable to come there with a special officer on board and prevent them from taking the fish they have caught to be handled in the factories in Eastport. If the government would take a little advice from me they will never waste money to print that report; they will tear it into shreds. The idea of putting a report like that upon the archives of this country as a reference for the future is perpetrating an absolute insult on the fishermen of this country. If the government want to have a commission let them have a proper one and we will forgive them for the money they have wasted already; at best it was only a little pap to these members of parliament and ex-members of parliament. Put men on a commission who have some expert knowledge; men who know the conditions, and the conditions are peculiar as every one knows who ever travelled around these tidal waters. Put men on the commission whose judgment is worth something, whose experience will tell them what it is best to do in the interest of the fishermen and let such men formulate a plan. Do not put men on a commission who will be influenced because of a coming election. Let these fishermen who toil by the sea have justice and right dealt out to them; let them be treated fairly as the other citizens of this country are treated, and further I say, that we do not want any more of these rush orders to change regulations; we want more stability so that the fishermen who have to prepare ahead will know from year to year what they may

prepare for. Every man who builds a weir has to invest his money in the purchase of material before the time comes for him to erect his weir, and if the government tells him no license will be issued then that man has his material a loss on his hands. Let the people know whether licenses are to be issued and the conditions on which they are to be issued ; let the fishermen know whether lobster traps are necessary for next year or not, and if they are necessary let the fishermen have a chance to prepare them. In my county there are at least 7,000 souls directly depending on the fishermen, and I am sure nearly as many more indirectly dependent on them, so that it is a matter of great moment as to what action is to be taken by those two ministers who have control of the business. I would not like to see our native born citizens driven out of Canada. The county of Charlotte is largely settled by United Empire Loyalists, men who love the old flag and love it well, and who are willing to stand by it, but they cannot sit down and see their families starve. They must follow business wherever business goes whether it be in the county of Charlotte or in the state of Maine. The movement to the United States has begun already and you cannot tell to what extent it will go. I have had letters within two weeks from a man who with his son left for Machiasport, Maine, they went from Grand Manan to enter into fishing on the American side and to catch sardines along that coast, because they anticipated that the government would carry out the recommendations of this commission. If these recommendations are carried out you can go among our island homes and you will find half of them closed up simply because the people cannot possibly obtain a living in Canada. It is up to the Minister of Marine and the Minister of Customs to say what they propose to do. To-day these fishermen have a club hanging over them by each of these ministers, not knowing from day to day what orders may come from the Department of Fisheries or the Department of Customs. These two ministers cannot take action too soon, and the people of this country, and the members of this House, and the constituents I have the honour to represent believe that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Marine should take action to-day. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Lost.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, is there no one amongst the ministers to make any reply at all to this ? Certainly the allegations that are made and the inconsistencies of the report of the commission itself demand some answer. To spend the country's money with the idea of having a well qualified commission to obtain information on the question and to give the government information upon which it may base an action, to the advantage of the fisheries themselves, and then to appoint men nearly all of them without proper qualification for the special work for which they were appointed, demands an explanation. These men make recommendations which traverse each other, comparing their first recommendations with their concluding one. The recommendations themselves are traversed by men of knowledge and experience living amongst the very conditions which these gentlemen were investigating. The legislature of the province of New Brunswick, which has jurisdiction over the counties very largely interested in these fisheries, unanimously passed a resolution not only deprecating, but voiding the recommendations that were made by the commissioners in at least two important points. A fact comes out late in the day—that not only do the two recommendations as to the length of lobsters that ought to be the legal limit, traverse each other, but that there has been some communication between the Fisheries Department and interested parties whereby in a certain season, and continuing up to the present time, and for reasons which I think can be easily seen on both sides of the House, the low limit for the lobster catch, which I think every discerning man, who has studied the question and understands the conditions and knows the history of the question, would consider to be a very damaging and bad limit, was actually allowed, and that the decimation of the industry went on under that low limit, against the recommendation of the whole commission and the view of men who understand the question, that ten and a half inches should be arranged as the lowest legal limit. It seems to me that when this is brought to the attention of the House, some of the members of the cabinet who have to do with these particular branches of administration ought to make some reply in the way of explanation, so as to mitigate the circumstances as they have been set forth to-day. My right hon. friend will say that the minister who has the particular charge of this matter is not in his seat ; but I have no doubt that it will be brought to his attention, so that he can make a defence and show what he is doing with reference to the department which he administers. But one thing is shown pretty clearly, that this making of commissions for the mere sake of giving jobs to certain people, has really gone far enough. We have had commissions under almost every government in Canada since confederation ; but I think I am safe in saying that no government in the same number of years has appointed so many commissions and appointed them so badly as the present administration. To take a newspaper editor and several others such as have been taken and appoint them as a commission to examine into and give expert testimony and light and guidance with reference to our shore fisheries, I think, was going a long distance. The mysteries of the return and

haunts of the fish are enough to tax the most expert. It is very difficult to show certainty and definiteness with reference to the coming and going of these denizens of the seas ; it certainly taxes the intelligence of the very best men ; and it would seem to me that when commissions are appointed, if they are meant to do any good, to really get at proper conclusions, so that the government and the country will be benefited by them, the greatest care should be taken to put the best of men upon them. My right hon. friend may say that he got good men ; but I think the country is quite of opinion that he could have got a great deal better men than he did get for the purpose for which they were appointed—a fishery commission involving so much not only in a financial way, but with reference to the whole future of our country so far as it depends on fish food.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not understand from my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) that he expected an immediate answer to the subject to which he has called the attention of the House. I rather understood from him that he wanted to make a general complaint, and then call for the information and advice of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I may say at once, in answer to something which he said himself, and which has just been repeated by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that I do not think for my part that any fault can be found with the character of the commission which was entrusted with the important work to which this commission has given its attention ; and I think I am warranted in coming to that conclusion by the very remarks of my hon. friend from Charlotte. The commission was composed, if I remember rightly, of one of the technical officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and so far as I have heard no exception taken to the appointment of that gentleman —Mr. Venning I think a very competent man. Another member of the commission was Mr. Bowers, of Digby, who I believe has been engaged in the fishery business all his life. I do not think any exception was taken to him either and I think he is a very competent man. True, at one time he was engaged in politics ; but I do not think that should disqualify him for exercising the functions entrusted to him if he was otherwise competent. Exception has been taken to Mr. Armstrong because he was a journalist. We all know that journalists are bound to have a wide range of information, and I judge that a gentleman who is a journalist on the seacoast of Charlotte county, from the very nature of his calling obtains information which ought to make him a competent man for the business with which Mr. Armstrong was entrusted. I am further warranted in saying that from the fact that the recommendations made by Mr. Armstrong have met with the approval of my hon. friend from Charlotte. Mr. Armstrong dissented from the majority of the commission, and judging from the remarks of my hon. friend from Charlotte, that was the best evidence that he knew the subject which he had been charged to inquire into. I might say of the late member for St. John, Colonel Tucker, that though he may not be an expert, when this commission was appointed we thought it well to have him and the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Copp) on it, inasmuch as their constituents were deeply interested in the matter and it was to be expected that these gentlemen would put some diligence into the work. There was no job given to anybody. Mr. Venning is in the employ of the department. Mr. Bowers was formerly a member of this parliament, and so I think was Mr. Armstrong. And as regards Colonel Tucker and the hon. member for Digby, they had no emoluments or remuneration and could have none. Therefore the charge of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is absolutely without foundation. Coming to the crucial point, namely, the recommendations made by the commission, these are for the benefit of the government and parliament. I do not agree with my hon. friend from Charlotte that this report ought not to be printed. I think, on the contrary, there is a good deal of valuable information in it, but it is not surprising that the recommendations should not be unanimous or meet with everybodys approval. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) knows that we have had this question before us during the last twenty years again and again and that the matters which this commission were investigating, with the single exception of the dog-fish, are old friends both to him and myself. The size of the lobsters we have had debated again and again during the past twenty years, and on that point opinions seem to vary according to geography. With regard to the proposal to put an export duty on fish, I would hesitate very much before agreeing to any such policy. At first blush I would not be disposed to agree to it ; and unless there are very strong reasons in support of it, we should be very cautious about adopting it. There is another recommendation of the commission which has met with the approval of my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) and that is with regard to the disposal of the refuse in the canneries. That, I think, would commend itself to everybody. But if the recommendations of the commission are not to be accepted blindly, some good may still come from them. There is one thing as to which there is much controversy and that is the size of the lobsters. At what degree of maturity should they have been handed over to commerce ? Some suggest ten and a half inches and my hon. colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I see has allowed nine

inches. I am not competent to pronounce any judgment in the matter, but the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will agree with me—for he has had the experience when he held office—that as soon as some restriction is imposed upon some parties, the government are assailed for having injured some particular interest. Then if the complaints are acceded to, the government are assailed on the other hand for having done an injustice to some rival interest. Should we have lobster canneries in the county of Charlotte or not? I understood from my hon. friend that if we were to restore the regulation to ten and a half inches, we would send away from the county of Charlotte an industry now carried on there by American canneries, and if we keep on the regulation of nine inches, these American canneries will remain with us and our people have the benefit of that industry. I do not know that the government could have done better than appoint a commission; even though the commission is not unanimous. The selection was not a bad one and the report, though not accepted in all particulars, may give valuable information.

Mr. STOCKTON. I was not aware that my hon. friend from Charlotte intended bringing this question up to-day. This question was discussed when I was running my election. My constituency adjoins the county of Charlotte, and the difficulty with the fishermen in the city and county of St. John was why there should be a discrimination between the county of Charlotte and that constituency. I am not going into a discussion of the question to-day. I want to read that report carefully, but I am glad to hear the leader of the government say that he personally, as at present advised, is not in favour of putting an export duty on fresh fish going to the United States. Should that be done, it would destroy the fishery industry in the county of Charlotte and along the shores of the city and county of St. John. With respect to the lobster question, I know that there is some difference of opinion regarding the size of the lobsters to be caught—whether nine inch or ten inch or ten and a half All I ask is that the government before acting should seriously consider the situation and as soon as possible make known to the fishermen along the coast what the government intend to do. I am convinced that if the restrictions suggested in this report should be carried out, we will lose a large section of the population of the county of Charlotte and along the shores of the city and county of St. John who are engaged in the fishery business. I do not know that this is a political question; I hope not. It is a commercial question. It is a question as to what is in the best interest of the fish industry of the city and county of St. John and the county of Charlotte and to that extent of the whole Dominion. All I ask is that the right hon. gentleman and his government will seriously pause and consider before carrying out all the recommendations in that report, and that whatever be done will be done within a reasonable limit so that those hardy men engaged in that industry may know what to expect and we may not lose any of them from our midst.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Gaspé). I am not very familiar with the problems of our fisheries, yet, as the county of Gaspé, which I have the honour to represent, is deeply interested in these matters, I desire to say a word. I am strongly convinced that the remarks made by my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) with regard to the commission are too severe. I have followed the work of that commission during its sessions, and I must say that it has rendered valuable service not only to the fishermen of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the province of Quebec, but to the Dominion at large. First of all, as to the composition of the commission, every one must admit that Mr. Venning, who is the moving spirit of the commission, is a gentleman whose name must carry weight in these matters. Mr. Venning was not looking for a job, as the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said a moment ago. He was already one of the officers, one of the most worthy officers, of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, a gentleman whose evidence has been given before international tribunals and whose opinion upon any great question of the fisheries is certainly very weighty. I know that Mr. Venning has followed that commission and has instructed it, and has gathered most valuable evidence, perhaps, especially in the county I represent, the county of Gaspé. For instance, I am sure that the hon. members of Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) and St. John city and county (Mr. Stockton) are aware that the Magdalen islands, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence form one of the most favoured spots in this Dominion for the prosecution of the lobster fishery. Until the commission was appointed, there were difficulties there, not only as regards the size of lobsters to be taken but as regards the seasons for fishing. My hon. friend (Mr. Ganong) says that in certain counties the minimum size of lobsters allowed to be taken is 9 inches and in others 10 or 10½ inches. Well, as regards the season, it was contended on the part of the fishermen of Gaspé county that the season in the Magdalen islands should be extended because the lobster would appear in the waters of Pleasant bay about fifteen or twenty days after they had appeared at Prince Edward Island. Well, it was a question for the commission to know at what time the season should begin and up to what time it should extend—a most important question. And it was complicated by another fact. As my hon. friend knows, in the Magdalen islands—and I speak of the Magdalen islands

because, as every one knows they are a great centre of the lobster fishery, there being large and important canneries there, including those of a number of American firms who have settled there and who carry on an immense trade not only with Canada but with England and France—I say, in the Magdalen islands there is a series of lagoons. It is a remarkable fact that sand bars encircle the islands, so completely that at certain hours of the day you can drive around the islands. Between these sand bars and the islands there are what are called lagoons, and in these lagoons are spawning beds of the lobsters. In these lagoons—I suppose because of defect in the regulations on the subject—and even during the prohibited season, the fishermen would ply their trade, not only destroying uselessly immense numbers of lobsters but putting upon the market a very inferior product. When the commission was appointed I directed the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) to the importance of having the commission visit the Magdalen islands, and also St. Paul's island near Cape Breton, and study the special conditions of these places as affecting the lobster fishery. The commission visited these places and collected most important information. When my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) and my hon. friend from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) shall have read the report of the commissioners, especially the report of the investigation that took place at the Magdalen islands, I think they will agree with me that this commission has rendered great service not only to the fishermen of the martime provinces but to the fishing industry of this Dominion.

Another thing which was studied most particularly by this commission was the presence of the dog-fish in Canadian waters. As a representative of the county of Gaspé I have received not merely scores and hundreds, but, in all, probably two thousand letters from my electors within the last two years on this subject. I do not know whether the dog-fish formerly frequented the shores of St. John county and Charlotte county, but it is only within the last two of three years that they have appeared in the waters bordering upon Gaspé. The dog-fish destroys immense quantities of commercial fish, being the special enemy of the cod, and the cod fishery is the great industry of the Gaspé fishermen. As I say, I received many inquiries from my electors to know what the government could do to help them against this pest. We know that in Australia the government authorities have paid bounties to secure the destruction of the rabbit and of other animals that menaced the success of the agriculturist. On the same principle, a system was proposed for the destruction of the dog-fish in Canadian waters. The commission have studied that question most carefully, and I am sure that when their report is published it will result in great advantage to the fishermen of this Dominion. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) has spoken to me about this matter many times since the commission reported, and he has under consideration a scheme which, I am sure, will receive the earnest support of both sides of this House and which when carried into effect, I believe will cause the disappearance of the dog-fish from our shores.

All this I say in order to defend the policy followed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman is not in his place in the House this afternoon, for he is attending a most important meeting of the Harbour Commission in Montreal. If he were here I am sure he would corroborate the explanations I have just given. I am not able to speak of the personal qualifications of the other members of the commission. But I am sure I shall be upheld by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), when I say that the fact of Mr. Venning, the expert officer of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being connected with the commission is a guarantee of the earnest efforts which must have been made by the commission to promote the best interests of the Canadian fishing industry.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). I was not aware that this subject was coming up this afternoon, so I shall not attempt to discuss the whole report of this commission. I have no doubt that what the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) has said with regard to Mr. Venning is entirely correct. The subject of the fisheries at Magdalen islands I do not wish to dilate upon.

I only wish to second, in a very few words, the remarks made by my colleague from the city and county of St. John. While I am aware that a number of fishermen in the county of St. John have signed a petition or statement to the effect that they would be glad to have the limit of lobsters in the Bay of Fundy placed at 10½ inches, I must say that since they have found that that limit has been lessened and made smaller in the adjoining county and in Nova Scotia, and on the opposite side of the Bay of Fundy, they have become dissatisfied, and while they would be quite willing to have the limit on lobsters placed at 10½ inches if the limit was the same in the adjacent waters of Charlotte county and on the other side of the Bay of Fundy, they are certainly dissatisfied with having this change made in the length of lobsters in the county in which they live and do their work. What they want is uniformity in the legal limit in the size of lobsters. With regard to this report, I notice that one of the members of the commission, Colonel Tucker, who, to my own knowledge, has taken a very great interest in this matter and has posted himself very well on the subject, makes a minority report; he does not agree with the majority report, but in his minority report asks to

have the limit put at not less than 10½ inches in all the waters of the Bay of Fundy. He gives very good reasons, I take it, why that should be the case. He gives the evidence of various fishery overseers; and, in addition to that, there is the statement of another member of the commission, Mr. Bowers, who, I believe, lives in Digby county, Nova Scotia, who says, with regard to the lobster fishing over in the county of Digby, that he thinks the limit should not be less than 10½ inches. Let me read what he says in the memorandum attached to the report:

Commissioner Bowers contends that his personal knowledge of the live lobster industry in Digby county, both as regards fishing and exportation, the trend of the evidence taken in Digby and Charlotte counties, and the statements made in their reports by Fishery Inspector Pratt and the fishery overseers of St. John and Charlotte counties, force him to the conclusion that the only method of preserving the lobster industry of the Bay of Fundy and contiguous waters for the enrichment of our fishermen, is by the immediate and strict enforcement of a 10½-inch size limit. In his opinion unless the size limit of the Bay of Fundy and the shores of southern and western Nova Scotia be at once placed at 10½ inches, we shall soon be in the same position as other countries whose fisheries were once thought ample to meet all demands upon them, but are now almost wholly depleted.

This is the evidence of one of the commissioners, and that, taken in connection with the strong argument which another of the commissioners makes, must force us to see the importance of dealing with this report not in too hasty a manner. At all events, the government, I think, should be very careful about carrying out the recommendations which are contained in this report. I had a personal conversation with Colonel Tucker before this report was made, and I know that he was in favour of a longer limit, and I would hardly feel justified in giving to the House the reasons which he advanced for the change, as they were given in a private conversation, but at the same time I am quite satisfied that he at least was very much dissatisfied with the recommendation to lower the size limit on lobsters in those waters. For my own part, all I am asking in the interest of those in my constituency who are interested in this matter is that there should be uniformity in the size limit of those lobsters in the Bay of Fundy, so that the same limit will apply to both the county of St. John and Charlotte county, and in fact all the other counties of the two provinces on the Bay of Fundy.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). One word with respect to the question of uniformity. The original limit for lobsters in the Bay of Fundy was 9½ inches. That limit prevailed until about a year and a-half ago, when, at the solicitation of the gentleman to whom my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Daniel) has referred, Mr. Tucker, who was then representing the constituency of St. John, a change was made and an order was passed enlarging the limit on lobsters on the New Brunswick shore of the Bay of Fundy. That created a want of uniformity. It was contended by the people of Grand Manan and St. Mary's bay, where the water is shallow, that if you were to enlarge the limit to 10½ inches it would absolutely destroy their fishery, and at the solicitation of the member for St. John the limit was changed against the protest of the fishermen of the county of Charlotte. Their contention, and particularly that of those on the island of Grand Manan, was that as the waters contiguous to the shore of the county of Charlotte were of a shallow character, the smaller lobsters only came there and that a limit of 10½ inches would destroy their fishery. Farther up the bay, along the shores of the county of St. John, where the water was deeper, that objection did not prevail, and they wished to be placed in the same category with the lobster fishermen of St. Mary's bay across the Bay of Fundy, on the Nova Scotia shore. Their representations were very loud, they were very persistent, and they continued to be so during the last session. They had delegations here, they made representations and sent memorials, and finally, before the fishing season opened last fall, the Charlotte county fisheries were separated from those of St. John and the limit was dropped to its original length—9½ inches. That, of course, has caused a want of uniformity. The fishermen of Charlotte county did not ask to have the limit changed, the fishermen of Grand Manan were opposed to it, and they said it was St. John influences which brought about the change. It was not agreeable to them, and they wanted it put back to their original limit, pending the final determination of the question by the commission and this was done.

Motion (Mr. Ganong) to adjourn, negatived.

REPORT OF RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask leave to submit the report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada. The report is in two parts, a report of proceedings from February 1 to June 30, 1904; and part 2nd, a report of proceedings from July 1 to December 31, 1904.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF moved the third reading of Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I thought we were to have a declaration from the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock)

in regard to this Bill. I have no objection to the Bill going through because there are one or two good provisions in it, but probably these provisions will be embodied in a general Act.

Mr. TURRIFF. I may say that I spoke to the hon. Postmaster General about this Bill. The Bill stood at his request some days ago, I spoke to him and he was quite agreeable that I should move the third reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CLARA BIDWELL McDERMOT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 152) for the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—Mr. Campbell.

On the preamble,

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Chairman, before the preamble is carried, supplementing what I said on this matter on Friday evening, I think it is necessary that I should even at the risk of wearying the committee for ten or fifteten minutes, draw attention to the character of this legislation. It must not be supposed from the want of interest that is taken in these Bills that they go through the House as a matter of course because the Senate has passed on the evidence on which they are founded. The question of divorcing a wife from a husband or a husband from a wife, is a much more serious question than seems to be realized considering the rather slight amount of attention that was given by almost all the members of this House to this question on Friday evening and I think, with all deference both to the committee and to the government, that I should draw the attention of the committee for a moment or two to what I think is not generally recognized namely that a person who is asking for a divorce in any British country is asking for a privilege, is asking for something he is not entitled to as a matter of course, something that there is no rule of law or of civil conduct that he can ask enforcement of in order to secure what he is asking for. I propose to draw the attention of the committee and the government to the definition of this Act of ours as laid down in Gemmill's Work of Divorce, which, in describing what a divorce is, emphasizes the distinction between it and another legislative Act. It is this :

> A divorce is a legislative Act originating in the Senate, and when a man comes with a petition for a divorce Bill, he comes to solicit a privilege, a preference to one individual over another—an immunity from obligations which are binding on the general mass of the community, and he is bound to submit to such rules as the House in its wisdom thinks proper to lay down for the conduct of all business brought before it.

There is abundant authority given in the foot-note for the principle which is here laid down. A person coming and asking for a divorce must show something in the interest of the state, not in the interest of herself or of her husband only. We are not the judges of the civil conduct of a man and his wife, but we are here legislating in the interest of the country and in the interest of society. Although personally—and I do not wish to be misunderstood by this committee—I am opposed to divorces on principle, yet, I recognize that under our law and custom certain people are entitled to a divorce under certain circumstances, but I say they must be extreme circumstances and the divorce must be granted on the principle that it is in the interest of the state and society generally. I think every hon. gentleman will agree with me that it is not in the interest of the state that divorces should be granted lightly, frivolously, for trifling reasons, or for anything but what must be absolutely in the interest of the country. The Bill before us is brought by a woman who alleges that her husband was guilty on the statutory grounds—I do not wish to particularize in the House any more than necessary—a number of years after they had been married. The preamble of the Bill sets forth that these wrong Acts of his took place in the years 1901 and 1903 and that these people had lived together until the year 1889. We have to ask ourselves what was the condition of these people at the date of his alleged wrong-doing. They were married in 1881, the woman being twenty-one years of age and the husband a couple of years older—not an unreasonable age for either of them to be married at. They have three children living in this country. They lived at Port Perry. They lived together all right until 1889, and then they separate because the wife insisted on living with her parents and would not follow her husband to his own home. This was three years before she alleges any wrong-doing on the part of her busband. Let us ask ourselves at the threshold of this case : Are we going always to divorce people because they happen to conclude that they would rather live separately and then after having lived separately a little while bring evidence, which, perhaps, it may be necessary for me to discuss later on, of a most outrageous kind of some act upon which she may be entitled technically to have a divorce granted? It seems to me that this woman, as we say in the court of chancery, does not come into equity with perfectly clean hands. Her duty, when she married that man, was to stay by him as long as he was true and faithful to her. She preferred to disregard the obligation she took and she went to live with her father. The man waited for three years to see if she would change her opinion about that during which time there is no suggestion that he did anything wrong and after waiting three years, when she refused to leave her father and mother and

live with her lawful husband, although his brothers-in-law had endeavoured to prevail upon her to do so, he went west. She now produces evidence before the Senate, for what it is worth, that after all that he committed adultery and she claims therefore that she is entitled to get a divorce from him.

I point this out because if this parliament is going to grant divorce for such causes, it may have the effect of leading the young men and young women who are growing up, to think that there is nothing more sacred in the marriage tie than this woman seems to think; that there is no more respect to be held between husband and wife than there would be between strangers where the marital relation may not exist. Should parliament allow this wouan to say: I will not live with my husband although there is no legal reason why I should not. I am the mother of three children of whom he is legally the father; having lived for nine years in wedlock I prefer to live with my parents rather than with my husband, and finding that he cannot induce me to live with him, when he goes away I will say that I am entitled to a divorce because he has deserted me and because after he deserted me he did some things he should not do. I do not want to be misunderstood; if he was guilty of what she alleges, even years after she refused to live with him, technically she is entitled to this divorce. But this woman does not seem to have treated her husband in the way she ought have treated him. She has no absolute right in this country to a divorce; she comes here, she asks for a privilege, and it is for this parliament to say whether under the facts proved it would be in the interest of the state to grant a divorce. We must ask ourselves what would be the effect, as a precedent of our granting this divorce, upon the young people of this country. I point out that the evidence against this man is most unreliable; it is the evidence of two acknowledged dissolute characters; the evidence of two accomplices who lived by the very thing which they allege against this man and which he comes to Ottawa to deny upon oath. He did not employ counsel, I presume because he did not think he needed counsel. I do not wish to imply the idea, because I am a lawyer, that this man should have employed counsel, but I do say that if he had a counsel of five years experience in cross-examining witnesses it is quite evident that the testimony of those two witnesses would be shattered. No lawyer can read that evidence without seeing sticking out all through it indications of a made-up story. These two dissolute characters give evdence as to this outrageous offence which most men would rather serve a term in the penitentiary than be found guilty of. I do not know if I am entitled to say that for all the men of this country, but from my general knowledge I think that would be a fair statement of the case. I think this House ought to say to the petitioner in this case: it may be unfortunate for you if this man is guilty, but you cannot get divorced as easily as you seem to think; you cannot ask us to take the risk of doing a great wrong to the father of your children. The evidence given against this man is of two women who at the very outset of their evidence state that they have been living by the very worst sort of vice for several years. We are not governed in this House by what a judge might direct or what a jury might find, but I say it is common sense to believe that women who will acknowledge that they have lived for years by selling their virtue, will sell their oaths if they get enough dollars to do so. These women came from British Columbia and it is fair presumption from their evidence that they did sell their oaths. I do not want to discuss this evidence in detail, but I do ask that before the House should grant this divorce hon. gentlemen should have an opportunity of looking into this evidence and dissecting it; and if the consideration of the Bill is not adjourned to enable them to do that then I would ask that they should vote against it. I think it will be found from the evidence that these two women came from British Columbia to prove a certain thing no matter how they might prove it. Their evidence is conflicting, the suspicious fact is there and one of the women places at the end of her story apparently as an afterthought, a declaration of the criminal conduct of herself, which from her knowledege she ought to have told at the very beginning. The evidence all through is full of inconsistencies and improbabilities, and it is further open to the very serious objection that it is the evidence of two of the worst kind of accomplices. Applying the principles of the criminal law no judge would allow a jury to convict on that evidence, but yet we are asked to convict on it in this House. We are asked to do something more serious than to try a man for a criminal offence, because we are asked to strike a blow at the whole fabric of society by granting a divorce on evidence which is not clear. I would like to quote to the House the words of Lord Penzance, a well known authority who in the House of Lords said:

> It seems proper, however, to present what has been said opening a broader view. In a certain sense the public has an interest in every judicial controversy between individual members of the community; hence it is, that for example, if a witness commits perjury in a mere private suit, he is indictable, for it is an offence against the public. But in a higher and different sense the public is interested in the marriage in the individual members of the community. They constitute the foundation, not only of social order, but of society itself, and without them there would be no legitimate population to support the state in its coming future. Therefore, though unmarried persons

may contract the status of marriage when they mutually please, those who have assumed it cannot cast it off by mutual consent, as parties to an ordinary contract may annul its obligations. Hence, when an attempt is made, through the courts, to undo a marriage, the public becomes the party, not in the strict sense to oppose, but to see that it does not prevail without sufficient and lawful cause existing in the real facts of the case ; 'for' in the words of a learned English judge, 'society has an interest in the maintenance of marriage ties, which the collusion or negligence of the parties cannot impair.'

I will also give the language of the Hon. Mr. Scott in the Senate in 1887, when he was the leader of the opposition in that House :

It is the duty of parliament to keep well within itself the power to dissolve the marriage tie. Canada will be all the better in the years to come if we hold to that principle soundly and wisely ; I trust, therefore, that the loose doctrines which are now being propagated as to foreign divorces will be no more advocated in this House. I am quite sure they are not in accord with the better spirit of the people of this country. I know that they are held in horror by nearly one-half of the people of Canada, whose opinions are entitled to respect. I know that in those churches which do reluctantly accept the principle of divorce, and notably in the Episcopalian, the leading minds regard with dismay and terror the havoc that has been made in the social system in the neighbouring country where the permission to annul the marriage tie is so easily obtained.

I can give hon. gentlemen another authority from the Senate, that of the Hon. Senator Gowan, who said in the same debate :

Nay, more, parliament may and ought always to have in regard not merely the question as it affects the parties, but the effect in relation to morals and good order—the effect which the passing of a particular law might have upon the well-being of the community. Parliament, as the supreme power, has its duties and responsibilities, and cannot compromise the well-being of society, but is bound to consider what would most tend to the public good.

I want hon. gentlemen, therefore, to carefully keep their minds upon this, that in passing this legislation, we must do it in the interest of the public. It is not simply a question whether we think Mr. McDermot or Mrs. McDermot will be as well off if we grant this divorce ; but the question is what the effect will be on the social condition of our country. If we grant this divorce, it should be because we think the Act of Parliament ought to be passed in the interest of the community. I do not know what position the government will take on this legislation. I do not want to embarrass the government upon it. I do not want to say that the government are responsible for it in any special or peculiar way. Of course, the government are generally responsible for all the legislation that goes through this House. If the government can convince this House that the evidence is not such as would entitle us to pass this Bill I will expect them to say so. If they do not, I suppose I shall have to go on and discuss it from my own standpoint, and tell the House why I think that in all the circumstances this Bill ought not to pass.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman has referred to the fact that the woman left the domicile of her husband without any reason.

Mr. LANCASTER. She insisted on living with her father and mother in the same town when her husband wished her to live with him.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is there anything in the evidence to that effect ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would like to know if Mrs. McDermot did not contradict him in that respect ?

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this woman denied that she had deserted her husband. I do not see where she denied it. There is no such denial in the evidence.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Read page 5.

Mr. LANCASTER I do not see any denial there. It is not disputed that in 1881 they lived in a house furnished by the husband. Then at the request of her parents, as she says herself, she induced her husband to come and live with her at her parents house.

Mr. CAMPBELL. She denied that.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have not seen any words that would constitute a denial. She lived with her husband at her parents' house until 1889. Then there was a family jar between her parents and her husband and she sided with her parents and remained with them when her husband left. She refused to follow her husband to another house. Surely you would not say that that was a desertion of the wife by the husband. The husband had a house for his wife and children. He had taken that house from a tenant in order that he and his family might occupy it, but his wife refused to go with him and also kept the children. To grant a divorce to the wife, in the presence of these facts, would be to make a travesty of the marriage vows and contract and be giving the young men and women of this country a very false idea of the duties and responsibilities they assume when they enter the marriage state. Let me put a converse case. Suppose two profligate men go into a witness box and swear falsely that they had improper connections with

a most respectable married woman and suppose she comes down to this Senate and denies it——

Mr. LEMIEUX. If there were only that fact, but there are others.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is exactly the case reversed. Is there anybody here who would grant the husband a divorce? In this case two women of bad character swear away the character of this man. Their story is not corroborated. The husband makes an admission; but you cannot use one part of his admission and not the other. You must use the whole of it or none. He admits that he went to see these women, but he did so in order to collect money for goods they had bought from him. He swears that it was purely a matter of business and that he was not guilty of any improper offence. But supposing this woman had gone to live with her husband as she should have done, would there be any complaint to-day? For three years he lived in Port Perry, in the same village with her, and she refused to go to him. There was nothing to justify her refusal. After three years he went west. In going west, he was not doing anything wrong, and the fact that he went west could not be called a desertion of his wife. I have no desire to condone any wrong doing that man may have committed in the west, if he did commit any, but I am not willing to hold him guilty on the evidence of two dissolute women, and I can see no justification for the wife's conduct. The man did go west, but it was after his wife had deserted him in Ontario without any cause. I would urge the government to afford us some guidance with regard to this case. For as I have said, this case establishes a precedent. If we pass this Bill, divorce becomes only a matter of dollars and cents. Evidence such as that against this man can be bought and being the evidence of people such as I can have described it probably can be bought for a very small amount of money. Surely if there were a case against this man some reputable and disinterested witnesses would be produced to testify to the facts. We must apply the same rule to all, and, if, in this case such evidence as this, absolutely unsupported, is to be a ground for divorce we set a most dangerous precedent affecting this very serious, this vital question of the marriage relation in Canada. I have already said that the evidence of the man in this case is not contradicted, I quote from page 2 of the wife's evidence:

Q. Then where did you go to live?—A. With my father.
Q. Why?—A. Mr. McDermott wished it.
Q. That was in 1881 that you went to your father's?—A. Yes.
Q. You continued to reside with your father how long?—A. Until his death.
Q. Was there a Mr. Frederick Howard Annis present at your wedding?—A. Yes.
Q. When did your husband leave you?

These are the woman's counsel's own words, not hers. Such a leading question not have been allowed in court, but the Senate committee is not governed by the rules of a court, and so this counsel is allowed to put these words in his client's mouth. The evidence goes on:

Q. When did your husband leave you?—A. In 1889.
Q. Seven years after you went to live with your people?—A. It would be hardly seven.
Q. Within a few months of seven years?—A. Yes.

Then at the top of the next page she speaks of his chastising one of the children. So driven is she to find a cause for the divorce that she brings forward this case of the man having chastised one of his children as a reason for divorce. That is a new proposition in this country that a man is to be divorced because he chastises one of his own children when he thinks it necessary, notwithstanding that the criminal law is there to take care of him if he chastises the child unduly.

Q. You have already told us that in 1889 your husband left you.

These are her counsel's words again, not her own.

Q. Where did he go to reside?—A. He still continued to live in Port Perry.
Q. For how many years?—A. About three.

Why did not she go to live with him in Port Perry? Where was her place when they were both living in the same town? Was it not with her husband, the father of her children? Then, lower down on the same page we find this evidence:

Q. Since 1892 how often have you seen your husband?—A. Never.
Q. Since 1892?—A. Oh, once.
Q. Where did you see him?—A. In my own home.
Q. Do you remember about when?—A. I think it would be about 1899, but I am not sure.
Q. That is the only time between 1892 and the present time?—A. Yes.
Q. How long did you see him then?—A. Oh, for about twenty minutes.
Q. He did not then stay over night with you?—A. No.
Q. Who was present?—A. My aunt.
Q. You only saw him about twenty minutes?—A. Yes.

For some reason the counsel does not ask anything about the conversation that took place or what occurred. But the husband himself tells us, and the woman does not deny the truth of what he said. He explains that he went there to coax the woman to live with him; and she refused and would give no reason. What are we coming to in this country if, under these circumstances, a divorce is to be granted? How many of us are to know what the marriage tie means? Now, the man did not stop at this one effort to induce his

wife to return to him. He sent his two brothers-in-law, both clergymen. They are disinterested witnesses and respectable people—both clergymen in good standing and living in Ontario. They went to the woman and tried to induce her to return to her husband. She would make no complaint of him, nor would she give any explanation, but only laughed. One of these, the Rev. Mr. Sills tells us what took place at the interview he had with this woman. I must explain that this man McDermot acted as his own counsel. He comes here from British Columbia to meet this action for divorce and he does not employ a lawyer. I suppose it was because he thought it unnecessary believing that when the Senate committee learned the facts they would see the counsel was unnecessary. He questioned the witness himself, and under his questioning the evidence was as follows :

Q. During that interview did my wife accuse me of cruelty ? What took place ?—A. Well, a general conversation with regard to the treatment by Mr. McDermot of his wife. She made no special charge against him. I asked, I wanted to know as a clergyman whether I was right in asking her to come back. I am just as conscientious about the matter as though he were a perfect stranger, and I thought it was such a great pity to have those three little children there. I had a little familly of my own. And in this case with the wife separated from her husband knowing what would occur in a few years, so I begged of her to come back to her husband again. I said 'What is the matter? ' She did not give me any particular reason, only well, he did not treat her as I treated my wife Katie, and Mr. Forneri's wife Florence: 'George had not treated me as Katie and Florence were treated. That is about all the words she used. There was nothing I could take hold of. There was nothing on which I could form a charge against the boy—

By this term he referred to the respondent in the case.

—or go and talk to him about it.

This woman could laugh and think it a great joke that she should refuse to live with her husband, the father of her three children, even though these clergymen tried to induce her to return to her husband. And this is the woman who asks this parliament to create this most dangerous precedent in dissolving the marriage tie. I have seen cases of divorce go through this House which seemed to me worthy of comment, yet, I offered no opposition, but this case is absolutely unique in the principle it involves—if you can call it a principle when that which guides us seems to be simply a refusal to act on principle. According to the applicant's own statement she has not tried to keep her husband by her side, she has preferred that they should not live together. And now, after all these years she asks for a divorce from him notwithstanding that she gives no reason why she refuses to live with him when she did so first refuse. Feeling that she could not get a divorce under these circumstances she seeks to make her case technically safe by producing evidence to prove that he did something wrong long afterwards in British Columbia such as forms a statutory ground for divorce in all countries.

And so she does—what ? She brings two, as I say, of the lowest kind of characters down here to prove the case against him. He denies it on his oath, and I do not know how it appears to the House, but it strikes me that we are bound to take that man's oath against theirs. If we take his oath and refuse to vote in favour of this divorce, what do we do ? We simply say : You and your wife shall live together ; you shall be the father of these children, as you have been in the past, and she shall be your wife ; if she wishes to marry any one else, we think she had better not ; she has nothing discreditable against you ; we accept your oath that you are not guilty in regard to the two discreditable witnesses. By doing this, I think the good of the state will be preserved, and there is nothing so calculated to undermine the whole social fabric of this country as the granting of divorces on evidence of this kind or carelessly. I have nothing more to say at this juncture. I felt, after reading this evidence, that, as representing a not unintelligent county and a progressive county in this province, it was my duty to put before the House the protest of the 34,000 people whom I represent in this House, and put their views on record as they can only be put on record through my vote against this Bill, because the divorce is not warranted by the evidence brought forward in support of it, and because the granting of such a divorce would establish a precedent that, in my humble opinion, would be very bad for the country. The government, I submit, ought to take this matter into consideration. I suggested on Friday night to the promoter of the Bill that the Minister of Justice should be consulted in reference to applying the law as to the legal evidence in the matter. I may have been misunderstood by him in the hour which we had on Friday ; he might have misunderstood me, if he thought that I suggested that we would be governed by the opinion of the Minister of Justice. I must put him right. We are supreme in this parliament. We are not obliged to go by any strict legal rules, and we must decide the case as we think best, but I think the government should begin to guide this legislation in regard to divorces to some extent, that it should look into the case and be prepared, in the near future, to lay down some rules to guide the House, or the hon. gentlemen opposite, and to assist us out of the difficulty in which I at least am placed, that I cannot see my way to divorce these people on this evidence, not so much because I say that I do not think Mrs. McDermot is entitled to it—although I do not think she

is—but because of the effect on the state, if we create such a precedent. No respectable man or woman in the state would be safe under such circumstances ; all that would be necessary would be to employ two witnesses who, out of their own mouths, would admit their immoral character, people whose oaths would not be accepted in any court of justice conducted on legal principles, in order to divorce some poor woman or some poor man, whose oath would be taken for nothing, and sever the marital relations, giving an opportunity to every one who gets married to understand that if they do not get along well together, they can do as the McDermots did, patch up a case, as the Senate and House of Commons are getting so easy, and get a divorce. That is a state of affairs which we cannot have. We may build all the Grand Trunk Pacifics we like, we may debate free trade or protection, we may grant autonomy to all the provinces from Vancouver to Halifax, we may pass all the laws on a business basis we like, but if we interfere unnecessarily or recklessly in the relations between man and wife, we will go a long way towards undermining the morality of this country, and if our laws tend to produce such a result and break up homes we had better repeal them and build up a system of laws more suited to a sound condition of public and private morality.

Mr. BOYCE. I fancy the sound and safe principle to be applied to cases of this kind is the principle which is applied in all criminal cases, that is, first that the accused shall get the benefit of any reasonable doubt, and, secondly, that it were better that one hundred guilty men should escape punishment than that one should be found guilty being innocent. I am glad to say that neither of the parties in this case are known to me. I suppose that all the members of the committee are in the same position, and that we are seized of the evidence sent down from the upper chamber, simply by reason of the printed testimony which is before us. Having regard to that evidence, Sir, it is certainly open to very grave suspicion whether the evidence preponderates in favour of guilt. It is clear, as a proposition of common sense and law, that if that evidence in favour of guilt does not preponderate, then this man should not be convicted of the very serious charge which is brought against him. The marriage in this case was solemnized in 1881, and there was very little cohabitation between the man and his wife. For about fourteen years, more or less, there was a separation, and whatever took place during that separation in the shape of desertion or cruelty I submit, with confidence, to this committee, is not sufficient to establish a claim by the wife to the assistance of parliament in granting the discretionary legislation of a dissolution of the bonds of marriage. Neither desertion, nor cruelty, nor any of the minor offences which are alleged in the evidence, the beating of the baby, the cruelty to the wife, the desertion, the non-remittance, if they be established facts, none of these offences, even though they are proved to the utmost limit, are sufficient to justify a dissolution. There must be the offence proven, and proven beyond the shadow of a doubt, of the legal infidelity, which alone can bring about the legal dissolution of the marriage tie and entitle the petitioner to the remedy of release by private legislation.

I find that the main evidence is the evidence of two women of admitted bad character, women who maintain themselves by immorality, women who are certainly not entitled to the respect of the community, and whose evidence in matters of this kind must certainly be looked upon with very grave suspicion. It is, Sir, upon the evidence of those women, and upon the evidence of those women alone, except as to one or two admissions of the respondent, to which I shall refer presently, that this Bill has passed through the Senate and has received endorsation from that body. It is undoubtedly true that, although of evil character, although of evil repute, although grossly immoral in their method of maintaining themselves, although not entitled to the respect of the community, these women are competent witnesses. But they are competent only to the extent to which they give evidence, and their competency is tinged with a great deal of incredibility by reason of their mode of life. Their story is one which has to be looked at, and, if there be any weakness in it, if there be any vacillating, if there be any contradiction, surely it can only be visited by the judgment that it is unsafe to attach any importance to it such as it is sought to attach to it by this Bill.

Now, without going too minutely into the evidence and desiring to be as short as possible, I would refer the committee to the evidence which is disclosed at page 7. Without following the questions and answers as they are set out I think hon. gentlemen will see that there are in the testimony of that witness at least very grave discrepancies. For instance, improper conduct is alleged with two women named. Apart from the fact that it is substantially denied by the respondent there is this fact in conjunction with it that the same witness who swears that the respondent was guilty of improper conduct with two women specifically named was debarred from alleging improper conduct with any other women by saying it was these two and nobody else. Let us take that statement. The witness goes into the box and states that such and such people are the people with whom improper relations existed, and although others were within her purview she says that there was nobody else with whom these improper relations existed. Then, in the next few minutes, apparently in answer to a question, an exceedingly improper question, put

in an improper form, a leading question, the witness makes another charge as to improper relations with another person in that house—with herself. As if it were not sufficient to allege improper relations with only two people she must throw in herself and then as if this were not sufficient she further goes on and alleges improper relations by this man with the whole household. In ordinary cases juries would look upon that evidence with a great deal of suspicion as it is uncorroborated and unsubstantiated by any other evidence of a creditable nature and they would reject it as against the positive evidence of the man that he was not guilty and explaining the circumstances under which he was in that house. I grant that some presumption is created by reason of the fact that this man went to a house of this description at all and that the committee of the Senate, in the absence of an explanation as to the nature of his visit to the house, must come to the conclusion that his visits there were of an illegal nature for the simple reason that it is an illegal resort which is carried on in defiance of the law, and that the presumption must apply as against any one who visits such a place without a satisfactory explanation of his conduct. But, the committee in reporting this Bill evidently lost sight of the fact that the knowledge and acquaintance of this man with these women was gained in consequence of his business because they both swear, if reference be had to the evidence, that they met him first not at the house, but they met him first at his store where they were doing business with him, and that in connection with his business, as he admitted in the evidence at the foot of page 8, under cross examination by the respondent himself, he went to the House. Could there be any fuller explanation of his presence there to rebut any presumption which might arise from his visit? Surely not. It is admitted that these relations commenced in connection with his business down town and that his business brought him to the house. Then, surely, that presumption is successfully negatived or explained. What more? He explains that on one occasion his visit was to proffer advice and see that a certain female received proper medical treatment. That is distinctly corroborated at the foot of page 8 by the same woman who admitted that he did go there for that purpose and that in consequence of his visit this woman was removed where she would receive proper medical treatment. From the top of page 9 down to the middle it will be seen that the visits to the house, or at any rate the visit there spoken of, was in the afternoon between the middle of the afternoon and six o'clock, and also on the lower part of the first half of page 9 it will be seen that the woman is not at all positive in regard to the date of the visits or in regard to the time of the year, although she is positive of the general allegation that this man was guilty of misconduct with two specific people. This is a case for the exercise of extreme care, and I would submit to the committee this proposition, which I fancy would be a sound one to apply in a case of this kind, that if there be evidence of this nature, largely substantiated by the direct testimony of witnesses of this character, it would not be too much for parliament to demand that before granting the relief asked for the evidence given by women of this class be corroborated by circumstantial evidence which is the safest evidence to rely upon. I mean this: The evidence of these women is brought directly in issue by the man's explanation as to the occasion of his visit and his denial of misconduct when he did visit the House. Surely these women could have obtained other evidence in regard to the visits at that house. Surely, if this man was such a notorious profligate and a frequenter of houses of that character, evidence of the fact would not be wanting. Again, Sir, surely, if these two women can upon their oaths specify acts of legal infidelity committed by this man, specify these with particular women named whom they know, it would not be too much for the Senate committee to have demanded that one or both of these women be produced, and the committee should withhold its decision until they are produced in order that the allegation may be verified by the evidence of these women themselves.

But, it appears that the hon. gentlemen composing that committee never even asked a question as to where these women were, with whom this man was supposed to have committed this act of infidelity. That is of very grave import as varying at least the degree of credibility to be attached to that evidence. It will be observed that the principal witness not only admits that she is a grossly immoral character, but that she is also particeps criminis in the same act with this man. Therefore her evidence is to be suspected and criticised in the strongest possible manner. The evidence of the woman Clark, at page 7, must be looked at also with a critical eye because it undoubtedly shows a very deplorable state of affairs. Her memory is faulty and vacillating with regard to circumstances. As to the evidence of these three women it must undoubtedly be gathered that there is not one ounce of satisfactory corroborative evidence, if there is an ounce of corroborative evidence at all. There is no identification of the women with whom these acts of infidelity were committed; they are referred to simply by their Christian names. Granted that the keeper of a house carried on for grossly immoral purposes swears to certain facts implicating these men, upon what evidence does she do so? She swears to the fact

having admittedly no knowledge of the fact and she swears to that as a fact which could only be a presumption. Her evidence with regard to misconduct with the two women named is entirely hearsay and should not of itself be admitted except as circumstantial evidence. She swears to the fact and she admittedly presumes that fact; she presumes to give direct evidence of the misconduct itself, but investigation shows that the evidence is presumptive or circumstantial; she has no knowledge at all of what she is talking about; in short she is a reckless witness. There is another circumstance which I desire to point out to the committee. The women had counsel before the Senate committee, the man was unassited by counsel and he did as best he could with his limited powers to cross-examine; his idea apparently being to get a better explanation of the answers in the examination in chief. But, he elicited this fact, and it is of great importance and will be found at the foot of page 9 of the evidence:

Q. You received your subpoena from Mr. O'Brien?—A. Yes.

Q. Is he or is he not a friend of yours in a business way?—A. Well, yes, in a business way.

Q. Does he go around and stay at your house very often?

Question ruled out by the chairman.

My hon. friend from Lincoln suggests: Why did they not let him answer that question. Here is the man who obtained the evidence; here is the man who procured the witness; surely it would be pertinent to the inquiry to ask if that man also is particeps criminis. Further the evidence goes:

Q. Did you sign a deposition or declaration to Mr. O'Brien prior to your coming down here?—A. Yes.

Q. Were you sober when you signed that?

Question ruled out by the chairman.

The point I am trying to make is that that women was not cross-examined; her story was attacked; it was unsatisfactory in general and in detail; she was swearing to facts of which she had no knowledge; she admitted that prior to her coming down here to give evidence she had signed a declaration with regard to these same facts; surely it would be proper and most desirable that that declaration should be produced and compared with the evidence she was giving so that a test could be made as to her veracity. Then we come to the defence. There is no evidence by the wife except evidence tending to show minor details which are no grounds for the passage of this Bill. The evidence in support of the main charge is entirely uncorroborated and is in itself weak and vacillating and contradictory. Cross-examination directed along proper grounds was not allowed; hearsay evidence with regard to the charges was admitted in more than one instance; the respondent was without counsel and without the means to direct cross-examination along lines which would have elicited possibly a very different state of facts. That is the evidence upon which the Senate recommended this Bill, and if there had been no other evidence I say that it would have been positively unsafe to have reported any Bill for passage through the House upon such unsatisfactory evidence. But there was other evidence. There was evidence which gravely contradicted the evidence of the wife even in minor details as to non-support, desertion, and cruelty. There was evidence expressly and positively denying the charges of misconduct, and not only denying them but going further and explaining them, because the direct denial would not be so strong as the denial of the fact coupled with an explanation of that fact. At the risk of wearying the committee I desire to refer to page 10, the evidence of the respondent who says:

In reference to my poor wife's evidence I deny in toto, I deny emphatically either cruelty to my wife or children, or desertion, or want of maintenance, or cruelty in any way towards either my wife or children or any person living in the house. I deny that I ever chastised one of my children by either spanking or in any other way. The primary cause of my leaving my mother-in-law's house was the fact that I was accused of stealing $5 out of a book which Mrs. Wilcox was reading which I saw my father-in-law deliberately take and put in his pocket.

I also swear positively that I maintained my wife and gave her everything she asked for for something like a year and a half after leaving my mother-in-law's house. When taking legal advice I was told by my lawyer to pay my wife no more moneys unless she consented to remove to her own house. . . . I received this letter from them threatening me with proceedings for alimony, and my reply was always that I was willing to support my wife, that the house was still vacant, and that as soon as she moved down with the children I would at once contribute everything necessary for their support. I remained, as near as I recollect, two and a half or three years in Port Perry. My wife still refused to move down to her own home.

That was before there was any allegation of improper conduct upon which any relief could be granted in the shape of divorce; and that evidence goes uncontradicted. The wife listens to it, and does not go into the box and deny it. At the time he offered to take her to her own home and provide for her, as it was his duty to do, there was no ground on which she could apply for a severance of the matrimonial tie. Again, on page 12 occurs the following evidence with reference to a letter written with regard to alimony:

By Mr. Armstrong, for petitioner:

Q. We have no such letter or copy of it?—A. If Mrs. McDermot has my letter she must have it. When I got that letter from Mrs. McDermot I at once sent her money. I told her I was keeping store in Golden, and told her that everything she required for the children, wearing apparel, I would take great pains in selecting it. I could buy it cheaper than she could in

Port Perry, and I would be pleased to send anything she asked for. In reply I got a letter back with a long list, something over $165 worth of dry goods, which I filled, and expressed them to Port Perry. I also sent the children a cheque a piece.

That is not denied by the woman; and this absolutely negatives the allegations as to desertion, cruelty and non-support contained in her evidence-in-chief. Again, on the same page, he says:

I not only did that, but on the next order for goods, as I knew that my wife was a lady who was particularly neat in her appearance and so on—this first time she told me she did not require anything for herself, she was able to provide for herself, but simply wanted goods for the children, but in the same invoice I included several articles of apparel, silk, lace and silk dress for my wife and a quantity of underwear that would come handy, and also a note attached to the goods that in the future she would take everything for herself that I felt like sending. Every request from that day till the present has been complied with. Since that date I have sent a bicycle apiece, snowshoes, watches, each one a watch and chain, and my wife has at different times sent me up orders for goods in the spring of the year that she wished supplied, and I have always supplied them. I also in December, 1904—I think that is correct—sent my wife two express orders for her own personal use of fifty each.

These allegations are not denied, and the man is taking the risk of his oath, of being convicted of perjury in a very simple manner, because he refers to express orders and express packages of which there is a record. The wife was sitting there and must have heard this evidence as to these remittances and consignments of necessaries; but she does not say that she never received them and inferentially that he never sent them. Again, on page 13, there is not only the specific denial of the misconduct alleged against him by these women, but there is an explanation of the reason of each of the visits to their house. Now, Sir, these unfortunate women who occupy this class of house have to live, and tradesmen have to go there, to take orders, to deliver goods, and to collect the money in payment for those goods; and if these people do not pay—and they have not the best credit in the world—they have to be looked after, and messengers have to be sent to them. Is any presumption of misconduct to be drawn from the fact that a man in the course of his business does visit these places? Is he to be branded as a criminal for all time because he does so in the course of his business as a tradesman? As is not denied, and as is admitted by the woman in charge of the house, he went there for the purpose of carrying on his business and collecting his debts—collecting the money out of which in all probability he sent these remittances to his wife. Is that to be a presumption of guilt against the man, or will this committee require some more tangible or definite to convict him of the charges made against him? When under cross-examination, at page 14, he does not abuse his wife. He speaks in the highest terms of her, and he further explains the occasions of the other visits to the woman Harron's house; and in the whole course of the cross-examination by counsel for the petitioner it is to be observed that the man does not falter from the story he tells. He is subjected to a very close and analytical examination, and his story does not vary generally or in detail; it stands as a straight story, and he is entitled to belief at least as much as the women who acknowledge their own guilt and their own immoral method of livelihood. Granted, then, that his word is as good as theirs, there is no case, because the evidence in favour of innocence, plus the presumption, is greater than the evidence adduced to show guilt. But it is greater, stronger, more reliable, for this reason, that he is definite in regard to the circumstances, he does not vacillate with regard to his facts, and he is not caught, as the women were caught, making statements which are wholly in variance with facts, which they themselves subsequently narrated in the same evidence. There is, in short, the story upon which this woman seeks legislative interference to dissolve that which can only be dissolved under our law as it exists at present, by this parliament. My hon. friend from Lincoln has referred in detail to the principles which we must respect in dealing with these Bills. Sir, I must confess that to my mind it is not clear beyond a peradventure that this man was guilty of the charges brought against him, which alone can be the ground upon which this Bill should become law. The relief in a case of this kind is purely discretionary.

There is no right to legislation dissolving the marriage tie, even on specific proof of legal misconduct. It is an application to the state for a privilege to a particular person, it is privilege legislation, legislation in favour of a particular person; and when we are dealing with the dissolution of so sacred a tie as the marriage tie, we cannot hedge it about with too many safeguards. And although this Bill might have to be relegated to the committee of the Senate and its further consideration deferred for another session, that would be far better than to judge this man guilty, on the evidence submitted, of the charges cited in the preamble of this Bill. If there be any doubt in the evidence, who should get the benefit? All men desire to befriend a woman. That is an obligation laid upon their manhood, but when we come to the question of dissolving a marriage upon charges such as are recited in the preambles of this Bill, it should not matter whether the petitioner be the wife or the husband. We ought to apply the same rule in each case. Let it be established as a principle that this House will reject each and every application for a divorce where

the evidence falls short of proving clearly beyond reasonable doubt the guilt of the respondent, whether man or woman. I submit that in the evidence sent down by the Senate there is grave doubt, doubt so grave that a jury would not hesitate in giving the accused the benefit of it; and I think we might well, if we do not reject the Bill, send it back to the Senate in order that the matter may be more thoroughly investigated along the lines I have pointed out that no injustice be done.

Mr. CARVELL. One would suppose, from the arguments advanced by the hon. members for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and Algoma (Mr. Boyce), that this Bill is an entirely novel proceeding and one that has never been brought before the House since confederation. As a matter of fact, however, these Bills for absolute divorce or dissolution of the vinsulum matrimonii have been granted from time to time since confederation; and if we follow the English precedent we can go back as far as 1551 to find the oldest case on record in England in which the principle of divorce has been acted upon. And so long as persons bring themselves within certain recognized principles, it has been the custom of parliament, and in later years in England and in some portions of this Dominion it has been the power likewise of the courts, to grant these Bills of divorce. Every one knows that there are certain elementary principles which must govern in divorce cases and which must be complied with before divorces are granted. This is not simply, as has been stated in the House, an action between two parties. It is an action in which a third party is interested. It is the duty of the state to see that no injustice is done, it is the duty of the state to protect society, but it is also its duty, when specific charges are proved, to mete out the same measure of justice to one party that is meted out to another. In the first place, the petitioner must come into court with clean hands. There must be no crime or guilt on his part. Has there been in this case the least attempt to prove any unbecoming conduct on the part of the petitioner? We have the evidence before us. The witnesses were brought before the Senate committee. The respondent had every chance to bring witnesses, and to my mind what has stronger weight than anything else, we have the testimony of an hon. member of this House, who represents the riding in which the petitioner lives, and who says that no more virtuous woman lives in the province of Ontario. Therefore the first, and to my mind, one of the most important elements has been settled. The next important element is that there must be no collusion between the parties. Surely no one will conclude that in this case there has been any. Then the next question is whether the ordinary cause of divorce has been proven. The hon. gentlemen who have addressed this House asked us to go back to the principle adopted by the English parliament prior to 1857 and by the English courts to a very large extent since and that is to grant to the husband a right they will not grant the wife. I do not think that such was the intention of parliament. True these hon. gentlemen did not say so in terms, but I can draw no other inference from the arguments they advanced.

Mr. LANCASTER. I said just the opposite.

Mr. CARVELL. I submit that it is a reasonable deduction to draw from the remarks of these hon. gentlemen that we should withhold from the woman the right we are willing to grant the man.

Mr. BOYCE. Not at all. Neither of us took that ground.

Mr. CARVELL. I am glad my hon. friends say they took grounds quite the opposite. That removes one very grave doubt I possessed. But if they have any doubt about the principles to be followed in the Canadian House, all they need do is read the famous Tudor-Hartt case decided in 1888 and they will conclude that the English law has not been followed in Canada, and I hope never will. I know of no more mischievous and unfair legislation than to deny to the woman the right to a divorce which would be granted the husband.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. That brings me to the question whether or not the charge made against this man has been proven. It is not a question whether the wife deserted her husband or whether he deserted her, because desertion, no matter how cruel or under what extraordinary circumstances, is not in Canada—and I hope never will be—a ground for divorce. I shall not go over all the nauseating evidence given before the Senate committee, but I do submit that according to the evidence, the case of the petitioner has been proven beyond doubt. We are told that we ought not to take the evidence of the two women brought from British Columbia. Why? Because they are prostitutes forsooth.

Did the hon. gentlemen who are opposed to this Bill expect to find evidence of this kind except in houses of prostitution? Do you go to the drawing-rooms or the higher classes of society for such evidence? Do you go to our churches or our schools for evidence of this kind? If these hon. gentlemen had ever practised in the divorce courts or had had experience of this sort of legal matters elsewhere, they would know that you must go to these places to get this kind of evidence. And they would know that case after case in Canada has been decided within the last fifty years on evidence such as this. In the province of New Brunswick they have a divorce court. And I submit that it is as hard to

get a divorce before the courts of New Brunswick as before this parliament of Canada, if not harder. Nine months ago I listened to a case in that court in which a divorce was granted and the only evidence given was brought from a house of ill-fame as in this case. The judge in that case—it is usual for the cases to be tried by a judge alone, though he can have a jury under certain circumstances—had no difficulty in coming to the conclusion that the case had been proved.

Mr. BOYCE. Was there no corroborative evidence ?

Mr. CARVELL. There certainly was and it was just such evidence as we have in this case showing that this man had been seen frequenting these places. And you do not want better corroboration. You do not get direct evidence in these cases—and it is a good thing you do not. I would refer my hon. friends to a case showing the rule of evidence adopted in these matters. For, Sir, as I have said before, we do not get the direct evidence in these cases and are compelled to rely on circumstantial evidence. I do not believe there is one such case in twenty-five decided in this House or in the courts of this country, but the evidence is largely circumstantial. I would refer these hon. gentlemen to the diction of Lord Stowell in the Lovedon case case in the House of Lords, about the year 1832. I cite from Gemmill on Divorce, page 206 :

> It is a fundamental rule that it is not necessary to prove the direct fact of adultery ; because if it were otherwise, there is not one case in a hundred in which the proof would be attainable. In every case almost, the fact is inferred from circumstances that lead to it by fair inference as a necessary conclusion.

Now, I will not refer to the evidence of these women at all. I think it highly improper to refer to that evidence in this House and put it on 'Hansard.' I ask members of this committee to refer to that evidence of which each hon. member has received a copy. You have absolute evidence of this woman who is seeking a divorce, and you have it denied in toto, almost in toto, by the defendent himself. But there is another important matter which we must consider, and that is that the members of this committee have not had the privilege which is granted in every other court I have ever heard of, namely that those who are to decide as to the weight of evidence, must see the witnesses on the stand that they may watch their demeanour, and judge by their manner and appearance whether they are or are not worthy of credence. This House has not had that privilege. But in the Senate committee they have had that privilege. And the members of that committee and the many members of the Senate who have unanimously decided in favour of passing this Bill are in an infinitely better position to decide upon this case than the members of this committee who have only the bald facts reported to them. These women come and give their evidence. And because they are women of ill-repute their evidence, we are told ought not to be taken. I made it my business to go to members of the Senate, and they told me that these women gave their evidence with the utmost difidence, that it was almost impossible to drag that evidence out of them, and that it was evident from their actions that they were telling the truth, that they had been brought here against their will and were forced to give evidence. But we in this House do not know anything about that. All we know is that these witnesses swore to these things, and that the defendant denied them. There is another important matter. If I had read the evidence of the husband alone and had not read the evidence of the petitioner or the petitioner's witnesses, merely from the way the defendant gave his evidence, I would say that it was about as hard a piece of evidence to believe as I ever heard of. The man has double the assurance of those harlots who have been held up in such an unfavourable light here to-night. Take the man's evidence as it stands and he denies his marriage, denies that they lived together as husband and wife, denies that they had three children. Probably this was not his intention. But he specifically and categorically denies certain charges made against him by the wife in her examination, charges that are sworn to by two other witnesses. It is impossible for him to deny that he was a frequent visitor at the house of the women Harron and Clarke. He tells us that it was necessary to go there in the course of his business to sell goods to these women. Had he stopped there, he might have been entitled to credence. But he does not stop there. He says he went there to introduce commercial travellers. What for ? That they might also sell these women goods. And he tells us in the next breath that he sold nearly all the silk goods sold in the town of Golden and that these women were the principal purchasers of these goods. When a man makes his livelihood by selling goods to women of this kind and then tells us that he took commercial travellers to sell goods in direct competition with himself and prevent him from making a profit, the evidence is hard to believe. But that is his explanation of why he entered those houses of ill-fame. That alone should be enough to convince any honest man that this witness is—I will not use as harsh a word as perjurer, but is not entitled to the credence which would deny this woman the right to divorce if this committee believe that in any case husband and wife should be divorced.

Now, there has been a good deal said

about whether or not this man deserted his wife, or whether his wife deserted him. As I said before, so far as the crucial point is concerned, it matters not to me which it was. I think there will be a lot of evidence found to show whether this man is worthy of belief or not. One thing is very certain—he only provided a home for his wife for about six months after he was married, and then, because he could not provide a home or did not want to do so, they went to her father's house and remained there for five or six years, after which he left. A great deal was said about his not being able to get along with his father-in-law and mother-in-law, and he tries to make out that it was never his fault. But he gives the lie to his statement from beginning to end because he admits that in one month after he left his mother-in-law's house he made an arrangement by which he gave his wife $12.50 a month and carried on this arrangement for a year. Is that consistent with the idea that he left because he could not get along with his wife's parents and was pleading with his wife to leave? Why should he put her off with a pension of $12.50 a month? If he wished to keep her with him would he not have given her everything he could? But he gets rid of her in the easiest way he can. He gives her $12.50 a month and says; Take that, for it is all you will get. And this arrangement he continued for a year or fifteen months. He lives there in the same village for two years after this; not one dollar of support does she get from him and finally after about three years he goes west and becomes, as he says himself, a Lothario. He admits it; not only admits it, but glories in it. He is what is described in the dictionaries as a gay deceiver, a libertine, a man without character, a man who glories in the fact that he sets at defiance the laws of God as well as of man.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not know how it struck my hon. friend but I know I noticed the same expression in the evidence and it struck me that he did not understand the expression.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend can point to anything in the evidence which shows that he did not understand the expression, I have not been able to see it, The evidence is simply that the counsel for the petitioner asks:

You were rather a Lothario in the west?

And he answers:

Yes.

That is all there is to it, and I would like to know how on earth my hon. friend can read into this language the fact that he did not understand the expression. I do not think the respondent will thank him for saying there is anything on earth he does not understand. If you read the evidence you will come to the conclusion that in his own mind he knows everything there is on this earth and a little of what is in the next world as well. We have this man on his own admission a gay deceiver, a libertine, a man who glories in it and who goes out there and is certainly a frequenter of these houses of ill-fame. He lives there for eight or ten years and there is not a particle of evidence that he ever offered to contribute one dollar to his wife's support, until some two or three years ago when she wrote, and then he would not give a cent until she signed a statement that it was not to be taken as a precedent that he would not be liabale for alimony. Then she sent a list of goods which she needed for her children. He tries to make a virtue of necessity by claiming that after proceedings had been started, not after the subpoenas had been issued, but after he knew that an attempt was to be made to bring the matter before the Senate of Canada, then he becomes magnanimous and then without being solicited he sends presents to the children and express orders to his wife and she returns them. If there is anything in this evidence for which I admire this woman, it is the fact that when the matter had gone to the extent it had she had the womanhood to return the money by which he was trying to buy peace.

We now come down to the last matter which I propose to mention in reference to the question whether this woman or this man should be believed and it is this. We have the evidence of the man himself that he left this woman some five or six years after their marriage, in 1889, and that in all the sixteen years intervening he has not contributed more than $400 to her support; he admits it himself. We have the evidence, as I said before, that he has led a wild, dissolute life in the west, that he has inhabited houses of ill-fame. I am taking his own admission, not the evidence of these women, and when his wife swore to the most abominable piece of evidence I ever listened to by a wife, which will be found at page 2 of the evidence, I say the man did not deny it. It seems almost too inhuman to be placed in print, it seems so bad that you can hardly believe that a man living in a Christian country would sink so low, to such a depth of degradation, that he would treat a woman as this woman was treated by him—and that at a time when he was professing to live with her as her husband. She swears at page 2:

I was in child-birth and I asked him to go for the doctor, and he refused positively and swore at me and said: damn it all why didn't I tell him before it was time to retire?

I submit that has not been denied. In the first paragraph of his evidence he denied categorically the facts that he had thrown the children under the table, bent their fingers back and driven her out of the

house. He denied these charges, but he has not denied this charge.

Mr. LANCASTER. What does my hon. friend say of the fact that the woman forgave him for that and lived with him for several years after ? Is that not an answer.

Mr. CARVELL. I am not asking the committee to pass the Bill on that evidence. I am asking the committee to believe that this man is not worthy of belief, a man who is brutal enough to make a remark of that kind under those circumstances is not fit to be believed in any court in any Christain or civilized country, and that a man who is sufficiently mean to do that is one of the most despicable specimens of humanity that it has ever been my experience not only to meet but to read of. With this evidence I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that the man has been proven guilty of adultery, and therefore, as I read the law, a divorce should be granted. But that raises another question. The hon. gentlemen who are opposing the passage of this Bill seem to be advocating something which so far as I have been able to read has never been advocated in this House since 1888 and I know not how long before that time. I may be in error but I have inquired from older members and I have been unable to find a single instance from 1888 when this House has ever questioned the finding of the Senate on this matter of divorce. Why has that rule been followed ? Simply because an agreement was made. In the first place they are following the custom of the House of Lords of England, a custom which prevailed in England from 1551 down to 1858 when these matters were handed over to the divorce court. Then in the old province of Canada these matters were taken up by the legislative council and after confederation was consummated these matters were taken into consideration by the Senate and have been ever since. Under the customs and rules of the Senate passed in 1888 and even before that, they have had the power, and have exercised that power, of bringing before them the witnesses, the witnesses give their evidence viva voce as in all courts of law and the committee of the Senate who have listened to the witnesses, watched their demeanour, observed the manner in which they give their evidence, forming their conclusion more I say from watching the manner of the witnesses than the actual evidence, these Senate committees have been passing these questions and their decision has been taken as final by this House as far back as 1888.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why then do they ever come before this chamber ?

Mr. CARVELL. Because under our present system of legislation it is necessary that a Bill be passed by both Houses of parliament.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL. If we are considering the evidence then I say we should be manly about it, I say that we should pass this Bill and give notice to the people of Canada that in future every divorce Bill is going to be contested in the House of Commons as well as in the Senate. Suppose this rule had existed in this case what would have been done ? These witnesses would have been brought before either the Private Bills Committee or a special select committee to give evidence, and members of this House would have had the privilege of going into that committee and listening to these people giving their evidence. Members of this House would have been treated as a jury is treated in a court of law, and would have been in a position to decide upon this matter intelligently on the principles of their common sense and their judgment, and they would not have been compelled to take the evidence second-hand as we are compelled to do in this case. I submit that this parliament has never adopted that principle. Let us be fair and manly about it, let us give the people of the Dominion of Canada public notice of it and let us put people in such a position that they will not leave a case half tried when they have got through with the Senate. These witnesses I presume have gone back to British Columbia. We have no way of getting their testimony or finding out whether they have sworn the truth or not. We must simply take the evidence as it was produced before the Senate. It is not fair ; this woman or her friends have been compelled to put up I suppose $500 or $1,000 in order to get this case in the position it is to-night, and now in an unfair and unusual manner, in a manner which I admit the House has a legal right to adopt but which has not been employed for fifteen years, it is attempted to hold up this Bill simply because we have not this evidence before us.

Another peculiar course was taken on Friday evening by the two learned gentlemen who have discussed this case here to-night. Then a different line of action was taken. On that occasion we were asked to submit this matter to the Minister of Justice. Think of it ! When the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) asked the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) why he wanted to submit it to the Minister of Justice, he said that he wanted to get a legal decision ; and when asked what legal decision, he said that he wanted to know whether or not there was sufficient ground on which to grant this divorce.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) is making my speech for me.

Mr. CARVELL. Am I ? I will do my hon. friend the justice of reading from the record, which, I presume, he will not deny, and I will leave it to the committee to decide

whether or not I have properly quoted him. I read from the unrevised edition of 'Hansard' of Friday, May 19, at page 6511:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Now I think that this is a childish, I think it is frivolous, the most frivolous argument ever advanced in this House for a man of the ability of the hon. member for Lincoln, or the hon. member for Algoma, to seriously propose to refer this to the Minister of Justice for a judicial decision upon the legal point. What legal point is there about it?

Mr. LANCASTER. The legal point is whether the evidence here is legally sufficient to warrant the stain of guilt that is sought to be put on this man.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who is to decide that?

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not a proper question for the law officers of the Crown to decide?

I ask is there a lawyer in this House who ever heard such a proposition as that?

Mr. BOYCE. Does my hon. friend deny that that would not be a proper course?

Mr. CARVELL. I most certainly deny that it is a proper course.

Mr. BOYCE. Well, then, my hon. friend is not acquainted with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CARVELL. I will read rule 'O' of the Senate, and we will see what that rule says. I want to treat the hon. gentleman fairly, I want to give him all the evidence and the law I can on the question, and while I do not hope to convince the hon. gentleman, yet, Sir, I will try to make my own position tenable before the committee. Rule 'O' is as follows:

Condonation, collusion or connivance between the parties is always a sufficient ground for rejecting a Bill of divorce, and shall be inquired into by the committee. And should the committee have reason to suspect collusion or connivance and deem it desirable that fuller inquiries should be made, the same shall be communicated to the Minister of Justice, that he may intervene and oppose the Bill should the interest of public justice in his opinion call for such intervention.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman contend that the House of Commons has not the same right to invoke that as the other chamber as to the necessity for passing this Act?

Mr. CARVELL. I am willing to admit that it is only a fair inference that the House of Commons shall have the same right to invoke the opinion of the Minister of Justice on these points as the Senate, but when hon. gentlemen ask us to refer this question to the Minister of Justice in order to decide whether there has been condonation or collusion, I say away with such an idea. Where is the evidence of condonation? I ask the hon. member for Lincoln and the hon. member for Algoma to point out where there is collusion in this case. They have talked about collusion between the wife and these women from British Columbia. They have even gone so far as to——

Mr. BOYCE. I think the hon. gentleman is going beyond the mark.

Mr. CARVELL. They have even gone so far as to talk of collusion between the wife and these women from British Columbia. That is not the meaning of collusion. Collusion, as it is used in that rule, and as it is understood in law, means an agreement or arrangement between the husband and wife by which a divorce might be brought about which otherwise would not be brought about. Where is the evidence of any legal collusion in this case? What is there to submit to the Minister of Justice on the question of collusion? Then, the next thing that is mentioned is connivance. Connivance in law means that if one party, husband or wife, intentionally places either one in a position that the statutory charge may be preferred against either, they are not entitled to any redress in this House or before a court of law. Where is the evidence of connivance? Do they claim that because this woman, after being treated as she was, would not go with this man because he went off to British Columbia and associated with harlots, is responsible for his association with these women? Do they claim that she drove him into these wrongful acts? That is the only logical conclusion they can arrive at, that is the only way they can make out that there is any connivance; and if there is any connivance, what do they want to submit to the Minister of Justice? Do they want the Minister of Justice to tell them that this parliament has power to pass a divorce Bill? Do they want the Minister of Justice to tell them, as a lawyer, that if they believe the evidence of these two women they are justified in finding the charge proven, and that the Bill should pass? Or do they want to put this thing off in order to get rid of a vote upon the matter? If so, I say they are giving us a childish pretext for asking the Minister of Justice to decide upon the whole case.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is pretty hard on the Minister of Justice.

Mr. CARVELL. It is pretty hard on the Minister of Justice; I thought so when I listened to it. I thought that surely these hon. gentlemen knew the law. I do not think the hon. member for Lincoln will plead guilty to ignorance of the law and I am absolutely certain that the hon. member for Algoma will not plead ignorance of the law. There is no question about that. I wonder at them wanting the Minister of Justice to go over the evidence, to come down here and take the place of the jury, take the place which has been occupied by laymen since the time of Magna Charta, and to decide according to this evidence if this man is guilty or not. I have taken up much more time in discussing this case than I intended to, but I do submit that this parliament, in the first

place under the British North America Act, has power to grant this divorce. This parliament fifteen or twenty years ago adopted the principle of allowing the evidence to be presented before a Senate committee. The Senate committee and the Senate itself, after passing upon these cases, send them down here and the recommendations of the Senate have invariably been concurred in. If this House is going to change that principle then I say the only proper thing for us to do is to pass this Bill. If we believe that this man is guilty of adultery, and I do not think there are half a dozen hon. gentlemen in this House who do not believe in their hearts that he is guilty of adultery, then I say we should pass this Bill. If this House desires that a different principle should be followed in future let us adopt that principle, make it public and let everybody who wishes know the principle upon which these matters are going to be decided, let them give their evidence before the Senate, then bring their evidence over here, before a committee of this House and then we will be able to decide intelligently, but until that plain intimation is given to the people of this country, I submit that if this man is guilty of adultery it is the bounden duty of this House to pass this Bill and let this woman have her divorce. There is only one other observation that I desire to make. The hon. member for Lincoln undertook to play upon the sympathies and credibility of the members of this House by asking us if the case were reversed and two bad men attempted to swear away the rights of an innocent woman whether every man here would not stand up and say: We shall not believe such evidence, we shall not give credence to it. But, he left out the important part of the argument. Let any woman come into this House and admit, as this man admits that she has been living with harlots for the last ten years of her life, let any woman come into this House and admit that she has been living the life that he admits he has been living, and I ask, if there is a man in this committee, if there is a member of this parliament, if there is a legal gentleman or a Christian gentleman in Canada who would not say that this woman ought to be divorced and who would not grant a divorce without discussing it for two minutes. I say that there has been no case made out against this woman, but that on the other hand there has been a strong and absolutely unanswerable case made out by the woman against the husband, and for that reason I contend the Bill should pass.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) has not referred to the main argument I made, namely: what is the interest of the country in this matter? Would the hon. gentleman tell me what good he thinks it would do the country to pass this Bill?

Mr. CARVELL.

Mr. CARVELL. My answer is this: for the past 300 years it has been the settled policy of the parliament of Great Britain to grant divorce when adultery has been proved against the woman. In 1832, the parliament of Great Britain granted a divorce for the adultery of the husband. The rule was laid down positively and absolutely by this House in the Tudor and Hart case in 1888 that adultery, unaccompanied by an unnatural crime is, as required in England, sufficient ground for divorce by the wife. If this House is convinced that the charge has been proven against the husband then it is our right beyond a question to grant the divorce, and I submit, following the practise, it is our duty to pass this Bill and grant this wife a divorce.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not yet quite understand from the hon. gentleman what good purpose is served in the country by encouraging divorce on such evidence as has been produced in this case.

Mr. CARVELL. My only answer is this: if the hon. gentleman wishes to take the position which a large and influential body in Canada take, namely, that he is unalterably opposed to divorce, then I can understand him.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am opposed to divorce except in extreme cases.

Mr. CARVELL. If he admits that divorce is proper in extreme cases, then as this is an extreme case, and on the ground of public policy he should support the Bill.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill reported.

On motion for the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not wish to reiterate what I have already said, but I must say that I cannot for the life of me see how any good purpose can be served to the country by passing this Bill on such evidence as we have before us. I must protest against the third reading.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Speaking for myself, I want to be put on record as saying that I cannot vote for the principle that any man's rights or privileges should be put in jeoparady upon such evidence as has been given in this case. I do not think that such evidence would be recognized in any court, and I say that especially should it not be recognized by this House.

House divided on the motion for the third reading.

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	McCarthy (Simcoe),
Barker,	McIntyre,
Barr,	McKenzie (Bruce),
Blain,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),

Bland,	Miller,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	Mulock (Sir William),
Brown,	Reid (Grenville),
Caldwell,	Reid (Restigouche),
Campbell,	Roche (Halifax),
Carney,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Carvell,	Stewart,
Christie,	Talbot (Strathcona),
Clarke,	Telford,
Emmerson,	Tisdale,
Fielding,	Watson,
Finlay,	Wilson
Johnston (Lambton),	(Lennox & Addington)
Kennedy,	Wilson (Russell),
Maclean (York, S.),	Wright (Renfrew).—38.
Macpherson,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Avery,	Lake,
Bergeron,	Lancaster,
Boyce,	McKenzie
Crawford,	(Cape Breton, N.),
Daniel,	McLennan,
Henderson,	Paterson,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Scott.—13.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF GEORGE DANCE HARPER.

House in committee on Bill (No. 154) for the relief of George Dance Harper.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose there is no use of opposing the passing of this Bill after what we have seen on the other one. The evidence in this case shows a very extraordinary state of things. After reading it one must come to the conclusion that the plaintiff Harper is a fool and the respondent either an imbecile or a blackguard ; and to give a divorce on such evidence is making a farce of the House of Commons altogether.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed, on division.

RELIEF OF JANE MARIE FITZ-SIMONS.

Mr. STEWART moved that the House go into committee on Bill (No. 130) for the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.—Mr. Calvert.

Mr. TAYLOR. The evidence has not been distributed in this case.

Mr. STEWART. The evidence was distributed amongst the members some weeks ago.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Clerk of the House informs me that the evidence has not been distributed yet, so far as he has seen.

Mr. STEWART. I think I ought to know. Although Mr. Calvert's name appears on the order paper as being responsible for the Bill, it was introduced by myself, and naturally I have followed it. The evidence was distributed among the members ; I received it and read it ; and the Bill passed the Private Bills Committee without any opposition.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The very fact that the Bill has been before the Private Bills Committee, and has been dealt with by it is proof that the evidence has been before that committee. The committee could not have reported the Bill without having received the evidence. The invariable practice is for the Senate to transmit to the House for the convenience of our committee the evidence taken before the Senate committee.

Mr. DANIEL. I am a member of the Private Bills Committee, I was present when this other case came before it, but I have never seen any evidence in this case. It certainly was not before the Private Bills Committee at any meeting at which I was present, and it is news to me that that committee has reported in favour of the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. The record in the orders is plain, that it is reported without amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I was present at the Private Bills Committee the day on which this Bill passed. This and the McDermot Bill passed at the same time.

Mr. STEWART. I may say that the only objection ever offered against the passage of this Bill was on technical or constitutional grounds. The marriage took place in the United States, and when the case first came up, a lawyer appeared and objected to it being dealt with on this ground, but offered no objection whatever to the evidence. I was present at the Private Bills Committee at the last meeting, when the Bill passed that Committee, and there was no objection whatever offered to its passing by the party most particularly interested in it.

Motion agreed to, Bill considered in committee and reported.

Mr. STEWART moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. DANIEL. Before that motion is put I wish to enter my protest. I have not received the evidence and have no knowledge of the Bill having been considered by the Private Bills Committee, and I object to the Bill passing without the evidence being in the hands of the members. Not only myself but many other members say they have not seen the evidence.

Mr. FIELDING. The evidence must have been received some time ago. My recollection is it was printed several weeks ago. Perhaps the hon. gentleman received it and has forgotten.

Mr. HENDERSON. As the date of the report of the committee is the 17th of May, it could not possibly have been printed and distributed weeks ago.

Mr. FIELDING. The practice is when a Bill is received from the other House, the evidence is distributed. I am only speaking from recollection.

Mr. BOYCE. I desire to place my protest on record on the same lines as the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would suggest that in order to avoid confusion in cases of this kind, some initials ought to follow the Bill so as to show the evidence has been distributed. When a Bill is printed in both languages we put the initials 'E. and F.,' and there is no reason why we should not put the initials 'E. D.' to show that the evidence has been distributed.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STEWART moved that a message be sent to the Senate returning the evidence taken before the Standing Orders Committee, to which was referred Bill (No. 130) intituled an Act for the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill, the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart), said emphatically that the evidence had been distributed. My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) asked him for a copy of the evidence and he sent a copy of the evidence of a former case. If it has been printed and distributed, he should send over a copy, and until that is done the motion should stand. I do not think Bills of this kind should be railroaded through without members knowing what they are voting on.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Bill has been passed. This is a motion that a message be sent to the Senate to return to that House the evidence.

Mr. STEWART. I may say that the evidence sent over to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) just now was handed to me by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Caldwell), who had the evidence in both cases in his hand at the same time. The evidence is somewhere between him and the Speaker's desk and it was distributed weeks ago.

Mr. CALDWELL. I thought that the evidence I sent over was the evidence in this case.

Motion agreed to, on division.

PATENTS OF WILLIAM A. DAMEN.

Mr. CAMPBELL, moved that the order for the House to go into committee on Bill (No. 129) to amend an Act respecting certain patents of William A. Damen be discharged and the Bill referred back to the Private Bills committee for further consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. Further consideration in what respect ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Minister of Agriculture said there were some amendments to be made which had been overlooked.

Motion agreed to.

FESSENDEN WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY OF CANADA.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 144) to incorporate the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On section 1,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to explain whether the government have a policy in regard to this company, which is a company engaging in the business of telegraphic communication. We have a general Act applying to these companies I believe ; but it is a question whether there should not be some special provision to regulate the conduct of such companies as this. Or, if there is such a provision, I would like to be informed of it. We know what has happened in the case of the Bell Telephone Company. That company has become an immense monopoly requiring the attention of a parliamentary committee. And, while it has proved of great advantage to the people, it has also proved a monopoly. It is easier to regulate these companies at the start than later on. While I have no objection to this Bill going through this stage, I shall certainly expect a declaration from the government of their policy in regard to companies of this kind, and an explanation whether this company comes under any general law regulating such corporations.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This matter was very fully considered in the committee, and some amendments were offered to the Bill, providing that the company shall not establish signal stations or give effect to their object without permission of the Governor in Council. It was also announced to the committee by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Préfontaine) that it was his intention to bring to the notice of the House an Act relating to wireless telegraphy such as had been passed in England. He produced to the committee a copy of that Act, and said that some action would be taken in Canada along the same lines. The Bill, as now amended, certainly safeguards every interest, including those of the government, which, as we all know, has taken some action in connection with wireless telegraphy. It is provided that no station shall be placed at any point where it will be against the public interest. All interests are conserved ; and I think that the Bill, as now amended, is entitled to the favourable consideration of the committee.

Mr. BERGERON. I may say to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that a new section, No. 20, has been added to the Bill, providing that :

The Electric Telegraph Companys' Act shall apply to the company.

The hon. gentleman will hear the amendments that have been made to the Bill, and

I think he will see that there is no objection to passing it. It is based upon the Marconi Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is copied from the Marconi Bill.

On section 8—general powers,

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does this wireless telegraph company intend also to telegraph by wire ?

Mr. BERGERON. It was explained in the committee, and upon these explanations the clause was based, that in certain places, as, for instance, in the Yukon, the company would be obliged to use wires for certain distances. It may be a very short distance, but the company could not do it without power from the parliament of Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask if section 8 is intended to give the company power to transmit messages by wireless telegraphy ?

Mr. BERGERON. I have just been saying that for the carrying on of their work they need in some places wires between two points. It may be a very short distance but they could not do it without the authority of an Act of this parliament.

On section 12,

The company may enter into any arrangements with any government, corporation or person owning or controlling any line of telegraphic or telephonic communication, or any system of signalling, or any power or right to use communications of that nature, to use its lines or systems, or cables or telegraphic, telephonic or other means of communication, facilities or works, upon such terms and in such manner as the directors from time to time deem expedient.

Mr. BARKER. What is the intention of the word 'government' there ? Does it mean any foreign government, the government of the United States for example?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would only mean any government within Canada.

Mr. BERGERON. That means local governments or the federal government.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think it is defined.

Mr. BERGERON. Those were the reasons given in the committee, that this was intended to cover arrangements with local governments.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the intention, but is it limited to local governments?

Mr. BARKER. That may be what was in the mind of the persons introducing this Bill, but I doubt whether it is the meaning of the Bill. 'Any government' must have a pretty broad meaning it seems to me.

Mr. FIELDING. They could not do anything in Newfoundland, for instance, without getting the authority of the Newfoundland legislature.

Mr. BARKER. If it were made subject to the approval of this government it might be all right. Why not make section 12 and those other sections which relate to governments read : 'subject to the approval of the Governor General in Council' ? Then there would be no objection to it.

Mr. BERGERON. That is said in some other clauses. I may say that this section is framed nearly word for word upon the Marconi Act.

Mr. FIELDING. How would it do to say 'any government in Canada' making the word 'Canada' apply to 'government' and not to 'corporation' ? They might want to make a bargain with the Western Union Telegraph Company for instance which is a foreign corporation.

Mr. BARKER. The difficulty as I see it is that if they had power under this to enter into an agreement with the United States government for example, the United States government might afterwards say that this government could not object because we had authorized it and the agreement must be borne whatever the contract was. It would get over the difficulty I think if it was provided 'subject to the approval of the Governor in Council'; then the government could always protect themselves.

Mr. FIELDING. I was not present in the committee when this matter was discussed, but I think the provisions as to stations were made subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. I am not sure if that applies to the agreements.

Mr. BERGERON. Clause 19 provides that section 195 of the Railway Act shall apply to this company.

Mr. FIELDING. What harm is there in saying 'any government in Canada'? I would make that suggestion to the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) if he is supporting the Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think that even if we put that here, we can bind any foreign government. I understood in the committee that it meant governments in Canada, either this one or the local governments.

Mr. FIELDING. You could not bind a foreign government but you could bind the company in any contract it might make with a foreign government.

Mr. BERGERON. This is the first I heard of any such idea ; it was not thought of in the Railways and Canals Committee at all. This clause I may repeat is framed on the line of the Marconi Act.

Mr. BARKER. I am not objecting to it at all. I am only pointing out it may have a different meaning.

Mr. BERGERON. I have not been taking charge of the Bill, I am only supporting it to-night because the hon. gentleman who is in charge of it is not here, and I know the promoters are anxious it should pass as soon as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. If we say 'any government in Canada' and the words 'corporation, firm or person' follow it will imply that the corporations may be foreign because the limitation only applies to the first words. I think the purpose of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) is reasonable, but would not the effect of my suggestion be that by limiting it to governments in Canada, the words 'in Canada' not being applied to corporations it could make bargains with foreign corporations ?

Mr. BARKER. Probably.

Mr. BERGERON. Why change it in this Bill when the Marconi Bill has a similar clause?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not a conclusive answer ; we are always learning.

Mr. BARKER. I suggest we deal with all the clauses except those that have the word 'government' in and allow them to stand for the consideration of the Minister of Justice.

Mr. BERGERON. All right.

On the question shall the Bill be reported:

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest that sections 11 and 12 be held over. They both have the same expression, 'government' and it is quite possible that the Interpretation Act may define the word 'government' for the purpose.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 11 has been adopted but it may be reconsidered if necessary.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 145) respecting a Patent, Number 69772, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 146) respecting certain Patents of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—Mr. Grant.

QUESTION.

LIEUTENANT J. M. MILTIMORE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Has Lieutenant J. M. Miltimore, of the 13th Scottish Light Dragoons, obtained permission to attend the Cavalry School at Toronto ?

2. If so, was his application sent through the proper channel, or was permission granted without going through the formality of applying through his commanding officer and the district officer commanding ?

3. If he did apply through his commanding officer, was the application forwarded or returned ? If returned, for what reason ?

4. If the application was returned as being incorrect, was a correct application sent in later, or did the officer in question then appeal to the Minister of Agriculture and obtain the required permission ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes.

2. As it was desirable that Lieutenant Militimore should qualify before going to camp in June next, special authority was given to the district officer commanding to send him for a course.

3 and 4. No official application in the matter reached headquarters.

ADJOURNMENT FOR MAY 24TH.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday next, the 23rd instant, it stands adjourned till Thursday, the 25th.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—LONDON BY-ELECTION.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, as I see that the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) has been sworn in as Minister of Public Works, I would like to know if the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) has tendered his resignation, as I do not see him in his seat I suppose that according to his promise he has resigned his seat.

Mr. TAYLOR. The challenge was not accepted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F Maclean) made the challenge on the condition that no better candidate could be got in London, but as the gentleman who is to be the Conservative candidate in London is going to have a walk over, it is not necessary for my hon. friend from South York to resign.

Mr. FIELDING. In the absence of the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) it is not fair to suggest that somebody else would be a better candidate than he would be.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, yes, he is one of the best men in Canada.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Immigration—further amount required for contingencies in Canadian, British and foreign

agencies and general expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $300,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Minister of the Interior please explain what this large sum is required for ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This vote is asked to complete the immigration services for the year. The sum originally quoted was $672,276. The expenditures for several years have overrun the estimates. It is found impossible in practice to estimate closely the immigration expenditures from the fact that as the flow of immigration increases the expenses increase proportionately ; that is to say the increase in expenses in one year is dependent upon the success of the operations of the preceding year. If the estimate for the coming year is based only on the estimate made for the present year the immigration efforts of the past year have been successful in securing an increased immigration, naturally the estimates for the current year fall short. That has occurred in this case to a serious degree. Besides, provision was not made in last year's estimates for the shortage of the previous year and this has to be provided for as well as the increased expenditure, because of the increased immigration.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) will turn up 'Hansard' he will find that last year when Mr. Sifton was putting through his estimates he described a state of affairs quite different from that described by the present minister.

Mr. BERGERON. What would be the total cost for immigration last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. $971,276.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that include salaries and everything ?

Mr. OLIVER. Everything.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understand the minister to say that this is to provide for the increased immigration this year ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is a very large increase and there was also a large increase last year over the previous year. How many immigrants came in for the last ten months ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot for the moment give the actual figures, but the estimate of the total immigration for the current fiscal year is : British immigrants, 67,548; French and Belgian, 2,572 ; other continental countries, 33,486 ; United States, 44,655 ; total, 148,261, as against 130,000 last year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I went to the trouble to send down to Mr. Scott the other day for some information when I saw that this vote of $300,000 extra was asked for. I have the statement of Mr. Scott in my hand and it shows that the total immigration during the the ten months. July 1, 1904, to April 30, 1905, was : ocean ports, 67,808 ; United States, 31,969 ; total, 99,777. If we got the same average number of immigrants for the next two months there would be only 120,000 compared with 130,000 last year. The previous year we spent $744,788, which was a very large expenditure ; this year the main estimates contained an appropriation of $672,276 and now $300,000 is asked making $972,276, while according to this report the immigration will be less than last year. To have it as large as last year it would be necessary to get at least 30,000 immigrants in the next two months. It does seem to me that this increased expenditure is entirely unjustifiable, and unless the minister can give some better reason than he has given the item should not pass. Of course, if the money has been spent we may have to pay it, but there should be some satisfactory reason given why we should spend nearly $1,000,000 a year on immigration when our immigration system is now so well established. Long before this government came to power we had our immigration agents in the United States and the policy was initiated. It is well known all over this continent and pretty well known in Europe, that we have the best wheat producing field in the world, and that we are giving every immigrant 160 acres free of any charge except a fee of $10 for the patent. It does seem to me that this ought be sufficient inducement, and that in the future we ought not to increase our expenditure every year. When you get a business well established and in good running order that ought be sufficient without increasing your outlay. I quite understand the difficulty the minister is in, seeing he is not long in office, and that while out of office he was not much in sympathy with the manner in which the business was carried on. He is not responsible for the expenditure up to the present time, but some minister who has been in charge of the departments since Mr. Sifton retired ought to be able to give the committee a reason why this additional sum should be voted. I may say that I also asked Mr. Scott to give a statement of the expenditure up to the present time, but he does not seem to have been able to do so. He says :

> Expenditure for immigration by Mr. Preston, July 1st, 1904, to February 28th, 1905 ; by Mr. Smith from March 31st, 1905 ; at Ottawa to May 16th, 1905 ; total, $621,206.38.

This does not tell how much has been spent altogether and I can see no good reason why there should be an unsettled account in the old country from February 28 to the present time. The minister ought be able to give us the expenditure in the old country, in the United States and in Canada up to date.

Mr. OLIVER. As I have said the increase is partly accounted for by increased ex-

penditure occasioned by the increased flow of immigrants, and partly by reason of part of the expenditure of last year being carried over to this year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Tell us how much has been carried over.

Mr. OLIVER. I am making the general statement. I can give a particularized statement of the expenditure.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think it would be well to let this item stand until the hon. minister can get the full information. I would also like to know whether the department have largely increased their staff ? if they have, what was their reason for doing so, where it is increased, and what the duties of the additional officers are ?

Mr. OLIVER. Three new agencies have been opened in the United States—at Syracuse, New York ; at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Boston. There has also been an increase of effort in Great Britain. There has been no increase on the continent. I am able to give particulars of the disposition that has been made of the vote in the main estimates, and also of the disposition proposed to be made of the amount asked for to-night, if the House would care to have them.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. We would like to have them.

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditures that have been made out of the sums voted last session for the year ending the 30th of June, 1905, are as follows :—Contingencies in Canada generally, including salaries and expenses of Messrs. Hillyard, Heboe, Johnston, Charlebois, White, Ross and Ward, and expenses of Messrs. Smart, Scott, Speers, &c., $8,850.69 ; contingencies and general expenses of United States agencies, including salaries of temporary agencies, $40,-384.27; King's Printer's accounts, $1,531.72; telegrams, freight and express charges, $2,-980.58 ; salaries of extra clerks, head office, $4,847.55; medical services and expenses, including salaries and expenses of doctors, not including detention hospital, $5,217.15 ; grants to detention hospitals at Halifax, Quebec and St. John, services, supplies, &c., $7,643.16 ; grants to hospitals, $2,301.12 ; commissions on settlers from the United States, $3,399.25 ; seaport expenses, Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal, $5,-135.59 ; uniforms, seaport agencies, head office, $1,639.14 ; postage, $4,235.79 ; Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, $8,000 ; Quebec and Lake St. John Repatriation and Colonization Society, $3,000 ; La Société de Repatriation et Colonization de Québec, $1,-200 ; Immigration Association of Western Canada, $2,500 ; Ottawa Valley Immigration Aid Society, $750 ; motor van, $1,250 ; miscellaneous expenses, $4,158.75.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Who uses the automobile ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. That is for the purpose of bringing the exhibits of Canadian farm products into the agricultural parts of the old country, which it is difficult to reach by railway. It is an automobile of high horse-power, upon which is constructed a van containing specimens of the agricultural products of the west, and it is managed by two men, who run it from village to village and give exhibitions. Commissioner Smith's expenses, which are for the purpose of placing immigrants, as distinguished from the expenditure for inducing immigrants to come, amount to $86,873.54 ; contingencies and general expenses of agencies in Great Britain and Ireland and on the continent, $36,605.48 ; British bonuses, as estimated by Mr. Preston, $201.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is meant by these ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are bonuses paid to the steamship agencies to induce them to direct immigration to Canada. The Women's National Immigration Society, $500 ; Girl's Home of Welcome, $500 ; tents for Barr colonists, balance of account, $18,-900.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Can the minister tell us what the tents cost altogether ?

Mr. OLIVER. About $32,000 altogether.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Where were these tents obtained ?

Mr. OLIVER. From the Militia Department.

Mr. BARR. Were they obtained by tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. They were taken over from the Militia Department.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. These were not new tents, and surely you do not pay full price for old tents almost useless.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Barr colonists claim that the tents were absolutely useless. What prices were paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. The price was about $25 each for Bell tents, about 12 feet in diameter. They had been in use by the Militia Department. The colony came out very early in the season, and it was absolutely necessary they should be provided with shelter in some way. It was impossible to procure such a large number of tents from any other source. It was a matter of urgency, the tents were procured and had to be paid for.

Mr. BARR. Were they just tents that were abandoned by the Militia Department ?

Mr. OLIVER. They were tents in use by that department.

Mr. BARR. Had the Militia Department to purchase new tents ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. They were used by the Immigration Department, and those

still useful are available for us. Those not in use are stored in Winnipeg.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the hon. gentleman really know how many of them are stored or what became of these tents ? Let us have the whole story ? Let the minister himself find out what the tents cost and at what prices, what other firms would tender for the making of them, how many were used by the Barr colonists, and where they are now.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentleman requests that information, I must provide it. But I do not think it has any material bearing on the case. It was urgent that these people should be provided with shelter, and whether the price was high or low was a secondary consideration. The immigrants could not be left to suffer.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government had in their possession all these tents and all they had to do was to borrow them from the Militia Department and they could be returned when no longer required. There was no necessity why the immigrants should suffer so long as the government had a large quantity stored up and there was no need to replace them at a price far above what they could be purchased for at public tender.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many immigrants came out in that Barr colony ?

Mr. OLIVER As the Barr colony came out two years ago, I presume the information has already been before the House, but I can get it again if necessary.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many immigrants are now being detained at Montreal ? I understand that a large number are detained there and are to be deported. Has the minister any information about that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not heard about it but can get information.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I suppose this money is about expended, and I would be willing to let this go through on the understanding that we will have a perfect right to discuss these things and have the officials of the Immigration Department appear before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. Comparatively little has been done before that committee this year for several reasons, and we ought to have an investigation before the main estimates are passed for the coming year. I know something of the history of the hon. minister in the past and his views with reference to immigration and I trust we are entering upon a different era in that respect. I think that the amount we are spending this year, something like a million dollars, is altogether out of proportion to the work being done, and some two years ago the hon. minister was of the same opinion. Now that he occupies a position where he can control to a large extent this department, I trust he will not call on us to spend nearly a million dollars for immigration next year. Such an expenditure is altogether unnecessary. Our country is becoming tolerably well known, and while I would not be willing to abandon the field, I think our expenditure should be kept within reasonable bounds, more especially as our neighbours are not spending a dollar on immigration except for the purpose of keeping undesirable immigrants out of their country. I am afraid, from information I have, that if we continue our course, we shall have in the near future to take similar precautions. We do not only require immigrants to be carefully examined on this side, but they ought to be examined before being allowed to go on board ship. From what I have read in the American press, the American vessels are frequently loaded with the best immigrants—those who would pass an examination—and the undesirable ones are put on board ship for Canada. That accounts for the few the Americans have to reject at their ports and for the large number they reject when they come to Canada. With this understanding I should be quite willing to let the item go through because I know we need the money ; but before the main estimates go through for the coming year, we ought to have a full investigation before the committee, and the minister should give us a full account of all he intends to do with the money as well as some explanation of what has passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to do so. My desire is to give the House the fullest possible information. And I may say that the information in my hands is pretty full, but, of course, these questions can be discussed to better advantage before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization than in the House. So, I can promise the hon. member (Mr. Uriah Wilson) that, whatever may be the result in the Committee of the Whole he certainly shall have the fullest opportunity before the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization to discuss all matters of policy and administration in regard to immigration.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is matters of detail that we want in that committee, and the permanent officers of the department ought to be in better position to give these details than the minister. And we want these men before the committee.

Mr. OLIVER. I will guarantee that they will furnish all the details. I have many details here which I shall be glad to give.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister a comparative statement showing the number of immigrants coming in month by month this year and last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have the record of these coming year by year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister the number coming in since the opening of navigation ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I have not that information here. The hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) suggested that the number arriving in the first ten months of this year was not as large in proportion as the number arriving last year. The point I wished to make was that it is in the remaining months of the year that we expect the large immigration.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What does the minister estimate the immigration to be from the 30th of April to the 30th of June ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the figures that the hon. member (Mr. Uriah Wilson) has and those that I have will enable us to arrive at it What do the figures he has show ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. They show the number arriving up to 30th April—ocean ports 66,880 ; United States, 31,969 ; total, 99,849.

Mr. OLIVER. My estimate of the whole was 148,261.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What I wanted was the estimate for the two months from 30th April to 30th June.

Mr. OLIVER. It is 49,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is an enormous estimate, is it not ?

Mr. OLIVER. These are the months of large immigration. The immigration movement in winter, both from Europe and the United States, is small. I am not altogether familiar with the working of the department, but I am satisfied that the great bulk of our immigration is in the months of spring and early summer.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like the minister to instruct his officers to give the number of immigrants for the last three weeks, that is, from April 30th to May 21st. Then, there will only be five or six weeks of the year to come and we should be able to form a better idea of the total immigration and judge what the results of this increased expenditure has been.

Mr. BARR. It seems to me we cannot impress upon the new minister too strongly the importance of being careful about the immigrants admitted to this country, for it is well known that the new comers may prove a curse rather than a blessing. We have to face the fact that the charitable institutions from one end of the Dominion to the other complain that a number of the immigrants brought into Canada have become a burden upon them. I can scarcely understand how it is that we have to deport such a large number if there is a careful medical examination made before the immigrants leave the ports whence they come. Last year we had an immigration of 134,000 adults and 17,000 children under 12 years of age. We paid for medical servince over $54,000. Yet, we find that a large number of these immigrants are suffering from diseases which it makes it necessary to deport them. So far as the instructions given by the minister are concerned, they seem to be very good, but those instructions can hardly be carried out or the results would be better. It must be that many of the agents, anxious to swell the number work in many who are not desirable immigrants for this country.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that there has been for several weeks, a considerable number of immigrants at Prescott, Ontario, who are seeking their way into the United States. But they are objected to by the United States officers. I would not expect the minister to be able to answer questions on that point at once, but I will call his attention to it so that at a future sitting he may be able to make a statement with regard to these immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. I will make a note of the matter and will inquire into it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the minister stated that a considerable amount of money was taken out of the estimate for the year 1904-5 to pay accounts carried over from the year 1903-4. I have been wondering if the minister was in error on that point, for it seems to me an extraordinary proceeding. Will the hon. minister inform me whether that is what he intended to say or not ? Was a portion of the estimate of the current year used to pay balances carried over from the previous year, and, if so, how much ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able at the moment to give the amount—in fact it is rather difficult to give. It is, I believe, a fact that there were accounts which, had they been properly put in and certified, and had the money been available, would have been paid out of the previous year's appropriation, but which were not paid until the current year. I do not know that that is a very extraordinary condition of affairs. I am afraid that this government or possibly every government does not square up its accounts at the end of each year. In fact I have very good reason to believe that it is not the custom of governments to be so very prompt in the payment of their accounts as to do that, and therefore, I say that there have been payments made out of the sums voted for expenditures this year to pay accounts that properly might very well have been paid the year before.

Mr. HENDERSON. I regret very much to hear the minister say that it is becoming the practice of the government to use money voted for a special purpose and ap-

ply it to another purpose. I am beginning to wonder whether parliament has any control over the expenditure of this country or not. It seems to me that we go through a mere form in voting estimates. We vote money for a specific purpose and then the members of the government—because the minister tells us that this is getting to be the practice of the government—turn around and use the money we vote for a specific purpose, for another purpose for which parliament never intended it. I do not know how to characterize that kind of procedure ; it is certainly highly improper ; shall I say it is dishonest ? What right has any minister to take the money which this parliament votes for any specific purpose and apply it to another purpose ? What control have we over the expenditure of this country if this kind of practice is to be continued ? I warn the Minister of the Interior that such a thing had better not occur during his regime if I am in this House because I shall enter a very strong protest and I believe the country will endorse me in every statement I make with regard to that. If there is one thing more than another the country will demand it is that those who are at the head of the departments, shall use the money voted by parliament for the purposes for which it is voted and that they shall not apply it to any other purpose. Is it any wonder that our expenditure is going up by leaps and bounds ? We have no control over it. We voted a large sum for immigration in 1903-4, sufficient to meet all the purposes ; we voted first a large sum in the main estimates, and then the minister came down with a supplementary estimate for sufficient to meet everything up to the end of the year. That money was cheerfully voted by parliament. Where was the necessity for taking money out of the vote for next year ? What became of the balance ? What was the authority ? What became of the money ? Was it used for some private purpose ? Was it used for some purpose unknown to this parliament ? Certainly it was used improperly if it was not available. The minister confesses it was not available. He says it was necessary to take money from the vote of 1904-5 in order to meet the obligations of 1903-4. If that is the case, the minister has done something else with the money, applied it to some purpose for which parliament never intended it and this procedure certainly cannot go on. What becomes of all the safeguards that we have on the treasury of this country ? We read away back in 1875 that the Prime Minister of that day lay on the treasury with a gun ; he had to sleep on it. Would to God we had a man to-day that would lie on the treasury box and protect it.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it not enough that they are sleeping on the treasury benches ?

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. You could not find it the other night.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member says that we do not know where to find it. I am rather afraid there is a good deal of the vote which the Minister of the Interior obtained in 1903 which is some place where neither the member for Cape Breton nor myself can locate it.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I know.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. member says he knows. He may have a share in it ; I am not going to doubt his word, certainly he cannot give an explanation of it. The Minister of the Interior is unable to give an explanation because he told us plainly that a portion of the vote of 1904-5 had to be used to meet the expenditure of 1903-4 although that expenditure in 1903-4 was fully provided for in the main and supplementary estimates. Therefore there should have been no demand made on the vote of 1904-5. I would like the Minister of the Interior to revise his statement and then when this comes before the committee again I hope that such an extraordinary condition of affairs as that which he has brought to the attention of the committtee to-night will not prevail. It is an expenditure of which I did not expect to hear, and if the Minister of the Interior never did anything more than what he has done to-night he will deserve a good deal from the people of this country for having exposed the manner in which the moneys of this country have been misappropriated in the past. I hope and trust the minister will take warning and that no such administration of the finances of this country will occur during his regime. Let me ask the minister another question. He is asking $300,000 of a supplementary estimate to meet the balance of the expenditure of the current year. I trust that is sufficient to pay everything up to the first of July. Is that the minister's intention ? That is the intention ? Now then, there should be nothing carried over, there shall be no balance carried over from 1904-5 to 1905-6 because parliament when it votes the $300,000 will have voted enough to meet every expenditure in connection with immigration up to the end of the year 1904-5. How much of this $300,000 has been spent already ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it is impossible to answer off-hand just now how much of this $300,000 has been spent. I was proceeding to give the House information as to how the main estimates of last year had been disposed of, and I can give the House the estimate of how it is proposed to dispose of the $300,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps I can relieve the minister. I am quite aware that in the short time he has been in the department he has not had an opportunity of fam-

iliarizing himself with the affairs of the department. We are prepared to make all allowances for that. May I ask if one half of this $300,000 has been spent? Can he give an approximate estimate of the amount that has already been spent?

Mr. OLIVER. The position is that the money has not been spent but of course expenditure has been incurred, that is a portion of the expenditure has been incurred. It would require, as my hon. friend must be very well aware, a very close accounting, to tell just how much expenditure has been incurred up to the present time, and certainly I do not know that it is necessary for the purpose of the House and I am not prepared to give the information at the moment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to say that it is absolutely necessary we should know because if a dollar of this $300,000 has been spent it has been spent without the authority of parliament and no minister of the Crown had the right to spend one dollar in that way. If I believed to-night that the government had spent a considerable portion of that $300,000 without the consent of parliament I would stay here to a very late hour to insist that the vote be reduced by the amount that has already been expended. I have warned the Minister of the Interior in bygone years—I think the hon. gentleman will find it on record last year—when we were asked to recoup the government $150,000 for money that had been spent by the minister without the consent of parliament.

I made the statement then that if the same thing occurred again, I would move that the item be struck out of the estimates. That is the duty of the opposition to-night. If we could ascertain how much of this $300,000 has been expended, how much liability has been incurred on account of it, it is our duty as a loyal opposition to stay here and to insist that the item be reduced by that amount. We must insist that the government spend no money until they have received the approbation of parliament for so doing. It is all very well for a minister to sit in his place and because he is a minister of the Crown say that he is going to use the people's money like ducks and drakes spending it here and there for any purpose that he sees fit. He has not the right to spend one dollar of it until he has come down to parliament and obtained parliament's consent. It is parliament who shall say how much we shall spend on immigration; not the minister. If parliament says we shall only expend $700,000 a year on immigration, the minister has no right to expend $701,000 nor any amount of money over the $700,000. He has no right to incur any liability beyond te amount appropriated by parliament. He must make his calculation according to the amount of money that has been voted unless he comes down and brings in a supplementary estimate. I apprehend that the hon. gentleman is asking for a supplementary vote not only to cover what is required for completing the expenses to be incurred from the present time until the first of July, but I fear very much that he is asking for that very large appropriation to cover something that has been already expended, expended without the approval of parliament, expended illegally, illegitimately, and may I say, if I can use a stronger word, expended fraudulently, because it is nothing less than that. Ministers have not the right to spend money without the consent of parliament. I hope that when he comes before the committee again the hon. minister will be able to give a complete statement of this matter and I trust that there will only be a very small portion of this $300,000 already expended. If it is only a small amount we may not complain so much about it, although we have the right to complan if there is $1,000. What I desire to impress upon the hon. minister at the commencement of his career is that he must not follow the course of his predecessors. We know that it was the practice of the previous minister, year after year, to spend the peoples money without regard to the wishes of parliament. We never can control expenditure if ministers of the Crown are going to expend money before we vote it and without the concurrence or approval of the peoples representatives and I am quite sure that the hon. Minister of the Interior at the inception of his career will desire to do his work as faithfully and as honestly as possible and that he desires to stand in good faith with the House. In order to do that I must insist that he will not presume to expend $1,000 on account of immigration or of any other branch of his department until the concurrence of parliament has been received.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the hon. Minister of the Interior is deserving of very great credit for the exposure he has made of the practices of the government in the past. I do not know whether the slap he took at the old ministers was inended or not, but I think it has given to the committee a good insight into the conduct of these hon. gentlemen. I believe it is now up to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) the leader of the House at the present time, to give some explanation of the conduct of the government in allowing these over expenditures to go on in the various departments of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to give all the information that can be given to hon. gentlemen opposite and I certainly wish to have their good-will in the performance of such duties as have been laid upon me. I think that perhaps the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has been scarcely fair in the construction he has placed upon what

I have said. I would not say at all that he was inaccurate, but, as a matter of fact, any danger that he might apprehend of fraud or trespassing upon the public right in the matter of taking money that has no been voted is, I take it for granted, very efficiently guarded against by that watchdog of the treasury, the Auditor General. There is no danger of money being taken except under an appropriation as long as that gentleman remains in office and I presume as long as any successor, if he is charged with the same duty and placed in the same control, remains in office.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose the liability is incurred before it comes before the Auditor General and then suppose parliament should refuse to ratify any unwarranted action of the minister, where would the Auditor General be and where would the minister be ?

Mr. OLIVER. The amounts which were incurred in the previous year and which the government honestly owed were placed in the estimates for the current year. They were not paid without being placed in the estimates. They have been placed in the estimates for the current year and are paid in due and legal course after parliament has voted the money. I mentioned the question of the tents supplied to the Barr colony as one of these cases. This was an account incurred two years ago and it is only being paid this year, but it is being paid, not outside of the authority of parliament, but with the authority of parliament and in due and legal form. Such is the case in regard to all these items.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why was the $18,000, which is only being paid this year for these tents, not paid last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable to answer that question at the present time, but if the hon. gentleman insists I will, of course, provide an answer. The point I make is that we are this year paying for an expenditure incurred two years ago and that it is being paid for not outside the authority of parliament, not by the authority of the minister, but by the authority of parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has not the debt been incurred without the authority of parliament?

Mr. OLIVER. It has.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Very well, that is the point we are complaining of.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to say on that point further that I am not altogether in agreement with the position of the hon. member for Halton. That hon. gentleman has laid it down as a cardinal principle that not a dollar shall be taken even for immigration purposes without the authority of parliament.

Mr. TAYLOR. Or by Governor General's warrants.

Mr. OLIVER. Or by Governor General's warrants. The facts in regard to immigration are as I stated in the remarks I made in presenting the vote. When we undertake the work of inducing people to come to this country and to settle if our efforts are successful beyond the means we have provided we must either render that expenditure we have already made useless, or not provide at a critical time for immigration that has come, or we must provide for that immigration when it does come. There is no person who wishes well to the cause of immigration in this country who would say that in the case of these Barr colonists they should have been left to shiver and die on the prairie in the spring snow storms for the lack of tents until parliament had been asked to vote the money for these tents.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was not parliament in session ?

Mr. OLIVER. Our experience is that it sometimes takes a good while to get a vote from parliament, and a woman or child will freeze to death in one night. I do not think we could afford to take chances in such a case. So long as I occupy the position I do, I will have no hesitation in asking the House to condone the offience, if it is an offence, of providing for the urgent needs of immigrants if they should come here in numbers beyond the provision we have made for them. This is more than a question of dollars and cents ; it is a matter of life and death ; it will not wait. We cannot afford to wait, and I have no doubt that both the House and the country will sustain the minister who takes immediate action under such circumstances.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This House was in session when the Barr colonists came here and when Mr. Barr was in Ottawa and proceeded to his colony. It was known for at least two months before Mr. Barr came that he was coming. Where was the foresight of this government that it did not get a vote of money to provide for these people, if provision was necessary ? There was no question of life or death about it. I want the minister to find out from his department how many tents were used, how many of these people were housed in tents, and how many have lived in these tents ? If he does not find out, we will insist on his doing so.

Mr. OLIVER. I will have the information supplied, in so far as it can be secured. That is a question of detail, but I am speaking of the general principle, that if we are to conduct an efficient immigration policy we must deal with the cases as they arise. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) used very strong language with regard to over-expenditure, but his language is

quite as applicable to the former Conservative government as to this government. As far back as 1892-3 the sum appropriated by parliament was not sufficient to meet the expenditure for several fiscal years. In that year and the two succeeding fiscal years the sum of $150,000 was voted. In 1892-3 the appropriation of $150,000 was, however, not sufficient to pay all the liabilities incurred in that year, and the sum of $31,401.09 was carried forward and paid out of the next year's vote. During the fiscal year 1893-4 the sum of $149,998.80 was expended, practically wiping out the appropriation of $150,000, but there was not sufficient to pay all the liabilities contracted in that year, and it was necessary to carry over $81,874.26 to the following fiscal year; that sum was paid out of the vote of 1894-5. During 1894-5 the whole of the appropriation of $150,000 was expended, with the exception of a few dollars, such expenditure including the $81,874.26 which was contracted in the previous year and had to be paid out of the vote for 1894-5. About this time the immigration business had practically ceased, and for the year 1895-6 only $84,915 was voted for general immigration expenses.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister has been endeavouring to get sympathy for the government by speaking of the necessities of the women and children of the Barr colony, but my recollection is that these tents were required in the spring of the year; parliament was in session; there were supplementary estimates and further supplementary estimates, and the government had every opportunity to get a vote from parliament. The appeal the minister has made does not justify the government in what they did, because there was abundant opportunity to have the expenditure approved by parliament. I am aware that when the Conservatives were in power it was almost impossible to extract from the House of Commons even a small vote like $150,000 for immigration purposes, and it is no wonder that immigration in these days was not as large as we would have wished it to be. I well remember that on one occasion when the Conservative government asked for an immigration vote of $120,000, one of the Liberal opposition moved that it be reduced by $50,000. The opposition of that day grudgingly voted even that mere pittance for immigration. It is quite possible that under such circumstances the minister would expend a little more than he was warranted in doing. But the point I wish to emphasize is this: No matter what the practice has been in the past, parliament must control the expenditure of this country, and I do not think the language I have used to-night is one whit too strong. I emphasize my statement, and I hold it out as a warning to the Minister of the Interior that nothing of that kind will be permitted in the future without protest. Who has the right to say to what extent the immigration policy of this country will be pursued? Is it the minister of his own will? What kind of a king is he? No minister has the right to set up his own individual opinion against the opinion of 214 men in the House of Commons. Surely the minister will concede that he was in error when he made his statement, and that in future he must in every case limit himself to the amount voted by parliament.

I trust that the minister will remember, when he comes to deal with immigration during the coming year, exactly how much money parliament has authorized him to expend for that purpose, and will carry on the service in accordance with that amount; and that if he thinks he could bring in another 50,000 immigrants by means of the expenditure of $300,000 more, he will not expend that without the consent of parliament. No minister would be justified in pursuing any such policy. Parliament has a right to control the government's immigration policy, and does control it by the amount of money it votes for that purpose. I want the minister for the coming year simply to cut his garment in accordance with the amount of cloth this parliament provides him with—not to expend $1,000 more on immigration than parliament says ought to be spent—until such time, at any rate, as he comes down to parliament again and asks for a supplementary vote, not after he has spent the money, but before he has spent it. There is no doubt that this is the true constitutional spirit of spending public money. If ministers are going to spend money right and left, according to their own will, what is the use of parliament? We might as well adopt the estimates as a whole and say nothing about them; we might as well vote them in a lump sum, and go home, if that is all the control parliament is going to have over the expenditure. I trust that the minister will start out in the coming year with a correct idea of what his duty and privileges are in this respect, and will not go back two years or five years to copy what some previous Minister of the Interior has done, and expect that the action of any previous minister will be accepted as a justification for him. I think we would not discharge our duty on this side of the House were we to permit a procedure of that kind to go on year after year without raising our voices against it. But I apprehend that after the expiration of another year we shall not be called on to speak so forcibly on this matter, because I believe the minister will realize what his duty is, and will give effect to that.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like the minister to bring down a statement of the over-expenditure for 1903-4 and the items for which the expenditure was incurred. The statement given to me of Mr. Preston's expenditure only extended to the 28th of February, 1905.

I would like to know how he gets his money—what authority he has for drawing it, and how he handles the financial part of his business in England ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give that just now. I will bring it down.

Mr. AMES. There is one phase of this question upon which I desire some information from the hon. Minister of the Interior. I would like to know whether at the present time any efforts are being made, either by advertisement, literature or otherwise, to induce immigrants to come from the southern portions of Europe to this country ? We all feel that we cannot have too many immigrants of a desirable class, and yet that it is very easy for us to have too many of an undesirable class. I quote from the 'Daily Telegraph' of Quebec of Friday the following :

> The Donaldson liner steamship 'Athenian' arrived in port yesterday afternoon from Glasgow. She had on board fifty foreigners who will be deported on instructions from the government officials. On arrival at Quebec the vessel was inspected, and it was found that a large number of the steerage passengers were afflicted with trachoma. A number of those slightly attacked were taken to the house of detention at Quebec for treatment, while the remainder came on to Montreal. Dr. Laberge, city health officer, and a number of his men met the boat on its arrival, and after his inspection he refused to allow any of the affected ones to come ashore.

This is only one instance. We are constantly receiving a class of immigrants who are affected with loathsome diseases, and we wish to know whether any of the money of the Dominion is being expended to attract this undesirable class ?

Mr. OLIVER. The department is not expending any money and keeps no agencies in any part of the continent of Europe except in France and Belgium. There are two or three agents in France and one in Belgium. They have, however, an arrangement with a steamship organization which operates, not from a southern port, but from Hamburg.

Mr. AMES. Is there any restriction as to the class of immigrants that steamship companies shall induce to come to this country ? Is the department supplying steamship companies with literature, advertisements or other matter, in order to direct immigrants, to this country, who are not desirable ? Is there any stipulation in the arrangement with the steamship company which binds the company to make at least an effort to recruit these immigrants from sections of Europe which can furnish us wih desirable people or is that left entirely in the hands of the company ?

Mr. OLIVER. The arrangement with the steamship organization is that only agriculturists are to be brought out. There is no intention to encourage the coming of people from the continent of Europe who are not agriculturists as well as desirable from a physical point of view. The fact that stringent medical examinations are made and that so many are deported, who are found to be suffering from disease, is evidence of the intention of the department. I presume that the reason there have been so many cases of diseased immigrants during recent months is that probably the same attention was not paid in past years, but when it is thoroughly known that this strict supervision is exercised we will have fewer instances of diseased people coming to the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. The same complaint has been made the last two or three years ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Are these shipped back and dumped in Scotland ?

Mr. OLIVER. If they sail from Scotland they are sent back there. If they come from Hamburg, they are sent back to that port.

Mr. AMES. While admitting the desirability of securing agricultural immigrants, I do not think the fact that a man is an agriculturist is necessarily proof that he is desirable. It seems to me that the experience of the department should have shown it that there are some sections from which it is not desirable to bring immigrants, and the Hamburg company should be prevented from exploiting those portions of the continent. When people are found to be suffering from a loathsome disease, which is proof that they are of filthy habits, the department should notify the steamship company that we do not wish any efforts made to recruit immigrants from certain parts of Europe. Experience shows plainly where these people come from, and the steamship companies should be warned not to recruit people from those sections.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister says that the immigrants from the continent are to be taken from the farms, does that apply to the British Islands also ? Because a number of our best farmers in the Northwest to-day were not brought up in the rural districts. I know of one who came out from London and who never saw the green country until he left England. He was a pastry cook at home and he is now one of the best farmers in Manitoba. One of the best farmers in the Prince Albert district used to be a watch-maker in Paris. Another was a clerk in a shop in Paris. The trouble with these continental farmers is that they have to unlearn a lot and you have to instill into them the Northwest system of farming. What you want is men of energy, with a clean heart and person and free from disease, and I care not whether men of that kind come from

the city or the country, they will make a success.

Mr. HERRON. We are getting a large portion of our immigration from some countries of Europe which do not furnish us with desirable settlers. Can it be possible that the government have no supervision over immigrants before they leave their native country? There is a general impression where I live that we have not been getting the right class of immigrants into the Northwest. A large percentage of the immigration is not of a desirable class, and our people would rather do without settlers than have settlements of that kind. Such people cost the country a lot of money not only to bring them here, but to assist them from time to time after they get here.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now that we have got all the information the minister has been able to give us, we might allow the item to pass on the understanding that on the main estimates the information asked for to-night will be brought down and full explanation given.

Mr. OLIVER. I have had all the questions noted down and will be able to give the House the information asked for when the main estimates are up.

Some resolutions reported.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Unless there be some arrangement to proceed with the Autonomy Bill we shall take up the estimates; we will continue at the point where we leave off to-night, and the Minister of the Interior will have his estimates up for consideration.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You have not withdrawn the Autonomy Bill, then?

Mr. FIELDING. No. Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) withdrawn his candidate for London?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No; he will win.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.30 a.m.—Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 23, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to place before the House an answer to an inquiry made yesterday by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in regard to a matter which appeared in the Winnipeg 'Tribune.' I will read the memorandum as handed to me by Mr. Côté, an officer of the department:

In compliance with your verbal request, I have the honour to submit for your information the following report respecting the recent issue of scrip to half-breeds, authorized by Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, as amended by Order in Council of the 17th December last, copies of which are attached hereto.

Under the Order in Council of the 2nd March, 1900, authorizing an issue of scrip to half-breeds who were born in the Northwest Territories between the 15th July, 1870, and the end of the year 1885, the claims of such half-breeds were not prejudiced on account of their residence outside of the Northwest Territories, provided their parents had been permanent residents of the Northwest Territories at the time of their birth, but under clause 6 of the regulations subsequently established and approved by Order in Council of the 6th June, 1901 (copy herewith), half-breeds who had left Canada and taken up their residence on Indian reservations in the United States and participated in the benefits of Indian life thereon, as well as all half-breed children admitted to the United States Indian schools, were excluded from participating in the grant of scrip.

On the 13th August, 1904, an Order in Council was passed, which was published for the fourth consecutive week in the 'Canada Gazette' of the 5th November, 1904 (copy herewith), in which it was stated that it was quite clear, in the opinion of the minister, that such removal did not constitute any valid reason for the refusal to recognize property rights fully matured and vested before such removal took place, and that this principle had been clearly and very properly laid down in former cases, where the right to scrip had been in question. Such Order in Council provided that the claims preferred before Mr. McKenna and excluded under the said clause 6, might be investigated by any officer or officers of the Department of the Interior, to be named by the Minister of the Interior, and that such officer or officers should have, in reference to such claims, all the authority formerly exercised by Mr. McKenna under the various Orders in Council relating to his duties or commission for the investigation of claims to half-breed scrip.

The undersigned, who was chairman of the half-breed commission for the Saskatchewan district in 1900, and a joint commissioner in 1887 with Mr. Roger Goulet, to investigate Northwest half-breed claims, was nominated by the Minister of the Interior on the 3rd October, 1904, to investigate the claims in question, and the following number of claims, in support of which the usual evidence had previously been submitted before Mr. McKenna, were accordingly reconsidered and disposed of as follows:

Claims allowed..	122
Disallowance confirmed..	108
Reserved for further evidence.. ..	26
	256

The following number of claims of persons whose names appeared on Mr. McKenna's list as having been rejected by him upon preliminary investigation on account of the claimants'

residence in the United States, and in support of which evidence was subsequently filed in the department, have also been investigated :

Allowed..	14
Disallowed..	62
Reserved for further evidence.. ..	43
	119

It will, therefore, be observed that the total number of claims investigated under the Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, is 365, of which 126 were allowed, 170 disallowed and 69 reserved for further evidence.

Re Delivery of Scrip.

It has always been an invariable rule of the department to refuse to recognize assignments or powers of attorney as authority for the delivery of half-breed land scrip, and the regulations already referred to of the 6th June, 1901, specifically provided 'that in cases in which a half-breed asks for land scrip, the commissioner has no authority to accept or act upon any assignment or power of attorney.'

It has also been the practice where the scrip certificate was not delivered to the claimant personally by the commissioner, to send his scrip by registered mail to his own address in care of any person designated therein, upon a written request being filed in the department over the claimant's own signature, attested by two witnesses, who must certify as to the identification of the claim, and one of the witnesses must also make an affidavit as to the execution of such order. The scrip, which was issued in satisfaction of the claims referred to, was forwarded on orders which were prepared in the manner above indicated.

Re Location of the Scrip Issued under the Order in Council of 13th August, 1904.

By departmental letter of the 10th March last, addressed to all agents of Dominion lands, the agents were advised that it had been decided to allow scrip, granted the half-breed residents of the United States under the said Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, to be located in the name of the grantee thereof by the holder of such scrip without requiring the grantee to appear personally at the land agency to make his entry. It was also pointed out that the applicant for location should make the application over his own signature on behalf of the person named on the scrip note, and in all respects comply with the rules and regulations governing the location of half-breed land scrip, and that, as heretofore, assignments of these locations executetd by the half-breeds prior to the date on which the land was entered for in the manner above indicated, would not be recognized by the department.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the House to a few remarks I made last night when the House was in committee on a divorce Bill. When I spoke I had in mind another case which happened a long time ago, and my remarks had no application to the Bill which was under discussion. I say this as a matter of justice to the parties concerned in the present case. If I voted as I did, it was on account of another case.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Dominion Lands—chargeable to capital—further amount appropriation for surveys, examination of surveys, returns printing of plans, &c, $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was the original estimate ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). It was $750,000 for the year 1904-5.

Mr. FOSTER. For what is this additional estimate required ?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason for the additional sum being asked, is that the estimate provided for the subdivision of 400 townships, but, as a matter of fact, 525 townships have been subdivided.

Mr. FOSTER. This increase is to cover that proportional increase in the number of townships nothing else ?

Mr. OLIVER. Nothing else.

Mr. BERGERON. So much per township ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, $950 each.

Mr. HENDERSON. In what part of the territory was the additional work done ? Was it in the section where settlement is rapidly going in, or away up in Athabaska, where, possibly, there is very little settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. This is for the work of subdivision, and no subdivision has been done in Athabaska. Some has been done in the northerly and westerly parts of the organized territories where settlement has been going in on account of railway construction.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many men are employed in this work of survey ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the information with exactness, but between fifty and sixty parties were out.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many men to a party ?

Mr. OLIVER. From eight to thirteen men according to the work to be done. A party working in a wooded country needs more men than a party working on the clear prairie.

Dominion Lands—chargeable to income—further amount required for contingencies, &c, $12,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the main vote for contingencies ?

Mr. OLIVER. It was $37,100.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister will see that this is a very large increase for a supplementary vote—about 33 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER. The contingencies vote covers the requirements for homestead inspection, timber inspection, the expenses of Dominion lands and Crown timber agencies ; and, owing to the fact that the settlers who went in three or four years ago are now entitled to their patents, it has been necessary to increase the number of homestead inspectors in order that there may not be undue delay in giving the settlers their patents. That is one cause of the increase.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it account for the whole increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but it is the principal cause.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might give the main items of the increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. Seven new homestead inspectors have been appointed. Besides, for the same reason—the increased number of patents—the running expenses of the land offices have been to some extent increased. But the main increase is due to the large number of homestead inspectors.

Mr. BLAIN. There has been a good deal of talk about these homestead inspectors in the last few years. Since my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has taken charge of the department we expect a good many reforms, and I am sure we shall not be disappointed. May I ask what policy the department has with regard to the homestead inspectors—whether they are to be permitted to become active politicians or not ?

Mr OLIVER. It is certainly not the policy to have them acting as active politicians, except as we hope that the satisfaction they will give the public in their work will be to the political credit of the government in power.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sure the minister (Mr. Oliver) knows the purport of the question. It has been stated, and I do not know that it has ever been denied that in the election that took place the officers of the Interior Department to a greater or less extent were made or made themselves active political workers in the campaign. I should feel like this with reference to this vote—that if the minister proposes to follow the same course that has been followed, and that in asking for the vote for new inspectors he should be asking a vote for men part of whose time is to be taken up in political work, it will take a long time for the item to pass. I do not think it is right or honest, and I do not think it is good politics in the long run. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver), from whom we expect a good deal, in this way at least, will be able to say to the committee that homestead inspectors and other officers for whom we vote money shall not be allowed to become active workers in political campaigns, that they shall be homestead inspectors, or whatever officials they are, and that they shall attend to the work assigned to them and attend to it solely. That, of course, we all admit to be the right plan and I think it is the plan which we might agree to have carried out. I would like to hear what the hon. minister's views are on that question.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not like, in consequence of any stand I would take or any admission I would make, to be thought to admit that it has been any part of the policy of the department to have their homestead inspectors act as political agents. I can assure the committee that as far as my say goes, I quite agree with my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster). To put it on the lowest ground I do not consider it good politics to have homestead inspectors or other government officials acting as active government agents. I think they can do their party as well as the country very much better service by attending to their duties and performing them in an efficient manner. I think that would reflect the most credit on the government and on the party.

Mr. LAKE. In reference to what the hon. minister has said I have a copy of the Regina 'Daily Standard' of the 14th April, at the time he was going up to contest the seat in Edmonton. There is an item in the issue of that date which says :

> Walter Scott, M.P., for this constituency, went west this morning to assist in the fight at Edmonton. He was accompanied by P. Talbot, M.P., J. G. Turriff, M.P., P. M. Bredt, assistant commissioner of immigration, and S. P. Porter, homestead inspector.

I do not know whether it is really the case that these gentlemen went up. I believe that Mr. Bredt and Mr. Porter are both exceedingly active politicians and that they were especially so during the last election. We have had some experience of them in the past if this statement is not true in this particular case.

Mr. OLIVER. This is hardly a fair subject for discussion in the committee. Mr. Scott only arrived at Edmonton, I think, the Monday evening previous to the nomination which resulted in my election by acclamation. Therefore, he did not take a very active part in the campaign. As far as the other gentlemen are concerned I never heard of their arrival at Edmonton. This is the first knowledge I have had of their ever having started for Edmonton. They certainly did not take any active part in the campaign.

Mr. LAKE. There is another question that I would like to bring up here. It is in reference to the policy of the department in regard to the Doukhobors. I asked a short time ago for the correspondence in the case of a man named Ivan Schukin, a Doukhobor, who obtained a homestead entry for the northwest quarter of section 23, township 31, range 6 west of the 2nd meridian,

near Devil's lake in the Yorkton district He fulfilled his duties, took the oath of naturalization, became a British subject and was then recommended for his patent. About the time he should have been given his patent, Mr. Peter Verigin interfered and called attention to the fact that the homestead for which Schukin was asking for a patent had on it a Doukhobor village. After a considerable amount of correspondence between Mr. Verigin and the department, Schukin's entry was cancelled and he was given another entry elsewhere. It would be a very great hardship to any man after fulfilling his duties and becoming entitled to his patent to have it refused him and to be sent off some distance away to start his work afresh in a new part of the country altogether.

Mr. OLIVER. Is this gentleman a Doukhobor?

Mr. LAKE. Schukin is a Doukhobor. He with several others was persuaded by the late Mr. Crearer to make a homestead entry. Of course, it was very much in the interest of these people and the Northwest generally that they should make entries and own their own lands.. Schukin and about thirty others made their entries and cut themselves loose from the community system. When Mr. Verigin came he apparently insisted upon the establishment of the community system with the result that this became a regular part of their organization and pressure is being put upon a few Doukhobors who were beginning to make individual entries for land to force them back into the community system.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able just at this time to declare any distinct policy in regard to the administration of that particular part of the department, but I will say that I would not think it part of the duty of the government or of the department to assist in any way in enforcing the peculiar beliefs in regard to religion or social life that may be held by the Doukhobors or any other people. In regard to the case mentioned, I have no knowledge of it other than what is stated by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) but it would seem to me that whilst the person mentioned has possibly suffered a hardship it would be no less a hardship to give to him the patent for the land upon which a whole village was situated. It would seem to me from the statement of the case to be one in which there must be a hardship either to one individual or to a large number and that the department had decided that the hardship should be suffered by the one rather than the large number.

Mr. LAKE. I have a report here amongst the other papers. I did not know this opening would present itself at this moment to take the subject up and I did not get it very well prepared, but I would like to read a report from the homestead inspector of the Yorkton district in regard to this case. Perhaps it would show the hon. minister clearly what one of his officials thinks about the matter. After reporting on the land in the ordinary form and as to the value of the improvements which had been made he adds this further report :

I further report and say to my knowledge that in the fall of 1902, Mr. James Crearer, deceased, who was then immigration agent at this point, was anxious that the Doukhobors should make entries for their lands, visited these people and tried to induce them to make entries and the people did not respond as they appeared to be undecided as to what course to pursue. Mr. Crearer told Mr. Schukin that he could make entry for any quarter section in the land reserved for them, so he in good faith made entry for the above land on which he then resided. The community system did not then exist among them and everything went along all right and the others made no objection until Mr. Peter Verigin arrived in their midst and started the community system.

Mr. Schukin would not join the community so they asked him to get off the place and made it very disagreeable for him ever since and would not allow him to cultivate his homestead. I consider that it would be a hardship to turn him off as all the lands for a long distance are now entered and he would have to go a long way from his friends in order to get a homestead.

And further, the statement made by Simeon Reifen is not correct regarding the mill which he claims is on this land. It is on the S W ¼ of this section.

About half of the houses now on this land were built since Mr. Schukin obtained his entry although aware of his entry.

I understand also that ten out of the sixteen families are leaving said village in the spring to be located in other villages near their homesteads. Six families will remain for some time until their present buildings become useless which will only be a short time and they will not be disturbed by Mr. Schukin. The granary on this land was built last year although Mr. Schukin objcted to its being built. I consider him justly entitled to patent.

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) N. G. McCALLUM,
Homestead Inspector.

There is another letter from a gentleman who resides in that district, a gentleman who I think has always been a staunch supporter of the Liberal party and he takes very strong ground with reference to the Doukhobor question and as to the manner in which Mr. Peter Verigin is acting. It may be as well to have this letter placed on 'Hansard,' as I think the whole subject should be discussed and laid before the House. This gentleman writes :

Devil's Lake, Dec. 16, 1904.

Commissioner of Dominion Lands,

Dear Sir,—I take the liberty of writing you a few lines regarding the Doukhobors here. There are about thirty here that have left the company. They have got out and are working on their homesteads. They have become British subjects and are falling in line with the laws of the country.

And then we have Mr. Peter Verigin with his company. Just now they are cutting and hauling spruce logs. I don't think there will be a standing tree of any account within miles of here after this winter. They will not register births, marriages or deaths, nor yet will they become British subjects, and Peter will tell you he would like to become a British subject himself but his people would not hear of it. He is working hard to keep the company together. He tells them if they leave the company, they leave the land, for he says he owns all the land round here and they will have to move one hundred miles from here. So these men that have left the company are in doubt if they will get an entry for their land or not. I tell them they will get it and I hope you will be of the same opinion. Now, these Doukhobors that have left the company tell me that Peter Verigin was the cause of them not taking up their land when they came here. He kept writing to them not to take up land until he would get here, and when he gets here he tells them to keep to work and he would go to Yorkton and take up the land for them.

I may mention that this correspondence appears to show that a great number of entries for lands upon which these villages were situated have been cancelled and that the new entries for the men who have been deprived of the old entries have been taken up by Mr. Peter Verigin.

Of course he gets the credit of them taking up their land. One can see by the actions of those that have left the company and have fallen in line with the laws of the country that Peter Verigin is the cause of the company men not falling in line with the laws of the country. I am told that he went into the land office at Yorkton and told them that he had eighteen men dissatisfied with their homesteads and would like to change it for another. Now, this homestead that he would like to change, were homesteads of these men that had left the company, and they knew nothing of Peter Verigin trying to cancel their homesteads at that time, but they found out in time and went to Yorkton to the land office and told them that they were quite satisfied with their homesteads. There was another man here, he (Peter Verigin) went to the land office and reported that he was dead and had his place cancelled and one of his company men put on it. I know for a fact the man who Peter Verigin reported dead is going around here feeling bad about losing his place. There is another man here by the name of Eone Sugan on the northeast quarter of section 23, T. 31, R. 6, W. 2. Peter Verigin is trying hard to cancel his place.

The Eone Sugan referred to here is the man whose case I am calling attention to :

This Sugan says that he heard that Peter Verigin had written to you about it. This Eone Sugan was among the first of the Doukhobors to enter for his land. There was no company when Sugan entered for his land. Peter Verigin had not come at that time. The late Mr. Crearer, the immigration agent, was out here to see if he could get them to enter for their land, and they had a letter from Verigin at that time to not enter for their land until he got here. I was along with Mr. Crearer at the time he made an offer to any Doukhobor that would enter for his homestead the choice of any quarter at Devil lake, so Sugan said he would take the quarter he was living on. He paid his ten dollars, got his entry, has done his homestead duties. He has become a British subject. I think a man like this should not be cast to one side and a man like Verigin get the preference. Peter Verigin and his interpreter have gone into the land office and reported false statements to them. He said the grist mill was on Eone Sugan's quarter. I took the surveyor's chain and measured from the nearest point from the line to the mill. It was 3 chains, 27½ links from Eone Sugan's quarter. Peter Verigin, at the land office, said that they had quite a bit of ploughing done on it. Sugan was ploughing on his farm when a number came down to him with their teams and ploughed. They gave him ten minutes to get out of the field. He unhitched his horses and took them to the stable, and they pitched his plough into the fence. Please do the best you can for him.

Yours truly,

ROBERT BUCHANAN.

This letter is dated the 16th of Decmber, 1904. It will, I think, be found from other papers in the department that unfortunately this man's entry had already been cancelled. He had left the rest of the Doukohobors to take up land and to become a good British subject and fulfil the duties of citizenship. But apparently on the word of Mr. Peter Verigin he was deprived of his property and sent off to start life anew on another homestead. The case appears to me to be a particularly bad one. A man who becomes a British subject and tries to be a good citizen, even though a Doukhobor should be protected just the same as any other British subject.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not hitherto been aware of the facts stated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake). He has placed them before the country in a very emphatic manner and certainly the statements he made will have to be taken notice of and the action of the department will be governed by the facts discovered on investigation.

Mr. LAKE. If it is found on inquiry that the statement I have made is perfcetly well grounded, will the government undertake to compensate this man for the loss he has been put to. I do not notice anything as to that in the correspondence, but I certainly think that if he has been turned off land which he has cultivated and on which he has erected buildings he should receive the fullest compensation.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not see that it would be possible to make compensation, and I would not like to judge the case until I have heard both sides. A very grave accusation is made against this man Peter Verigin and of course we will have to hear his side before giving a decision. I would not like to make any statement now as to what will be done in the matter. It has been suggested to me that it is entirely improbable that this man's entry was made before the village was established on the lands. As every one knows, when the Doukhobors come into any section of the country the

first thing they do is to form into a village on the land so that on the face of it the probability would be that the village was on the land before this man made his entry. However, if he had an entry first I would certainly think he was entitled to it. No doubt the deparmtent took action believing it was the lesser of two evils ; an injustice to be done either to the one family or to fifteen or twenty families, and they decided perhaps to let the one man suffer.

Mr. LAKE. In reference to the question as to whether the village is on the land or not the report of Mr. McCallum says :

About half of the village houses now on this land were built since Schukin claimed his entry, although aware of the entry.

Mr. OLIVER. What about the other half ?

Mr. LAKE. I presume, although there is nothing to show it, that Mr. Schukin went on to the land with the other Doukhobors and they built the village together. That, after all, is not the point. After he and others had been established in the village, Mr. Crearer, the immigration agent, now dead, who to those people represented the power of the government, came down and asked them to make entries for their land, and according to both of these reports offered them any section they chose to enter for ; and he gave Mr. Schukin the entry for the land he occupied. I do not think the government should go back on that entry. Mr. Schukin made the entry in good faith, and since that time he has apparently resided there and performed his cultivation duties ; and if he is not allowed to retain the land it will be a great breach of faith on the part of the government, and will be likely to prevent these people leaving the community system.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, I would not like to speak of the conduct of the agent, who is now dead ; but I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that however wrong he may have been, the homesteader was certainly in the wrong in entering for the homestead, when he knew that other people were in occupation of it and had made improvements upon it, which my hon. friend knows is entirely contrary to the letter and the spirit of the Homestead Act. He entered for the homestead with the knowledge that there were other families occupying the land, whose prior rights in it were just as good as his; and although he held the homestead entry, he permitted still other people to come on that same land and build on it and occupy it. I do not think he can hold himself to be altogether the aggrieved party in the transaction. He did commit a wrong with his eyes open. He may have acted under misinformation in entering for land that was already in the occupation of other people, and he was not protecting his own interest as he ought to have done when he permitted still other people to go on and occupy and make improvements on that land.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. minister must remember that the Doukhobors were not at that time very well acquainted with our laws and customs. They were brought out in a way as wards of the government. They were put upon their land under the direction of the government officials. When the chief government official in that quarter comes to one of them and says : You can have the entry of this land, I want you people to make entries for your land ; and this man says, if you give me the entry for the land I am living on, I will make it, I do not think he did with his eyes open what he knew to be a wrong. He was told that he was at liberty to make that entry by Mr. Crearer, who at that time held a very good position under the department.

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not think the Doukhobors can make the plea that my hon. friend makes, that they did not understand the laws of the country, because, if there was one thing that was explained to them time after time, it was the homestead laws and the homestead conditions. I think I am right when I say that all these Doukhobor villages were established before any homestead entries were made. This very difficulty was foreseen, and it was suggested to the people that in making entries it would not be advisable for them to enter for the quarter sections on which the village was to be located. This man evidently had been living there for probably two or three years before he made a homestead entry at all. He knew perfectly well that this village was on this land, and I do not see how he could make the entry knowing that, because he would have to make an affidavit that there were no improvements and no people living on the land. I think the better plan if it could be managed would be for the department to allow the homesteader to retain his homestead, but to allow him the privilege of disposing of five or ten acres that may be occupied as a village, and sell it to the community. The difficulty has arisen largely in this way. At the time this homesteader made the entry, I do not suppose he had any intention of acting on his own account. These villages are all separate business communities, having no business connection with each other, the people in each village owning everything in common, and I presume that his idea in making entry for the homestead, was that it would become common property in the future ; but he has apparently changed his mind. I may say that the department did everything in their power to induce these people to make their entries at the proper time, foreseeing that there would be difficulty from delay. They did delay for a long

time, and there will be some little difficulty, but I think it is a matter that can be easily got over by the department.

Mr. LAKE. I hope this matter will not be lost sight of by the Department of the Interior. I notice a telegram here signed J. W. Greenway, Department of the Interior, to Peter Verigin, Esq., and dated the 12th of December, 1904 :

Entry Ivan Schukin Northwest twenty-three, thirty-one, six west second, cancelled, being Doukhobors village site.

That means that the entry has been cancelled. I also notice another telegram here, dated Yorkton, December 13 :

Verigin acting for Doukhobors here Saturday and yesterday. All re-entries of Doukhobors completed ; forty-three entries granted them.

The reason I call attention to this second telegram is that it seems to me undesirable that one man should make a bunch of entries in that way for these communities, especially holding the position which he appears to do in the Doukhobor community. It tends to keep in their minds the idea that the lands are being entered by the community as a body, and not for the individual.

Mr. FOSTER. The question, I think, the minister will admit, is a rather serious one. It is not simply the case of this one Doukhobor, but it seems to go further than that. The peculiar system that the Doukhobors have may be the best, looked at from their point of view, and there may be, in the earlier days of settlement, some good features in it, in the way of massing together for support and bringing large numbers together, which would recommend it to a certain extent in the eyes of Canadians, who are not in favour of that system, of course. But I think we ought to keep this in view ; that if there be any person who wishes to assert his individuality and become a British subject and conform to all our laws, and work on the same line as individual holders, he ought to be very carefully supported by the department, at least to this extent, that the leader of such a settlement, who naturally has great powers, and naturally also, I suppose, wants to keep those intact and make them greater if he can, does not become in a way arbitrary and to a certain extent tyrannical, and by the great influence he has, keep down and utterly make impossible this assertion of individuality.

I think that the department ought at least to see that such influence is not exercised in an arbitrary and tyrannical manner so as to prevent any individual getting his land. Of course it is easy to say that if one is pitted against the many, the one must suffer and not the many. But you can turn that right around and say that a good many are better able to make up the loss to the one than he is to bear it alone. If this man made his entry in good faith and then is driven out, the department should seek some way of making the matter even for him, but I do not know that the department should suffer. Probably if the fault were entirely with the officers of the department, that would be a fair way to consider it ; but if the interests of the one must be sacrificed to the interests of the many, then the many ought to make compensation. I am not sure that some arrangement such as has been suggested might not be made, namely, to allow the person who entered in good faith to keep his homestead and dispose of whatever portion of it is necessary for the village. The village is not going to run over the whole 160 acres. In that way the village would get what it wants and the man who holds the property around the village would have its value enhanced. But what I would like to emphasize is this, that the department should look into this matter and see that a remedy is at once applied, if necessary.

Mr. LAKE. It is not merely one case apparently, but 43 cases. I do not know whether there were 43 villages founded previously to these lands being entered for, but I have here a letter which I had better read :

Otradnoe Village, October 18, 1904.

John Obed Smith,
Commissioner of Immigration,
Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Dear Sir,—We have just finished in finding out the homesteads which are under Doukhobors villages, and have found correctly. The list of villages and proper homesteads which are under villages we beg to inclose you herewith, kindly look into this matter, and leave those homesteads for villages, making them free from homestead entries. If any homestead entry was made for land, which is under villages, so that was made by mistake, as I told you. In every village there is one free homestead, which was given for village in wrong place, and which can be changed now for man whose land is under village.

Yours faithfully,
PETER VERIGIN.

Then follows a list of some 43 different villages. Apparently Verigin had gone in to Yorkton and changed those entries for 43 other entries. It is quite possible there may be great hardship on other men whose lands have been taken away from them with the improvements thereon.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that I can add to what has been said. It is no part of the business of the department to assist the peculiar religious ideas of any people whoever they may be. Our business is with the individual settler and to protect his rights. A very grave statement has been made which will have to be investigated and action taken. With regard to the individual case mentioned, this man

does not come to us with clean hands, and therefore has not that claim for consideration which he would have if he came with an absolutely clear case. The good faith of the agent who had to deal with this man is called in question. That agent is now dead and we are compelled to take the evidence of other men as to what he said and did; and I do not know that we would be quite justified in accepting in full everything that many be said regarding this deceased officer.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be records and letters.

Mr. OLIVER. We must judge of the case as we find it, aside from the question as to what he is reported to have said or done.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This Doukhobor matter has been before the House several times. It was a mistake bringing them into the country at all, and that was the view taken by the minister himself. They are living in communities, and I should like to know how many of them have homesteads and whether they have made any provision to repay the money they borrowed from the government. I should like to know whether the assurance given us by Mr. Smart, ex-deputy minister, that this debt would be held against the land is correct. This statement was made before they took out any homesteads, and I do not see how it could be entered against the land when they had no claim on it. How much has been paid on the debt and is there any lien on the land homestead for that indebtedness? It will be pretty hard to divide up the indebtedness and register it against the property of each individual. Some arrangement should be made by the leaders of the Doukhobors to pay back the money lent. I understand they are a rather prosperous community although they do not fall into our ways. My hon. friend the minister (Mr. Oliver) made the statement in former days that the country would be better off without them. I quite agreed with him then, and have not seen any great reason for changing my mind since.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. U. Wilson) to say that he desires certain information. His request will be attended to; and if it is the pleasure of the committee to pass the item as it stands in the supplementary estimates, I will guarantee to have an answer by the time we reach the main estimates.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The only trouble is that so many of these questions are postponed that some of them are sure to be forgotten. The hon. minister has his officer beside him, and I think he might give us at least some of the information we require at once. These questions, it seems to me, might easily have been anticipated. The official must be familiar with the facts, I should think. They have been before the Agriculture Committee time and again, and have been threshed out fully in this House.

Mr. TURRIFF. I may state that there were about 8,000 of these Doukhobors, men, women and children.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much have they increased?

Mr. TURRIFF. I do not know. That is a matter that the local government attends to. A year ago these people had practically all made homestead entries—between 1,800 and 2,000, I think. There are about thirty-five of the Doukhobors, as I understand, who have, as it were, broken away from the communal system and taken out naturalization papers. I agree with every word that has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), that those individuals who wish to break away from the communal system should be given every possible consideration by the department. I wish to say, however, that while they have been troublesome in connection with their homestead entries, the Doukhobors have been a good class of settlers. And they are doing well. I do not know whether they have been paying back what money they owed or not; but they are in a position to pay back or will be very shortly, because they have prospered wonderfully well. They are very industrious, and no doubt the work they have done under Peter Verigin has been good work. I think there is no doubt that his influence so far has been good materially—that he has been a good business head, and under him the people there have progressed very well. Still, I do not think that it is in the interest of this country that any one man should be the practical dictator over 7,000 or 8,000 people. Therefore, any encouragement that can be given to individuals to break away from the communal system, I think, should be given.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Perhaps the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) can tell us whether they follow the communal system so far as their earnings are concerned. Do their earnings go into one fund, or are they living like other people?

Mr. TURRIFF. With the exception of the thirty-five to which I have referred, I think they are all living in the communal system, that is to say, each village is a business community by itself. It has no business connection with the other villages, but in each village everything is owned in common.

Mr. LAKE. Referring to what the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has said about the local government keeping the record of the increase, I think I ought to say that the local government have had considerable difficulty in carrying on that work. That recalls to my memory a matter which was brought to my notice some time

back which I would like the minister to inquire into when he is looking up the other things in regard to this settlement. Some time last year a Doukhobor was found hanged in a stable. I would like to know whether that fact was ever called to the attention of the authorities, whether it was reported by Mr. Verigin, and whether any inquest was held.

Mr. OLIVER. It is no part of the business of this department to take notice of anything of that nature. However, I will make inquiries if it is thought desirable.

Mr. LAKE. I would like the minister to tell us whether Mr. Smart, the ex-deputy minister, is now connected with the department; and, if so, what is his position?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Smart is not now employed by the department.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is not long since he was employed by the department as special agent in the west. I do not know what his duties were, but I believe he was paid $10 a day and expenses. Can the minister tell us how long it is since Mr. Smart was employed by the department?

Mr. OLIVER. Since Mr. Smart resigned his position as deputy minister he has not been in the employ of the government except in special service. He was employed a month or two ago in conducting a delegate of the Austrian government through the Northwest. He also made a visit to the United States, looking into the quarantine arrangements there.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But he is not now employed by the department?

Mr. OLIVER. Not in any capacity.

Mr. FOSTER. When engaged in connection with quarantine, he was paid, I suppose, by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. OLIVER. No. Mr. Smart was not engaged in superintending quarantine, but was looking into the operation as affecting the immigration. Of course, the immigrants are the ones to get the benefit of the quarantine, and Mr. Smart was looking into the regulations from the immigrant's point of view.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As I understand it, the $12,000 additional and the $10,000 additional are largely for clerks. In the original estimate the minister asked $12,357 of an increase, and that apparently is for extra clerks in the department. Do I understand that all these sums are practically for extra assistance?

Mr. OLIVER. The sum of $12,000 required for contingencies includes all salaries for homestead inspectors and officers who work outside. Then the amount of $10,000 is for salaries for increases in the staff in offices throughout the west. The item here says outside service,' but that means, not outside the offices, but outside the vote for civil government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I notice that in the charges for Dominion lands the salaries for clerks amount to $31,101.27. Do I understand that that includes all the clerks in the Interior Department, or only those connected with Dominion lands?

Mr. OLIVER. Only those in the Dominion lands branch.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many officers are employed in this branch?

Mr. OLIVER. This item is for service altogether out of Ottawa, and I am not prepared to answer that question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It distinctly says clerks at Ottawa.

Mr. OLIVER. The salaries which are provided under civil government are for what is called the inside service, and everything that is not under that head is called the outside service, whether the persons are employed in Ottawa or at outside offices. This increase of $10,000 for salaries for the outside service, is for the purpose of meeting the requirements in the outside agencies chiefly, owing to the increase of business there; and this increase of business does not occur simply because of an increase of settlement, but because the settlers of some years ago are now in a position to draw their patents, and that causes a great increase of clerical work in the different land offices.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On page L—91 of the Auditor General's Report I notice 'Dominion Lands, salaries of extra clerks at head office, and advertising.' Then it says 'Salaries of clerks at Ottawa, $31,110.27.' Now, I understand that these votes of $12,000 and $10,000 the minister is asking for are to pay further extra clerks. In that view I would like an explanation of that statement on page L—91.

Mr. OLIVER. The figures I have here show total increases in salaries amounting to $19,239, and decreases caused by resignations, transfers, &c., amount to $9,229, leaving a net increase of $10,010. This covers the extras here in the Ottawa office, and the extra service required in the land offices in the Territories.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I realize that I cannot expect the hon. minister to be thoroughly conversant with all the figures. But I would like his deputies to explain why this appears in the Auditor General's Report in the manner it does.

Mr. OLIVER. There are a number of clerks listed as extra clerks, but that does not mean that they are employed as extras for work in this particular year. They are clerks who have been employed for a greater or lesser time, but they are not on the

permanent list, and therefore they are called extras. These are in what is called the inside service, and are not connected with this vote of $10,000 we are asking for.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. They are practically permanent, inasmuch as you have kept them every year.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount in the main vote ?

Mr. OLIVER. Salaries for outside service amount to $137,900.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. On what page of the estimates is that ?

Mr. OLIVER. That sum of $137,900 does not appear in the estimates of this year, but in last year's estimates, on page 71, in the column of 1904-5.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister spoke of Mr. Smart's work in accompanying the Austrian delegate. What does that mean ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not personally familiar with the object of the delegate in visiting Ottawa, as that took place before I assumed office. But I am given to understand that he was the commissioner of the Austrian government, who were desirous of having exact information as to how the colonists from that country were progressing on the continent of America. This commissioner was sent out to investigate the Austrian colonies in the United States and Canada. It was thought desirable, I presume, to treat him with the greatest courtesy and to facilitate his movements and his getting the fullest information to the greatest possible degree. Therefore, the department took every means to facilitate his tour through Canada, and as Mr. Smart had been in charge of the Interior Department and of the immigration branch as well, and was familiar with the work, it was thought desirable that he should have the conduct of the delegate through Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the hon. minister prepared to say just why Mr. Smart left his office as deputy ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no knowledge of the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems rather odd that we have had no sufficient explanation of it. Mr. Smart is supposed to have been and is generally acknowledged to have been an efficient deputy. He seems to have taken a great deal of interest in his department, and as far as the testimony from the government side of the House was concerned he was fulfilling his duties well. All at once and very suddenly he seems to have departed that office and the only explanation we got in the House from the minister was that he left it because he had a chance of bettering his financial position. Quite a long while has passed since then and Mr. Smart seems still to be here, and the fact that he is taking these special services up for the government would rather militate against that. I thought the hon. minister probably might know and be able to give us the explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no knowledge of the matter whatever. The resignation was handed in before the session of parliament occurred and there has nothing come to my knowledge in regard to it. I presume that any officer of the government is at liberty to leave if he sees fit without giving any reason and I presume that is what occurred in this case.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister is asking for an increase of $20,000 in the mines branch of his department. May I ask what they intend doing in that branch during the coming year ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is not an increase ; it is a transfer from the civil government vote to the Dominion Lands vote. It is merely a transfer from one vote to another within the department.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At page 71 of the estimates, under the column of increases, is placed this $20,000.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course it is an increase in the lands branch, but if my hon. friend will turn to civil government he will see that it shows as a decrease. At page 13, it shows in the estimate for civil government as a decrease just as on page 71 under the heading of Dominion lands it shows as an increase.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister stated that Mr. Smart was not in the employ of the government now in any position. How long is it since he ceased to be in the employ of the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the date off hand, but Mr. Smart has not been in the employ of the government since he returned from the west in company with the Austrian delegate, which would be in the latter days of April.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think, if my hon. friend will look at 'Hansard' of only a short time ago, he will find a question which I put to the government the answer to which indicated that he was then in the employ of the government and receiving $10 a day. It is only a short time ago since that question was answered by some acting minister.

Mr. OLIVER. It probably was an error if the question was later than the 1st of May.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose a portion of this $10,000 is to make up extras to him since he has left the department as deputy minister ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Smart's expenses in that connection would have no connection with this vote at all. They would come in

connection with immigration. This was distinctly a matter of immigration work.

Further amount required for maintenance, construction of roads and bridges, and other necessary works in connection with the Hot Springs Reservation, near Banff, Northwest Territories, $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the original vote ?

Mr. OLIVER. $27,020.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a very large increase, which, in a matter like Banff and the reservation there, ought to have been estimated for and included in the original estimates. There cannot be any very special reason why the vote should be increased by more than a fourth. What is the explanation of it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give the reason why the under estimate was made, but I can give the particulars of the items included in this intended expenditure. The vote of $7,000 is to cover the expenditures from the 1st March to the 30th June and it is estimated as follows :

Salaries for four months at $301.66.	$1,206.64
Mr. John Galt's account for preparing plans and estimates in connection with the contemplated waterworks and sewerage system in the park.	926.73
Cost of publishing a pamphlet on the park, 30,000 copies at 16 cents each.	4,500.00
Miscellaneous expenses, express, freight, telegrams, printing and stationery, travelling expenses and so on.	450.00
Balance to be spent on necessary repairs to roads, bridges and buildings in the reservation.	2,412.84
Total.	$9,496.21

There were $2,496 on hand on the first of March standing against this proposed expenditure. This leaves a balance of $7,000 required.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the salaries of the officials for the year ? It would seem as if only eight months salaries were voted unless you have made large additions to the staff which I hope has not been done. It is a very bad and a very deceptive estimate if you are going to come before parliament for a year's money and only make a three-quarters or a two-thirds estimate. Officers salaries should be seen from the beginning, it seems to me. Has there been any increase in the number of salaried officials there ?

Mr. OLIVER. The salaries, as I understand the information given to me here have not been increased nor has the number of officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Have the officials been increased ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. How does the minister explain that he is asking now for four months salary ?

Mr. OLIVER. This is the four month's salary from the first of March to the first of July, and is necessarily included in our statement of the requirements for these four months, but we have $2,000 in hand out of which cheques for salaries will be paid.

Mr. FOSTER. You are requiring no more money for salaries.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the necessity for printing 30,000 pamphlets on Banff.

Mr. OLIVER. Generally speaking I presume it is thought desirable that when we are spending so much money in beautifying the park and building roads and making it desirable as a place of resort, we should spend some money in advertising its attractions.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was this work done ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the Rolla C. Crain Company of Otawa.

Mr. FOSTER. On tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer but I rather think it was not, because it is a very fine class of work and could not very well be let by tender.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the cost ?

Mr. OLIVER. Fifteen cents a copy.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the system of distribution ? I should think that it should be distributed amongst the great outside world to announce that we have natural beauties here and are making and maintaining parks. The method of distribution would be very important in the case of a pamplet of this kind.

Mr. OLIVER. We sent a copy to each senator and member, some were distributed to the railway companies and others were sent to our immigration agents in England and in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the visitors to Banff increasing ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed they are increasing very largely.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Principally Americans.

Mr. OLIVER. From every country.

Further amount required for engraving lithographing and printing maps of the Dominion and Northwest Territories, $16,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount in the main estimates ?

Mr. OLIVER. $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The supplementary estimate is larger than the main estimate; that requires explanation.

Mr. BARR. Where was this work done?

Mr. OLIVER. The drawing of the maps is done in the geographer's office, Ottawa, and the Toronto Lithographing Company does the printing.

Mr. BARR. Is it let by contract?

Mr. OLIVER. I am given to understand there is only one company in Canada that does copper engraving.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. We did get some maps printed in Chicago and they were done very cheaply. I would prefer having them done in our own country if we could get them at a reasonable price, but it does seem to me there ought to be competition in these contracts, especially when they are for large amounts.

Mr. OLIVER. There are certain classes of work that Canada is not as far advanced in as other countries, and this appears to be one of them. If we invite competition it would simply be competition between our own country and other countries.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That was done before.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and it may have been the better way, but there has been considerable feeling expressed against giving so much government money to foreign industries, that it was thought if we could get the work at a moderate price we should keep the work in our own country.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the cost of these maps?

Mr. OLIVER. There are a number of them. There is a relief map of Canada costing $1,500 for 5,000 copies; a map of the new mining district in the Yukon west of Whitehorse costing $1,000 for 4,000 copies; the Peace river map costing $2,000 for 4,000 copies; the Temiskaming map, costing $500 for 10,000 copies; mounting 900 copies of the large map of the Dominion at $3 each.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who did that work?

Mr. OLIVER. It was done in New York.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is an awful price for that.

Mr. OLIVER. The map is so long that ordinary wooden rollers warp and this is mounted on steel cylinder rollers. Then there is $3,000 for printing 5,000 copies of the third edition of the Dominion map; photographing plans in connection with the map $400, and 5,000 printed copies and 2,000 bound copies of the Economic Atlas costing $5,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that distributed to the cabinet ministers?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not completed yet; it is sent to the members too.

Mr. FOSTER. You should send it to the cabinet ministers; they might learn something from an 'economic atlas.'

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister has not explained why it is that the supplementary estimate is in excess of the original estimate.

Mr. OLIVER. I really am not in a position to answer the question. I suppose the answer might be that the occasion has arisen for bringing out some of these maps, for instance, that in regard to the mining district in the Yukon, under circumstances which could not be contemplated, and therefore they were not provided for.

Mr. FOSTER. That is about the only one to which that might apply. The others might have been foreseen and provided for last year.

Mr. OLIVER. I suppose, with regard to the large map of the Dominion, the printing is done in many thousands, while the mounting is done only in comparatively small numbers as required, on account of the greater expense of mounting.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How are these maps distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no definite system of distribution. They are issued to members who apply for them, and members generally apply for them for use in schools, and it is thought desirable to have such maps used in the schools.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. If there are maps or other things given to members for distribution in schools or anywhere else, all the members ought to be furnished with a list of such things; otherwise those who have opportunity of knowing about them get what they want, while others are left without them.

Mr. OLIVER. I think this might be done; while the department might print the maps for general information, those who desire to have them mounted might very well be asked to pay the cost of mounting.

Mr. FOSTER. This is a large expense merely for the distribution of these maps by members among their constituents. The man who knows about them gets them, while the man who does not know about them does not get any. I would have no objection to a senator or a member getting one of these maps; but to use them in a way as perquisites to members who apply for them is not what we are here for, and not what we ought to spend the people's money for. This matter was brought to my attention by a letter which I received

from an old friend in New Brunswick, who said that So-and-so had sent fine mounted maps to three or four of his friends in that locality, but that he could not get one, and he wanted me to get one for him. I have not applied for it, because I did not know whether I could get one or not. I would have some sympathy with allowing every member to have three or four of these maps if they went into schools. To furnish maps to every school in the country is a large undertaking, and if you furnish to one why not to another. To make these expensive maps and give them to members as a piece of patronage to be circulated among their constituents is not good public policy. A simpler and less expensive way, would be to let each member have a half a dozen or so unmounted maps and pay for the mounting themselves. I do not see how you could get these mounted maps through the mails.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite agree that we should arrive at some sound basis of distribution. Evidently the House considers it desirable to provide such maps for the use of the schools, unmounted if not mounted. If a charge were made for the mounting, that would be a considerable check on the demand for the mounted maps. There is no difficulty about sending the mounted maps because they are sent by express. They can be mounted in large numbers much cheaper and better than they could by the individual.

Mr. TAYLOR. I presume that last year, when the sum of $15,000 was asked, the then minister thought that would carry him through. Is this $16,200 all expended ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not expended, but it is contemplated to expend it. Possibly the work that will require that expenditure may be in hand.

Mr. TAYLOR. What authority had the department to incur this expenditure without having asked parliament ?

Mr. OLIVER. I fancy the department will have to ask the grace of the House in this matter.

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys, construction and other expenses, $290,500.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is to defray the expenses of the commission from the 1st March to June 30th, 1905, namely :

Estimated expenses from 1st March to June 30th 1905, $468,000; available out of appropriation for the year, $177,500; to be voted, $290,500.

There was expended up to the 28th February, 1905, $322,500 and from the 28th February to the 1st April, 1905, $114,505, making a total of $437,005.

Mr. FOSTER. No objection to this getting through and taking the discussion on the main estimates.

Mr. FOSTER.

Intercolonial Railway—improved accommodation and facilities along the line, $29,600; additional sidings along the line, $26,100; to eliminate two road crossings at rail level at the Cape Road Crossing near Dorchester, N.B., $2,000: $450,515.

Mr. EMMERSON. If hon. members refer to the estimates of 1904-5, they will see an appropriation of $1,000,000.

At that time I submitted a statement showing that we would require 12 passenger engines and 10 freight engines, 10 first-class sleeping cars, 20 first-class day coaches, 4 second-class sleepers, 4 parlour cars, 2 dining cars, 4 postal cars, 10 baggage cars and 150 box cars. The total expense, I explained, would be $1,383,000. I stated that it was not necessary to get the whole vote at that time, but that in the supplementary estimates I would ask for the balance. This is the balance.

Intercolonial Railway—new machinery for locomotive and car shops, $9,350.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was found necessary to have new machinery in the locomotive and car shops at Moncton for repairs and construction work. The total expenditure is estimated at $9,316.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was this machinery bought ?

Mr. EMMERSON. From machinery men in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. And tenders called for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has this contract ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Machines are being supplied by different concerns. There is one in Hamilton, one in London, one in Brockville—I think it has been widely distributed. The selections were made by the mechanical superintendent, Mr. G. R. Joughins.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the minister gave practically the same explanation, but I understood that the vote that passed covered this whole expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some additional machines were needed, according to the judgment of the mechanical superintendent. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will remember that for a time the mechanical department of the Intercolonial was without a head. The services of Mr. Joughins were secured about a year ago, after the estimate was made of the requirements of the service. His experience led him to believe that this machinery was necessary. I thought it wise to instruct him to procure what was necessary for the expeditious and economical carrying on of the work in the shops.

Mr. INGRAM. I know that it is necessary to have this class of machinery in the shops, but I thought all this was provided for last year.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend will see the reason why these were not provided for in the original estimates.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the department a well-equipped shop at Moncton for the manufacture of locomotives ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. We turn out new locomotives every year. We do not make many—last year about two or three. Whenever there is time to spare from repair work, the superintendent puts the men upon construction. The parts are made as opportunity allows, and these are assembled into locomotives.

Intercolonial Railway—improved accommodation and facilities along the line, $29,600.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are these improvements ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is the completion of a station at Granton and also at Oxford road $1,000. New land had to be bought in connection with the station at Aulac, $450.

Mr. FOSTER. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The station was burned down. To minimize danger we had to rebuild the station on the other side of the track, and for this additional land was required. At Boiestown we required a platform and also at Cross Creek.

Mr. FOSTER. Had they no platform before at Boiestown ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that station is on the Canada Eastern. At Cross Creek there is a junction. A little line has been completed from Stanley to Cross Creek, and a platform was necessary. The total of these small items is $29,603.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister has only accounted for abut $4,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can give them in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister might run over them quickly.

Mr. EMMERSON. For ties, putting in track, $4,800.

Mr. FOSTER. Where ?

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Canada Eastern.

Mr. FOSTER. Were these to replace old ties ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was part of the work of improvement.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these charged to capital ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We purchased the road in a certain condition, and this is to improve it and bring it up to standard of the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOSTER. But the minister should not charge to capital account money spent in replacing old ties with new ones.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is an investment in the road.

Mr. FOSTER. Every expenditure on the road is that.

Mr. EMMERSON. The object is to bring the road up to standard and fit it for the modern engines and cars. I made the statement in connection with taking over the road that these expenses would be necessary in order to enable us to utilize on this line the rolling stock of the Intercolonial. On those branch roads we have had them quite a distance apart, and we have found it necessary to put them closer together. We are using heavier engines, the cars run with greater speed, and it is necessary, in order to ensure the lives of the passengers, to improve the roadbed.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the hon. gentleman any idea as to the number of ties that he used per mile before he made the change ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not remember how many there were to the mile, but they were further apart than on ordinary roads.

Mr. INGRAM. Are you putting them in now the usual number per mile, as on other roads ?

Mr. EMMERSON. We are putting in 2,600 per mile, I think, on the Intercolonial.

Mr. FOSTER. That still does not come up to the $29,600.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are expending for ties $22,241 for the whole length of the road. Then there are stations, freight sheds, platforms, and so forth. In putting in new ties we are making them closer than they were before. We are not only renewing old ties, but are putting in new ones extra. In our estimates for the coming year we will have to ask for an appropriation to replace ties that have been used.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be in current account ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there ever been any experiment with ties of any other material than wood ; and, if so, what has been the result on the Intercolonial ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The deputy minister tells me they have never used anything else but wood.

Mr. BLAIN. What about cement ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, that is very expensive, though it might pay in the long

run. But I do not think it has been tried generally in countries where the climatic conditions are similar to those of Canada. I think they have used that material in England to some extent.

Mr. COCHRANE. How long do the ties last ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The life of a tie, of course, is dependent on the character of the wood, but it varies from five to eight years. We use a good many cedar ties on the Intercolonial, quite a number of prince's pine and quite a number of hemlock. I think the engineers use the best ties on those sections of the road where the traffic is heaviest. For instance, between Moncton and Truro is a section of the road very much used, many coal trains passing daily. I think the better class of ties are placed on this section. On the north shore there are some sections where we use cedar ties. We can get cedar cheaper on the northern division of the road than we can down in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Cedar grows very extensively, as we all know, in Quebec and in the northern section of New Brunswick, and we do not have to haul cedar ties any distance. In the eastern section we use hemlock, and also what is called prince's pine.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood the minister to say that on the Canada Eastern the ties are too far apart, and he was asking a sum of money to put in more, and that he was also going to ask more money to put in ties all along the line. Could the minister say what time would elapse from the time he puts in additional ties, to make them closer together, and the time when he renews the old ties ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About a year and a-half. We do not have to take up the track in order to replace old ties.

Additional sidings along the line, $26,100.

Mr. EMMERSON. One of these is at Campbellton, increasing the yard ; one at Sussex, the extension of a siding, costing $674. The Campbellton expenditure includes the purchase of land, which, along with the siding, will cost $10,900. A siding at Sandy Cove, near Halifax, will cost $1,000. There is a siding at Nelson, costing $748. There is a siding at Johnson's road and at Chatham junction there is an extension. About $1,000 will be required for these items. Then at Cushman's, Chelmsford, Grey Rapids and Coughlan's, there are sidings costing about $2,700 altogether. There is one each at Upper Blackville, Weaver's and Brierly's brook, costing $1,500 ; one at Carroll's, one at McNamee's, one at McGivney's, one at Durham, one at Penniac and one at Gibson. These last that I have named cost about $4,000. There is one at Pictou landing, on the opposite side from the town of Pictou, in Nova Scotia, costing $1,600. The total of the items is about $26,100.

Mr. FOSTER. Are any of these renewals of sidings ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are not renewals they are additions.

To eliminate two road crossings at rail level at the Cape Road crossing, near Dorchester, New Brunswick, $2,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the balance of the expenditure made at Dorchester for a subway eliminating two level crossings. It was a very dangerous place. There have been quite a number of lives lost. There was a bad curve there and the crossings were hidden from view. I had an appropriation of $4,000 for this work last year. The balance required to meet the expense necessary is $2,000. The total cost will be about $6,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the reverse curve near a bridge that the hon. gentleman brought up last year ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, that reverse curve near a bridge is at St. Leonard's Junction in the province of Quebec.

Prince Edward Island Railway—dwelling for agent at Bloomfield, $715.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that outside of the station house ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is outside of the station house.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to know what the policy of the government is in reference to that, whether it is proposed now to commence and build dwelling houses for the agents. The hon. minister will see that if there is a dwelling house built for one agent in one place there will be demands upon him for dwelling houses for agents in other places. The expense of one house is small, but if this is going to be taken as the policy of the government it is going to add an immense sum to the obligations of a railway which is now not paying. It does not seem to show anything but a backward tendency under the hon. gentleman's management.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite agree with the idea that my hon. friend is throwing out with regard to the construction of dwellings. Certainly it is not the policy of the department to construct dwellings except where it is absolutely necessary ; that is where the station is situated so that it is impossible for the agent to secure a residence near the scene of his work It is important to have the agent always right near the station. In the olden time on the Intercolonial Railway, or rather before it became the Intercolonial Railway, they started out building station houses that included dwellings upstairs for the agents. There is quite a number of these, as my hon. friend very well knows, between Moncton and St. John on what is now known as the

Intercolonial Railway, but which was known as the European and North American Railway in days gone by. That was necessary because in establishing stations as they did they were unable to do so in settled communities and the station agent could not get a dwelling house. The policy is gradually changing and in constructing new stations we eliminate the dwelling house feature in almost every instance, but where it is impossible for the agent to secure a dwelling by rental near the station we find it necessary to build a dwelling house for him adjoining the station. We sometimes utilize an old building. These conditions prevail in Prince Edward Island, as I am advised, and it is necessary at this place, and I think at some other places on the island to which my attention has been invited, to do this. It is done upon the report of the officials. It is purely departmental and it is only done where it is necessary. The general policy of the department is not to furnish dwellings. If we furnish a dwelling, of course the officials get the benefit of it; but those who are not so favoured receive compensation in lieu of it; that is to say, an allowance is made for the rental paid for them. There is no discrimination. All are treated alike and it is regulated by agreement with the Telegrapher's Union, which comprises amongst its membership the station agents along the line of the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway

Mr. FOSTER. Is Bloomfield in an utterly unsettled portion of the country in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not put it in that sense. Sometimes these stations are so situated that no one else builds near them. Towns do not grow up around them. Prince Edward Island is peculiarly situated. It is an agricultural province as we know. There are no thickly settled communities. The stations are isolated. They do not gather houses and little stores around them like they do in other sections of the Dominion.

Charlottetown—extension of railway track along water front, $7,150.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to extend the track to the wharf where the winter boat lands. We took $5,000 last year, the total estimated expenditure is $12,150.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is only one other item in the supplementaries and I want to discuss it myself.

Mr. FOSTER. Can you discuss it now ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not in a position to give some information to the committee, but if the item is passed I will discuss it in connection with another item which is reserved.

Mr. FOSTER. What item is it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOSTER. We want to have a little talk about that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to talk about it myself; I do not intend to let my hon. friend do all the talking.

Mr. A. MARTIN. When will this item be discussed?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am waiting for some information.

Mr. FOSTER. The session is young yet; if you are not ready take your time.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The House made an order in February last for information concerning the erection and location of a railway station at Charlottetown.

Mr. EMMERSON. Those papers were laid on the table yesterday.

Mr. R. MARTIN. There was also a return ordered with regard to the extension of branch line in Prince Edward Island.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought that was brought down; I will inquire about it.

Gratuity to Jeffrey Foot, ex-tide waiter, Halifax, $500.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Jeffrey Foot was appointed a tide waiter in His Majesty's customs at the port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, on the 1st February, 1895, at a salary of $500 per annum. His age at the time of appointment was 53 years so that he did not come within the provisions of the Superannuation Act—the age limit provided by such Act being 45 years. On the 22nd January, 1903, while acting as locker at warehouse No. 14, of the port of Halifax, Mr. Foot met with an accident which greatly aggravated a disease from which he was suffering and in consequence he was permanently disabled. While discharging his duties on the day referred to a teamster came driving along at a rapid rate, the shaft of the wagon knocked Mr. Foot down, he was trampled by the horse and the wagon passed over him. His head was badly cut and he was unconscious for a considerable time. He has made a statutory declaration setting forth the cause of the accident as before stated and the circumstances as narrated are verified by affidavits of Mr. A. S. Taylor, a clerk, and Mr. A. O. Gastonguay, a merchant, who were eye witnesses of the accident. The Department of Customs gave Mr. Foot the only relief possible under the law, which was payment of his salary for 12 months. Section 10 of the Civil Service Superannuation Act provides that if any officer is constrained to quit the service be-

fore the period of superannuation, ten years, by reason of severe bodily injury, received without his own fault, in the discharge of his public duty, the Governor in Council may allow him a gratuity not exceeding three months pay for every two years service. Taking into account the extra year during which Mr. Foot was paid as a public officer his service would only amount to nine years or one year less than the period covered by the Civil Service Act. On the basis provided in section 10 of the Superannuation Act the gratuity to be allowed Mr. Foot would be $500, namely: three months salary at $500 per annum, $125, multiplied by 4 as his full service was 4½ times 2 years service.

Gratuity of two months salary to widow of J. B. Shadwell, late acting collector of customs at Whitehorse, $233.33.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Howard B. Shadwell, acting collector of customs at Whitehorse, Yukon, died of diphtheria on the 14th October, 1904. His daughter died two days before him of the same disease. Mr. Shadwell left a widow and four children, one a baby of six months old, and it is stated by Mr. Robert Lowe, a member of the Yukon council, that owing to sickness in the house and the cost of living in the Yukon his family is left practically destitute. Mr. Shadwell was employed from 22nd of December, 1896, and his salary at the time of his decease was $1,400 per annum. Being an acting officer he did not contribute to either the superannuation fund or the retirement fund and not being permanently appointed by Order in Council his widow is not, under the law, entitled to the usual gratuity of two month's salary.

Gratuity of two months' salary to the widow of the late John Turner, in his lifetime acting sub-collector of customs at the outport of Caribou Crossing, $200.

Mr. PATERSON. Mr. Turner died on the 29th of March last from heart disease. The correspondence in the department shows that Mr. Turner had many misfortunes in his family immediately preceding his demise, as in September, 1904, he lost one daughter, and was obliged to remove another from the country in order to save her life. Not being permanently appointed, he did not contribute either to the superannuation fund or to the retirement fund; and owing to the heavy expenses caused by his own illness and that of members of his family, the remaining members of the family are in pecuniary want. In view of the fact that he was not a contributor to either of the funds above mentioned, his family are not entitled, under the law, to the usual two months' gratuity, and, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case, it has been deemed advisable to ask for a vote equivalent to such an amount. Mr. Turner entered the service on the 24th January, 1891, and, after serving for some years at Vancouver, B.C., was transferred to Dawson in the month of September, 1899, and to Caribou crossing, on the 6th of June, 1902.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

River St. Lawrence ship channel, Marine Department—further amount required on account of the construction of a dredge for improvement of the channel below Quebec, $100,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This amount is required for immediate disbursements on account of material and labour towards the construction of a sea-going, steel, twin-screw, suction, hopper dredge for improvements to the river St. Lawrence ship channel below Quebec, to be constructed at the government works at Sorel. Estimated cost, $350,000. The thirty foot channel at low water between Quebec and Montreal is now well on towards completion. In two or three years we will have vessels sailing between Montreal and Quebec at all stages of the tide, while below Quebec there is at one place only 20 feet at low tide. In the spring of 1901 the matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works by the shipping interest of Montreal. The officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department of Quebec, who had an intimate knowledge of this part of the river, strongly recommended the north channel, commencing below the Island of Orleans, as being better, easier navigated and more clear of ice in winter. Orders were given to the staff of the River St. Lawrence ship channel to make a survey and examination of the north channel with a view to reporting on the practicability and cost of improving that route and adopting it for navigation. In 1902 a similar survey was made of the south channel to ascertain what improvements would be required to make a thirty foot channel on the line of the present route. A comprehensive report was made on February 24, 1903, to the acting chief engineer of the Public Works Department on the question of the proposed improvement below Quebec. The engineer, who is now superintending engineer of the work being carried out on the St. Lawrence by this department, Mr. Cowie, reported that the difficulties by either route are between Murray bay and St. Jean, Isle d'Orleans. The dredger required for either would be practically the same, the material everywhere being soft. It was estimated that for either route, the cost, including the required plant, to give a thirty foot channel, 1,000 feet wide, would be about $1,000,000, and it was urged that immediate steps should be taken to provide the dredge, as it would require a year and a half to build. Mr. Cowie did not recommend the adoption of either route, but advised that the choice should meet with the

approval of the underwriters, the shipping interest and the pilots. The decision as to the route need not be given at once. The Transportation Commission visited the locality, going over each channel and took evidence on the subject, and it is hoped that they will go further into the question and give an opinion. In the meantime the superintending engineer has submitted the proposal that the plant be constructed and the present south channel dredged to thirty feet and to a width of say 500 feet. This could be done, it is estimated, in two seasons. Then, if considered advisable, the dredging of the north channel Traverse shoals could be undertaken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much has been expended ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not a cent yet, but we are figuring on ordering the necessary material in order to start the work. The work will be done at the Sorel shipyards. It will be one of the most modern and improved dredges.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A suction dredge ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A suction and hopper dredge at the same time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Transportation Commission having visited this locality, did they make any suggestion or report ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They made a report which I have not before me. It stands to reason that if you have a thirty foot channel between Montreal and Quebec, you must also have a thirty foot channel between Quebec and the Gulf, and there are shoals at different points below Quebec where the water is only twenty feet deep at low tide.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When do you expect to complete the dredge ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In eighteen months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then how long will it take to dredge the channel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In two seasons the work will be done in the south channel because we will be able to get the help of other dredges now working between Montreal and Quebec. We have seven dredges finishing the work between Montreal and Quebec, and in eighteen months we shall be able to take away two or three of them and use them in the south channel below Quebec. After the south channel is dredged, we will work in the north channel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These two channels continue only a portion of the distance ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About thirty-five miles. One is on the north side of the island of Orleans and the other is on the south side. In days gone by, the north channel was the one used, but at that time vessels had not the draught they have now. The south channel was then adopted and greatly improved ; but at two points near Murray bay and Beauchemin, there are shoals where the water at low tide is only twenty feet. This means a delay of six or seven hours when steamers strike those points at low water.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the rise and the fall of the tide ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About 18 feet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This will give two channels, and it is contemplated that each will be a 30-foot channel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, at the lowest point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minimum depth. And what will be the minimum width ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Five hundred feet. The north channel, when completed, will be about a mile. It is very deep water, except at certain points. There is very little to be done on the north channel, except at the northeast end of the island of Orleans.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister (Mr. Préfontaine) spoke of the Transportation Commission. We do not hear very much about that commission now. It began its work, I think, about two years ago this summer. But we have not had the advantage of its wisdom, except that upon one occasion, I think, they made a short report with regard to some particular locality. There is danger that we shall have completed all our arrangements with respect to the matters this commission was to investigate before we receive its report. And it would be most unfortunate if it should advise something altogether different from the measures we are now engaged in carrying out. Of course, it is quite possible—as great minds think alike—that the government may be proceeding exactly along the lines which the Transportation Commission will eventually advise. But will it not be possible for the government to stimulate the activity of the commission a little, and so enable us, some time before the end of the present century, to find out what it is doing or what it advises ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This Transportation Commission, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is aware, is not under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but is under the control of the Department of Public Works. I must admit there has been a good deal of delay, but it is due to circumstances over which we had no control. As he knows, one of the gentlemen on that commission was sick for a long time and died a few months ago. Another member of the commission, Mr. Fry, of Quebec, resigned a few months ago. The work of the commission was suspended

because of these things. As to the work which pertains to my department—the work of the ship channel—I must say that every time we were in doubt as to what should be done, I gave Mr. Cowie, the engineer in charge, instructions to consult with them. Everything we are doing as to the ship channel proper has received the approval of the commission. Of course, in years past there was much careful study of the St. Lawrence channel and its needs by the engineers of the Department of Public Works; and, on any points that may have been in doubt, though our engineers had their own opinion formed as regards these points, Mr. Cowie has always acted with due care, and I am quite sure that any work he has recommended, and which is in process of being carried out, will be found to be such that it need not be done over again. The plan has been carefully thought out. These improvements will be finished within four or five years. Then, if the question arises of further widening or deepening of the channel, the public, especially those interested in transportation and navigation, will find that no mistakes have been made. The work has been efficiently carried on under my predecessor as Minister of Public Works, and, since it has been under my charge, I have given it my personal attention. These works have received the unanimous approval of those connected with navigation. We have been pressed by the boards of trade, the shipping federation and other similar bodies to carry out the work as fast as possible so as to meet the demands of our commerce.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Préfontaine) has not had his rights. He had an Order in Council passed transferring to him a portion of the jurisdiction formerly exercised by the Department of Public Works. But he did not have that Order in Council so framed as to take over the Transportation Commission. I think that the Transportation Commission should have come under his jurisdiction, and then he would have been in a better position to answer to-day. When this Transportation Commission was first constituted, in 1903, we were told by the Order in Council that it was useless to proceed unless the government were advised by experts so that they could engage in some comprehensive scheme for the improvement of our transportation facilities for internal and export trade. When we criticised the government later on for proceeding with a great railway policy without appointing that commission or waiting for its report, the Prime Minister (Sr Wilfrid Laurier) gave the reason that this Transportation Commission would devote particular attention to the water-ways of Canada, which are now largely under the control of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). But we find that, not only did the government not wait for the report of the commission before embarking upon a great railway policy, but it is not waiting for that report before entering upon a policy of developing the water-ways. I am not criticising the expenditure of money for developing the St. Lawrence route; I have always advocated the development of that route and the expenditure for that purpose of any reasonable sum. But I call attention to the appointment of a commission under Order in Council, which declares that the government cannot embark upon a comprehensive scheme without expert advice, such as would be given by this commission, and I point out though that commission has been constituted for two years and has not made a report of any value, the government is proceeding exactly as if no commission had been appointed. In other words, the government is treating the appointment and the work of the commission as a farce, and is proceeding to deal with matters on which the commission was supposed to advise, exactly as if no commission had been appointed, or as if it did not expect to receive assistance or advice from that commission which would be of the slightest value. I would respectfully submit to the hon. minister (Mr. Préfontaine)—because I think that, after all, the Transportation Commission should be under his control, if it is not—that the government should do one of two things; it should either desist from pretending that this commission is going to be of service to us, disband that commission and save the country further expense on its account, or they should insist that the commission proceed with due diligence and make out a report, so that these works can be carried on with the assistance which we expected to receive from the commission when it was appointed. I think that is a perfectly logical position.

I understand of course that the difficulties referred to by the minister have supervened; there was sickness and death, then there was a resignation. But I venture to think there are gentlemen in this country just as familiar with the interests of transportation and with the proper mode in which to deal with the development of our water-ways and an inland system of navigation, as any gentleman who is a member of that commission to-day. Let us grant that they are proper persons to be appointed to that commission, the men who now compose it; but no one of us supposes that they monopolize all the knowledge or all the wisdom with regard to this question that can be gathered up in Canada. I once more respectfully suggest, and urge, and insist that either the commission should proceed with due diligence, so that we may know from its report whether the course entered upon by the government in developing the water-ways of the St. Lawrence is a proper course, or that they should cease to make a pretense of going on with the work of the commission at all. Does the minister know,

for example, whether, within the last three months—we will go further back, since this session began on the 11th of January last, whether within the last five months, that commission has held a single sitting, has taken a single step, has done any work whatever, has made any progress with the duties which were entrusted to it by parliament in the summer of 1902. I think at least we ought to have some information on that point from the minister who, although this commission may not be under the exclusive control of his department, nevertheless is a member of the government which does control that commission. It seems to me that in making that request for information. I am not at all exceeding the legitimate duty of an opposition in making inquiry with regard to the expenditure of public money.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In answer to the hon. leader of the opposition, I may say that I do not know what the commission has done since the beginning of this session ; my impression is that they have done nothing, by reason of the resignation of one of the members and of the death of another. As I have said, the commission is not under my control, though of course I am a member of the government under whose control it is. I must state also that the works which pertain to the ship channel were decided upon and were carried out without the aid of the commission, except in one or two cases where they were consulted by the superintending engineer with regard to certain improvements. The improvements of the channel were decided upon, and have been carried on, even before the commission was appointed. I understand that the scope of the commission was mostly to consider the question of transportation as regards the great lakes, transportation by water as well as by rail. It was especially for that purpose that the commission was appointed. Of course, in special cases they may have been called upon to examine certain points, they may have been sitting as experts on certain improvements, such as improvements contemplated in the harbous of St. John, as well as in the harbour of Halifax and other places. But with regard to the ship channel, I state again that the plan of improvement was laid out a number of years ago, and was matured before the commission was appointed. The commission only pronounced on this ship channel between Montreal and Quebec, as well as between Quebec and the Gulf, in cases where there may have been some doubt as regards the best locality in which to make the improvements. All the plans for improving the ship channel of the St. Lawrence have received their full approbation. I do not know when the commission will be reorganized so as to go on with their work. The hon. gentleman must understand that under present circumstances all the departments are very busy ; parliament has now been in session nearly five months and with all the work that has been thrown upon us, it is impossible to go on with much outside work. For my part I can say that I have had all I could do to conduct the affairs of my department, and prosecute the work in a manner that the public interests require.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that, and of course if this commission had been making reports and suggestions during the past eighteen months, as it might have been, the hon. gentleman's duties might have been much lightened. He may have been doing a great deal of work that should have been done by this commission.

Mr PREFONTAINE. Not as regards the ship channel.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps not. I understand the ship channel is necessary in order that ocean vessels may reach Montreal, that is apparent to all of us. We must have a thirty foot channel, we must have that highway made secure, and safe, and as perfect as we can make it having regard of course to the resources of the country. But the channel of the St. Lawrence is only part of a great system of inland water-ways that reaches into the very heart of this country. What I object to is that while this commission has been practically doing nothing for two years, so far as giving advice to parliament is concerned, we are dealing with part of this great system of inland water-ways, we are developing part of it, and we do not know whether it is exactly the development that would be best if we take into consideration the whole system of the great lakes and everything that pertains to them. It is impossible to tell how the expenditure of money in the St. Lawrence in connection with the great lakes might be modified if we had the report of a commission composed of gentlemen thoroughly acquainted with the subject, who had devoted their attention to it for a year, or six months, or eight months, and who came to parliament with a well considered report. I do not see that we are any nearer to receiving assistance from that commission than we were when it was first appointed. They have held certain sessions, they have gone to different parts of the country, they have made one interim report with regard to some locality on the great lakes. Apart from that, parliament has not had one single word of advice or assistance from that commission since its appointment. I understand the commission was constituted according to the terms of an Order in Council that was brought down to parliament, and the situation was described as urgent by that Order in Council. That Order in Council, I always regarded as a very able document, I do not know who was the author of it, but I

consider that it was drawn up by some gentleman who was thoroughly acquainted with the needs of the transportation system in Canada. I always thought that the work of a commission of experts proceeding along the lines of that Order in Council would be of great advantage and assistance to parliament and to the country. What I find fault with is that, although that commission has been appointed for nearly a year, although it has been going on at a very great expense to the people of this country, although its report is urgently required, as the government then stated in that Order in Council, for the development of our transportation in connection with our great inland water-ways, nevertheless we are going on exactly as we were before the commission was appointed, with an appropriation of $100,000 here and $200,000 there; we are dealing with the work piecemeal and not according to any comprehensive or well considered scheme. What I would like to know from some member of the government before we vote many more of these appropriations is this: When will the commission really get at work, when will it make a partial or complete report and when will we have its assistance here, so that we may know whether to vote money for such a purpose as this? If my hon. friend is not able to answer that question to-night, because, as he says, he has not the commission under his control, it seems to me that the government should see to it that the information is laid at once before parliament as to the proceedings of this commission.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is rather unusual to ask a member of the government who has a department perfectly well defined to furnish certain information which he declares is not in his possession and cannot be in his possession. At the present time the commission is composed only of one man, Mr. Reford. There is not even a secretary. The secretary is dead. He died about two months ago, so that a reorganization of this commission is required to know what has been the work that has been done and what are the recommendations that are to be made. I state again that the plans of my department as regards the ship channel were approved unanimously by the commission. The superintending engineer, in the season of 1903, under my direction accompanied that commission on a tour of inspection of the whole channel with charts, maps, plans and everything connected with the works which had been executed and the works which were contemplated and for which certain amounts of money are asked to be voted by parliament in these supplementary estimates. We know perfectly well where we are going. We are executing a plan perfectly defined and known to the public generally and especially known to the shipping federation. The plan which is being executed by the department received the sanction and approval of the shipping federation years ago. We are carrying out the work as fast as we can, in order to give satisfaction to the shipping federation. As regards this part of the work of improving the facilities for inland navigation it is under the control of my department. The great lakes are not under my control except as regards aids to navigation such as lighting, but the channel of the St. Lawrence, which means that part of the national route extending from Montreal to the gulf is under my control. The work of deepening and straightening the channel and putting it in such shape that it will give satisfaction to the public has been under the control of my department since the 1st of July 1904. I am aware of what has been done. I have studied the plans and everything connected with these improvements and I have studied what is contemplated to be done. What is contemplated to be done has received the approbation of the commission, so that, whether there is a report or whether there is no report from the commission, we know where we are going and what we are doing. What we are doing has received the approbation of the shipping federation and is receiving their approbation to the extent that they are pressing the government to complete these improvements as fast as it is posible to carry them out. As a member of the government I can only state that this commission will certainly be reorganized within the shortest possible time and will be put back to work so that they can present a complete report to parliament or even an interim report as to what has been done. Although the secretary is dead and although one of the most important members of the commission is dead also, I suppose there are documents, there is a record of the expert evidence which has been given and drafts of reports which the new members of the commission can take up and deal with. I repeat again it has no reference at all to the ship channel except that the interim report which has been already made refers to certain improvements which require to receive the approbation of that commission. We have not asked for this amount without knowing what would be the result of the work. The work is approved by the shipping federation and everybody connected with navigation. We want this part of the national route to be improved and to be put in such shape as to afford a necessary guarantee to the shipping federation. We want that work to be completed as soon as possible taking into consideration the means at the disposal of the country. I think it is well understood by everybody in this House and every body outside of this House that in going on with these improvements in

the way we are going on with them we are working upon a definite plan and there is no risk that later on there may be changes. If there be some changes later on they will only be changes necessary to the improvement of the work ; that is in making the depth greater than it is, 20 feet, and making the width at certain points more than it is at the present moment. At the narrowest point the channel is 350 feet wide. At some points it is 500 feet and at some other points, where it is not absolutely necessary to dredge, it goes to 800 feet and even to a mile. But, the improvements that may be made in the future in a part of the channel, after it is considered to be completed, will be only improvements in the way of increasing the depth or the width of the channel or securing increased aids to navigation so as to make it a perfectly safe route.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course the shipping federation is merely a private organization. While its recommendations may be entitled to every possible respect it has not the official status of a body such as the Transportation Commission, appointed under a statute of this country and under an Order in Council for a special and particular purpose. I understand the hon. minister to say that it has made a report in respect to the particular matter for which we are now voting this money. That report was in writing, perhaps, or was it merely informal ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was in writing. The report applies especially to the other item of $115,000, not to this item, because it was necessary that we should secure a dredge to make the channel what it should be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It has no special connection with this item ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the report referred to in writing ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, it was a report in writing. I think it was laid before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman certain that it was laid before the House.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I remember making allusion to it when discussing the main estimates this year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope the hon. gentleman will be good enough to let me have a copy of it. The very fact that there has been a report made on this matter is the best possible evidence of the connection of the work of the Transportation Commission with the hon. gentleman's department. The work of that commission may not relate exclusively to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but it is very closely associated with a number of matters which are within the jurisdiction of that department. The difficulty is that the Minister of Marine tells us that the Transportation Commission is not within his department, while the Minister of Public Works says, that the river St. Lawrence from Montreal to Quebec and below is not under his department, and therefore he does not know what the Transportation Commission is doing . We desire that some one should be authorized to speak for the government who will be able to tell us what this commission is doing, when it is to be reconstituted, and why there has been such delay. A few years ago the government thought the appointment of this commission a very serious and urgent matter, and yet the Minister of Marine speaks to-day as if a delay of four or five months was nothing at all. When we have an office vacated under the Crown by death or resignation it does not usually take four or five months to fill it as has been the case with the office of secretary to the commission. If this commission is of anything like the importance that was attributed to it by the government when it was appointed, then the government should have reconstituted it when a death occurred and insisted that it should proceed with its work or else disband it altogether and not pretend that its work is of importance to the country. If the commission is of importance its work should proceed ; if it is not of importance let it be terminated. I do not pretend that the Minister of Marine is more at fault than any of the other ministers ; I put the same question to the Prime Minister two months ago and he gave me just about as much information as the Minister of Marine gave me to-night.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He must have given more.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He gave no more and certainly he could not give any less. If the government regard this commission as of any importance why in the name of all that is sensible do they not take steps to enable it to carry on its work and insist on its doing so. Then if the commission does not carry on its work let the government ask the members to resign and appoint others who will attend to their duties. The Minister of Marine knows very well that my criticism is justified ; I will not press him further to-night but I will insist that the government shall give some answer at an early date.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never intended to belittle the importance of this commission because I think its work is of the highest importance to the future of transportation in Canada. What I did say was that these works between Montreal and Quebec and Quebec and the Gulf had been planned and decided on before the commission was appointed so that whether there was a commission or not it would not pre-

vent the progress of the work for which this vote is asked. I think it is the intention of the government to have this commission reorganized as soon as possible and to report all the information gathered.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Under what department does the expenditure for this commission come ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Department of Public Works.

Mr. AMES. To return to the vote for the dredge, will the minister kindly tell us what is the proposed type of dredge and its estimated capacity ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In reply to the hon. gentleman I may read the following :

Description, requirements and general specifications of a sea-going, hopper, hydraulic dredge, for the improvement of the ship channel in the River St. Lawrence, below Quebec.

General description—The hull to be of steel. The vessel to be self-propelled by a pair of independent engines, twin screws, with a draft when loaded of not more than 15 feet. The capacity of the hoppers to be from 1,000 to 1,200 cubic yards. To be capable of dredging to a depth of 60 feet. The speed of the vessel when loaded to not be less than 8 knots per hour. Hull—The hull to be of the same general type as that of the dredge 'W. S. Fielding,' with at least two feet more free board, 3 feet greater width, and as nearly the same length as practicable. Well—The well to be designed so as to take a hydraulic deepening frame, with cutter of the same type as the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' and at the same time to have the dimensions so as to be suitable for an elevator deepening frame, if at any future time the dredge should be changed to one of the elevator type. Engines—The propelling marine engines to be similar to those of the dredge 'W. S. Fielding.' Cutter—The cutter to be of the same type and size as the one which has given excellent satisfaction on the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte.' A new pattern, however, to be made with additional knives and improved design which may be set up in the shop and revolved so as to obtain the proper shape and adjustment for the knives. Hydraulic suction pipe—The intake pipe to be similar in design to that of the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' but reduced in size so as to increase the velocity of the discharge into the hoppers. Centrifugal pump—The pump and connections to be similar in design and arragement to the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte.' Main marine engine—To be of exactly the same design, and made from the same patterns as the one on the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte.' With a contracted intake pipe, and a discharge into hoppers, this engine will have adundant capacity for the duty to be performed. Boilers—The vessel to be equipped with four marine boilers similar to those on the dredge 'W. S. Fielding,' only smaller, to give a capacity equal to the present equipment of the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte.' Winches—The bow, stern and side manoeuvering winches to be of the same type as the present improved equipment of the dredge 'Tarte.' Hoppers—The hoppers to be similar to those on the dredge 'W. S. Fielding' with slightly increased capacity. The doors to be replaced by circular valve gates, a mechanical attachment being proposed for starting the dumping of the material, the flushing to be done by the main centrifugal pump. Well—The framing of the well and foundations for the 'A' frames to be so designed that at any future date the hydraulic machinery could be removed and replaced by elevator machinery, to be driven by shafting from the main marine engine. Discharging features—The dredge to be designed to pump the material directly into the hoppers, but connections to be constructed in such a manner that without any important changes arrangements to be made either to dump the material into scows or to discharge it through a pipe similar to the manner of disposal on the dredge 'J. Israel Tarte.'

The approximate estimated cost is $350,000.

Mr. AMES. I understand that the dredge is a combination of the 'J. Israel Tarte' type and the 'W. S. Fielding' type ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Is it to be built entirely by day labour at Sorel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. Some of the fittings will have to be made elsewhere, and tenders will be asked for those ; but otherwise the work will be done by day labour by the men in the employ of the department at Sorel, as the work was done on the 'J. Israel Tarte' and the 'W. S. Fielding.'

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell us the estimated capacity of this dredge—the amount of work expected of her ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I gave the capacity of the hoppers—from 1,000 to 1,200 yards in 10 hours. She is supposed to work twenty-four hours like the others of similar capacity which we have.

Mr. AMES. Is it larger than any other dredge presently owned by the government ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It will be about the size of the 'J. Israel Tarte.'

Mr. AMES. Can the minister tell us what the 'J. Israel Tarte' cost to build ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I could not tell that. The 'J. Israel Tarte' was built by the Department of Public Works three or four years ago. The hon. gentleman can get the information from the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. AMES. But that is not the point. What I wish to know is whether the sum of $350,000 which we are now asked to vote is more or less than the cost of similar dredges which have been built by the government ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I must say that it is less than the cost of the 'J. Israel Tarte,' which was the first of the kind built, and on which there was a good deal of expenditure incurred which will not require to be repeated. For instance, the plans, &c., connected with it, cost, I think, in the neighbourhood of $15,000. We re-

quire to make no such expenditure on this. That being the only dredge on the continent of the kind, a good deal of the work had to be done experimentally, causing a good deal of delay, and bringing the cost of the dredge nearer to $400,000 than to $350,000. From the reports that Mr. Cowie has made, we think the cost will be within $350,000. In the construction of the 'J. Israel Tarte,' a good deal of the work was scattered, because the means for doing it were not in the shipyard ; but now all this preparatory work has been done, and will not be charged against the new dredge.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that from the previous experience of dredge building, you have practically the plans and specifications for this dredge in the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, and plans on which there is room for improvement. Mr. Cowie has reported that there are two types of dredges of a debatable kind—the 'J. Israel Tarte' and the 'W. S. Fielding.' They are different in some ways, but they have been built under the same engineers ; and Mr. Robinson, a man, I am told, of very great experience, and profiting by his knowledge of the construction of these two dredges, has prepared the plans of a dredge that will be almost perfection in the class of large and expensive dredges.

Mr. AMES. Will this new dredge when completed be capable of performing any work different from that which the 'J. Israel Tarte' or the 'W. S. Fielding' can do to-day ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may say that she will be different from the 'J. Israel Tarte' which is not a hopper dredge, nor a sea-going dredge. This one will be a sea-going dredge, and will combine the suction principle with the elevating. It will be able to work in sixty feet of water, whereas the 'J. Israel Tarte' cannot work in more than thirty-five or forty feet of water. Of course, I do not depreciate that dredge, which is one of the marvellous dredges of this continent. She has done work, where the material afforded her a chance to work continuously, at the marvellously low rate of 1⅞ cents a yard. The dredge is a wonderful dredge, and has been pronounced such by experts from the United States. But if you combine the hopper and the suction principle in one dredge, and make her sea-going and capable of dredging in sixty feet of water, you can understand the difference between the two, although this one will cost less than the 'J. Israel Tarte.'

Mr. AMES. Are any of the other dredges owned by the department sea-going dredges ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. None. The 'W. S. Fielding' is a sea-going dredge, but she belongs to the Department of Public Works, which is dredging in the gulf. My jurisdiction does not extend farther than the beginning of the gulf. At the present moment, I know perfectly well, there is only one single dredge on this continent able to do the work at St. John, owing to the difficulties of that work, due to the difference in the height of the water through the action of the tides. I think it is of advantage to the country that we should have a dredge capable of doing this special work.

Mr. AMES. This feature of the dredge that she was to be a seagoing dredge was not brought out before, I believe. I was about to point out to the minister that it would take about eighteen months to complete this dredge, and, as he has said it would take about eighteen months to finish the work from Batiscan to Quebec. So he would have at his disposal the fleet of dredges engaged in that work. But, if they are not sea-going dredges, I can see why he should have need of a new dredge of that kind. But that point, as I said, had not previously been brought out.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is a very important part of the channel, between Quebec and Montreal, which will call for the work of almost the whole fleet of dredges, except the suction dredge, 'J. Israel Tarte.' Below Cap à la Roche the material to be taken out is so hard that it was thought the work could not be done except by reinforcement of our elevator dredges. There are three or four elevator dredges that we proposed to put on this Cap à la Roche work, and it will take them probably three seasons to bring that work to a conclusion. I explain this in order that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) may understand why we shall not have the fleet of dredges available for other work for about three years.

Mr. AMES. Is it the intention of the department to keep a separate account of the money spent for wages, material and sub-contracts that go into this dredge, so that we may be able to understand, when the dredge is completed, exactly what she has cost ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. When I took over control of the shipyard at Sorel, the first thing I did was to have an inventory made of the stock there. Then I had some expert accountants look through the books to see how the expenditure had been divided and controlled. I must say that I discovered no records that would show exactly how the expenditure was divided amongst the different pieces of work. Of course, there was no urgent necessity to do so. But it became a necessity for the department under my control to have the books so kept that we should charge every cent of expenditure to each boat or dredge that would come into the yard, the simple reason for that necessity being that we were doing work not only for ourselves, but for the Depart-

ment of Public Works. I have organized a system of bookkeeping by which every expenditure is charged to the special work to which it applies. If we repair a dredge we know exactly what those repairs cost; if we do a piece of work for the Department of Public Works we know what we should charge against them for it. So, it goes without saying that every expenditure on this new dredge will be entered on the books in such a way that we shall know exactly how much that dredge costs. Of course, a fair average is charged for all machines and other things that have been provided as a part of the general equipment.

Mr. AMES. So, when the dredge is completed the minister will be able to give us an exact statement of what she has cost?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Absolutely—unless of course, the books are not kept exactly as the men have been instructed to keep them.

Mr. AMES. And the minister will be able to give us from time to time a statement of the work turned out by the Sorel shipyard so that we may see whether the sums appropriated to the shipyard yield a return in manufactured and repaired articles?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Exactly.

Mr. AMES. That is important because it is necessary that we should know from time to time whether the work can be done cheaper by contract. And in this connection, I would like to ask if the minister considers the advisability of having this dredge built by contract, and, if so, why he decided in the negative?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This question has received the serious consideration of the superintending engineer, Mr. Cowie and he has consulted upon it the superintendent of the shipyards who is also a competent engineer. They came to the conclusion to do the work as we are doing it; as to the material and certain parts of the machinery to ask for prices before undertaking to do the work. All this has been thoroughly studied and we think that in doing as we have done we shall have the best satisfaction.

Mr. AMES. There is one other feature to which I would call the minister's attention. I see that this item of $100,000 is to be charged to capital account. That is to be borrowed money and to be included in the consolidated account of the country. Now, the dredge it appears to me, should not be charged to capital account because it is practically a tool, a machine, which after several years labour will necessarily be discarded and sold for old material. I think it should be chargeable to income, because it appears to me that it is not justly classed with such permanent works as the excavation of canals or the construction of railways.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been the practice of the government, under different administrations, to treat these expenditures as this is being treated. All the dredges and all the boats are charged to capital account, and the question has not arisen in this case why there should be a change of policy. This dredge will certainly be such a fixture that will last the lives of many of us. It will be nearly all of steel and the machinery will be very heavy and of the best construction.

Mr. AMES. The minister is probably aware that the most up-to-date business houses are in the habit of crediting themselves with a certain amount as representing machinery and then charging all machinery purchased to replace it to merchandise and not including it in the assets of the firm. The best business acounting is carried on in that way, and the Dominion of Canada ought not to be second in its methods of bookkeeping. At present while the government is enjoying an increasing revenue each year, it is possible for it to improve upon past methods. I would suggest that the government should establish a precedent in this direction and be more particular in charging items of this kind to income and not to capital. The fact that we may have charged them to capital in the past is no excuse for doing so in the future. We look to the government, with its ample revenue, to establish precedents in the right direction and here is an opportunity for them to do so.

Mr. BLAIN. How much would it cost to operate a dredge of this kind for a year and how many months during the year does it operate?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It operates about five months in the year and it is pretty hard to say how much it will cost to operate it. When the main estimates were being voted, I gave the figures which it would cost to run these dredges, and I can tell the hon. gentleman the approximate cost of running this dredge by taking as comparison our experience with the 'J. Israel Tarte' dredge. That is not the same kind of dredge, but it is doing the same work. We can work the dredge from the 15th May until the beginning of November, about five months. You cannot work the suction pump when it is frozen but you can work the elevator two or three weeks later. The 'J. Israel Tarte' we generally took in after four and a half months. She is only a suction dredge.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister made some reference to a change in the system of bookkeeping at Sorel shipyards, is there any system of auditing the accounts at the different government works?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We generally send one of the staff of the accountant's branch twice a year to the different works to audit the books. The accounts are transmitted here and the books are kept at the works for convenience sake. A duplicate of everything is sent to the department at Ottawa. Last year I sent a chartered accountant to Sorel to audit the books and see that everything was kept in good order.

To provide for permanent piers on Lake St. Peter and other places in the ship channel, including Beaujeu bank, $115,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Steps were taken by the department this season to inaugurate winter navigation, or at least to extend the season of navigation as much as possible in the spring and fall. For this purpose the floating lights, such as are largely used in the River St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, are worse than useless when there is ice in the river. To enable any steps in this direction to be taken, it is necessary to have points, such as the turns in the dredged channel in Lake St. Peter, permanently marked by structures that will stand the ice pressure during the winter and the running ice in the spring. It has also been the custom to remove many of the lighthouses in this stretch of water in the fall and replace them in the spring after the ice has passed down. This of course cannot be done in future, and the foundations of these lights must be extended above high water mark and strengthened sufficiently to resist the ice. The amount of $115,000 is asked for to commence these improvements, including the construction of a similar pier at probably the most critical point in the river below Quebec, namely, at the sharp turn at Beaujeu bank near Crane island. The plans and specifications for this work have been prepared, tenders called for, and the contract has been awarded to Messrs. Griffing & Desnoyers, the lowest tenderers, for the sum of $25,000. The necessary expenses for examining the site, for preliminary services, and for the necessary superintendence and inspection during the construction, will add at least $2,000 to this amount. It is contemplated to construct four piers during this season. The cribwork is already done and these piers will be constructed at points on Lake St. Peter where they are necessary. We will then be able to install lights which will remain there during the whole winter. Since two or three seasons we have demands made by the steamship companies, which had steamers in Montreal after the 15th November, not to remove the buoys. We took the risk, and as late as the beginning of December ships were towed out to sea by tugs or vessels belonging to the Marine Department. This state of affairs cannot continue. If we are to have navigation as late as the beginning of December and even late in December—some years until the 1st January—it is necessary to have these piers and permanent lights at different points. That is an improvement which the shipping people have been asking for years. The two first that were installed were installed below Quebec at each end of the Traverse and they have given so much satisfaction that we have decided to build another one at Beaujeu bank. The work has been planned out, and tenders called for, and the contract will be given. It will be installed next season. Four other piers are under construction at Lake St. Peter and will be finished for the close of navigation this fall, so that we may be able to take away the buoys which are now only installed for the season and still have navigation prolonged late in the season.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that this is a new work and the plans have been approved and tenders called for. Who authorized this work? What right had the minister to spend the people's money without asking the consent of parliament?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was part of the contemplated expenditure last year. Beaujeu Bank was specially mentioned as one of the works to be done and tenders were called for according to law. As regards the others, the work was begun by day labour by the employees of the department, in the ordinary way.

Mr. HENDERSON. From the wording of the item I take it to be an entirely new work. It reads thus: 'To provide for permanent piers in Lake St. Peter and other places in the ship channel, including Beaujeu bank, $115,000.' This does not appear to me to be the continuation of any work that had been previously undertaken, but something absolutely new, something that has originated since we last met in parliament, something that does not seem to have been contemplated, but that is a new idea of the minister and has originated entirely with himself, something that he thought he would carry out on his own account. It was a small matter, only $115,000, and the minister with his extraordinary ideas of self-importance, thought it was not worth while to consult the members of this House as to whether $115,000 of the people's money should be spent on this little job or not. Now, I wonder when we are going to get through with this kind of procedure, when the time is coming that ministers will learn that they are simply the servants of the people and not their masters, that they have no right to put their hands in the public chest and take out the people's money without asking the consent of the people. I think that time has come now. How are we going to succeed in stopping this continual drain from the public treasury? Is it any wonder that the revenues of this country are being exploited to the extent of $70,000,000 or $80,000,000 a year, when parliament has practically lost

all control of the expenditure of the country? I do not like the idea of rising in my place day after day and drawing attention to matters of this kind, but I conceive it is the duty of members of this House to do so. I hope that by continuing to do so ministers will come to understand that they have a duty to perform, and that duty is, in the first place, to consult parliament as to what public works they should undertake. I need not tell the minister how that thing is done. In the first place, they come to the House and ask for an appropriation, they commend a certain kind of work. If the House approves of the work and votes the money, then it becomes the duty of the department to give effect to that resolution by carrying out the work. If parliament says in its wisdom that the work is not desirable, or that the cost is going to be too great, then, of course, they refuse the appropriation, and that will be an instruction to the minister not to continue that particular work. Now, the minister has intimated that in some way this is connected with a previous vote. If so, it is something that the House has not heard of at all, at any rate it is a very vague connection, and the minister cannot justify himself in committing the country to an expenditure of $115,000, when, by bringing down an estimate at any time after the 15th of January last, he could, if it was a feasible work, have obtained the sanction of parliament, and could have gone on in the regular constitutional way to expend the money. Here we are in the month of May, after being in session for nearly five months, and we are told that the minister has decided to do a certain work, that it is going to cost $115,000, that he has called for tenders and the work is practically going on. Of necessity it will have to be finished by the 30th of June, otherwise this vote will not be available. Now, I think we are getting too much of this kind of thing, and I trust the minister will not humiliate the House to the extent he has been doing in the past. This occurs every year in the departments. The House is practically told that they are merely here to register the acts of the government, not to be consulted, not to be taken into the confidence of the government and asked whether this expenditure is reasonable or not, whether the country can afford it or not, but simply to register what they in their majestic minds think it to their advantage to do as a political party. I hope the minister will not ask us to vote any more estimates like this ; if he does, I shall be obliged again to draw the attention of the House to the fact that such a mode of expending the people's money is not a constitutional mode.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can relieve the anxiety of my hon. friend. As regards the Beaujeu bank, the work was contemplated and mentioned during the discussion of the estimates last year. As a matter of fact, that work has been going on since September of last year. Fortunately, that was included in the general expense of construction of aids to navigation. There was no special vote for the Beaujeu bank, but it was among the improvements contemplated. The expenditure of the department has been large, but the department has not done worse than other departments, it has striven to do the best possible with the amount available at its disposal. The work had to go on. It was contemplated in the ship channel vote, for which there was an amount of $80,000. We thought we would not be doing anything against the constitution or against the public interest in taking advantage of a number of men being out of work and putting them to work at Sorel in the shipyard, preparing for the installation of these piers, so that they could be finished at the end of this season. If we had not done so, we would probably have lost one season. Part of the work had to be done under water, and it had to be finished before the close of navigation. So that really we do not deserve the censure of the hon. gentleman. This is one of those works that, when started, must go on, even if there is no money voted by parliament, because otherwise the country would suffer loss if the work was not done at the time and in the manner contemplated. If we have a vote of half a million dollars and, in going on with the work that was contemplated when we made that estimate, we exceed the amount, the general practice is that we come before the House and ask for so much additional for that work. I could have done that easily if I had wanted to mislead the House. I could have stated that in order to complete the work of the ship channel as contemplated by the expenditure which was asked last year $115,000 was necessary ; but no, I wanted the House and the country to know what we were doing in improving the channel, so that nothing would be done in the dark. Probably it would have passed easier if I had just stated that the $115,000 was required to complete the work of the ship channel. On the contrary, I came openly before the House, and I think I should be given credit for acting openly in the interests of the public.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am sure we will all give the hon. minister credit for boldness in acting openly. Even when he gets very far astray he is not afraid to do that. He tells us that this is a continuation of the work for which an appropriation was obtained last year under the heading 'Aids to Navigation.'

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last year there was a good deal of distinction made between Aids to Navigation and the ship channel. The ship channel was not under my control until the 1st of July, so that this amount for piers on lake St. Peter was

supposed to be paid out of the amount of $500,000 voted for the ship channel. The work at Beaujeu bank was contemplated to be paid for out of the vote for aids to navigation. In order to make it clearer we have put the item in such a way that everybody can understand it.

Mr. HENDERSON. If the hon. minister himself understands it nobody else in this House does. I think he has mystifyed the matter as much as possible. He commenced a work part of which he tells us is being paid for out of the vote obtained for the purpose of improving the ship channel while another portion is being paid for out of money which, was voted for aids to navigation. Then he comes down with apparently a new item entirely for the construction of works we never heard of before :

To provide for permanent piers in Lake St. Peter and other places in the ship channel, including Beaujeu bank, $115,000.

How can any hon. member of the committee connect that with the estimates that were asked for and voted last year ? For my part I never would have suspected that there was any connection whatever, and I think the hon. minister is drawing upon his imagination very largely when he attempts to make this connection. It seems to me that it is rather an after thought. It is one of those adroit methods he has of pulling the wool over the eyes of the members of this House when he gets into a tight corner. I give him credit for that. He is an adept at that sort of thing, but notwithstanding that I stick to what I said before. This seems to me to be an entirely new item, something which has originated since we last met in parliament, something that was not provided for in the session of last year and something which should not have been undertaken until this vote was obtained and the consent of the House also obtained to the expenditure of the money. The reason I have made reference to it is because we find that there is a great tendency year after year to expend money regardless of the feelings of the members of this House, without considering whether the country approves of it and without regard in fact to any kind of economy. How is the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) going to provide means for carrying on the affairs of this country if the ministers in the various departments are going to proceed with the construction of works of which he has no knowledge and of which he has no information at the time he makes his estimates for the expenditures of the year ? It seems to me that it is heaping a great deal of trouble on the hon. minister whose duty it is to provide all the money that is necessary for carrying on the affairs of the country. To my mind it is not treating that hon. gentleman with fairness, and I hope the day will come when he will call his colleagues to account and ask them to be good enough to confine themselves to what parliament has voted in the expenditure of the money of this country and not continuously to draw upon the future for funds which the hon. Minister of Finance has had no opportunity of providing.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) says that he has been spending money and that he wants the country to know what he is doing and what he has done with its money. Well, I may tell the hon. minister that the country does not care a cent for information of that character. Every year items of this kind come before the House ; we are tormented almost to death with items of $50,000, $150,000 or $200,000 and every hon. minister appears to have a good reason for paying out the people's money. I tell you that the country does not care a cent when a statement of that kind is made to it. You know what was done a few years ago with the money which this House voted for the Seven Islands scheme. What can you call that ? Then, we had the Grande Vallée scheme. I would ask the hon. minister not to imagine that the people are anxious to be told of expenditures of that kind. They are not, and if the hon. minister thinks they are he is greatly mistaken. The country does not care to hear of them and they do not like to pay for them. These hon. gentlemen expend half a million here or $300,000 there and then when we call attention to it we are criticised from the other side because, as these hon. gentlemen say, we are detaining the House. Well, I say gentlemen you are the servants of the people and you are no more than the clerks of the people. You have the Minister of Finance to collect the money for you, he pays it out to you and then you go and pay it out to your Grit friends all over the country. That is just the way it stands. In all these works that you propose to do and particularly in connection with this dredge, there will not be a Tory employed. It will be a Grit shop and a Grit dredge. If a Tory goes there and asks for work he will be told that there is none. It is just the same as it is on the Transcontinental Railway, or on the Grand Trunk Pacific as we call it sometimes. A Conservative cannot get work on the Transcontinental Railway. The government will send to New York and engage Italians and Hungarians rather than give a white man work. That is the way the government tries to blindfold us ; they are spending half a million a year doing work on that ship channel and it has got to be a farce. Formerly they were dredging between Montreal and Quebec but now they are dredging away down the gulf, and they are spending money building dredges that are fit to go to London. We have a right to complain of this and we will continue to complain until the government give up doing wrong.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item is 'to provide permanent piers in Lake St. Peter and other places in the ship channel.' How many piers are to be erected in Lake St. Peter and how many elsewhere ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are four in Lake St. Peter, which will cost more than the $78,000 in this vote, and will have to be provided for as to the balance in the supplementary estimates for next year. I think the report of the engineer states that he contemplates putting piers at each bend of the river, which would be about eight or nine altogether.

Mr. TAYLOR. You say there are four to be erected in Lake St. Peter ; where are the others ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They are not to be built out of this amount of $78,000, which will not cover the expenditure on the four piers.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was nothing said about these piers last year, and therefore this is the first time that the question has been brought before the House. The minister has undertaken work which was never approved of by parliament, and that system must be condemned.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The item of $581,000 last year for the ship channel had in view the establishment of these piers.

Mr. TAYLOR. We do not know what it had in view, but we heard nothing about these piers.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I cannot tell what was stated by the Minister of Public Works, who asked for the vote last year, but probably no details were asked from him.

Mr. COCHRANE. You contracted for jobs that were not approved by parliament.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was approved by parliament.

Mr. COCHRANE. How could it be approved by parliament when we never heard anything about it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are lots of things approved by parliament that you hear nothing about.

Mr. COCHRANE. They are approved in your mind, and the people have to pay for them.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the item of $580,000 many works were included, probably two or three hundred items, and if the minister were not asked about each item he probably would only mention the most important, which was for the dredging. I had a list before me this year, and if I were asked I would have given each item which made up the $580,000, and I suppose the same thing was done last year when the $581,000 was voted for the ship channel.

This year I took the precaution of putting in the item to read 'River St. Lawrence ship channel, Marine Department,' and as there was need of $115,000 more for the ship channel, I explained how the money would be expended to the 1st July.

Mr. COCHRANE. The expression 'ship channel' is misleading.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I did not invent it.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise. When you speak of a ship channel, it means to the ordinary mind that you are dredging that channel, but you are now using this money to build permanent docks.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. These are permanent piers to install lights at the bends of the river.

Mr. COCHRANE. Then it is for lighting the channel ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is always considered as part of the ship channel.

Mr. COCHRANE. It has no connection with the making of the channel at all, and therefore the expression is misleading.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. All works pertaining to the channel have been considered as ship channel works.

Mr. MORIN. For my part, I cannot see that these piers will be any help whatever to navigation. I have seen the St. Lawrence below Quebec clear of ice as late as the 27th day of December, and yet navigation had been closed for over a month. When the time comes for navigation to close in the fall of the year the ships will cease to go up the St. Lawrence, and this expenditure is simply a waste of money.

Mr. BLAIN. When were these contracts let ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is only one contract let. We simply prepared the cribwork preparatory to the installation of the piers, and the four piers are being erected by day's work. The first pier was included in the expenditure last year under the head of 'aids to navigation.' Tenders were asked in September last year, and the contract was let some time afterwards. It was for $25,000, which was the lowest tender.

Mr. BLAIN. That was let about the time of the general election.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, I think it was after the general election. At any rate, it does not make much difference ; there was not enough difference to kill a cat. Public tenders were asked through the newspapers, and there were only two tenders, one of $25,500 and the other $25,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was the successful tenderer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Crevier & Lemoine. The other was Dussault & Lemieux.

Mr. BLAIN. When is the work to be completed ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think by the 1st of September. The contract was given at the end of the season in order to give the men a chance to prepare their cribwork in the winter ; but nothing is to be paid until the crib is sunk and put in place.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why could not all the cribwork for the different lights be let by tender ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We thought it was better to employ our men of the shipyard at Sorel to prepare these piers in the winter on the ice. We thought it was more economical.

Mr. INGRAM. The cribs are prepared by the government employees, and the filling is done by contract ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No filling in is given out by contract. We intend to do the concrete work. The steel superstructure will of course be done partly by the shipyard and perhaps partly outside ; I do not know exactly. But the four piers on Lake St. Peter we intend to stall by day labour as much as possible.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is the material obtained with which you fill the cribwork ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. By public tender. There is rough stone for filling and broken stone for concrete, all got by public tender.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is the material obtained ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The lumber has been obtained at different places. I can give the hon. gentleman a complete list of the different tenderers. The cement has not been delivered yet.

Mr. INGRAM. I wanted to know where the broken stone was obtained.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know where it is obtained, but a man named Beauchemin of Sorel is the lowest tenderer. The price is $1.80 a ton.

Mr. HENDERSON. Do you buy broken stone by the ton or by the yard ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. By the ton.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems a very peculiar way.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the contract specify that the broken stone shall be bought by the ton instead of by the cord ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I never heard of stone being bought by the cord. Toise, the hon. gentleman means. The cord is not a legal measure in the province of Quebec.

Mr. INGRAM. That is news to me. I understand that it is bought by the cord in other provinces, and it seems to me that is the proper way to buy stone for cribwork. Do the specifications call for stone of any particular quarry ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We do not care where the stone comes from so long as it is good and acceptable.

Mr. INGRAM. I am simply asking for information. The government, then, does not specify any particular quarry ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. LALOR. I never before heard of stone being bought by the ton. Would the minister give us an idea of what a yard of stone weighs or what a ton measures ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. A yard weighs a little over a ton and a half.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the price of $1.80 a ton is equivalent to $2.70 per cubic yard. I am sure the electors of this country will not like to hear the price of that stone.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think they will.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the man who has the quarry will be delighted, but the minister has been led very far astray in regard to the price of broken stone.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may say that a week ago I bought some at the same price for my own use.

Mr. LALOR. This was large stone for cribwork ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Stone broken by machinery for making concrete.

Mr. INGRAM. The gentleman who has that contract has a bonanza far better than the Klondike.

Mr. LALOR. What facilities were afforded at this particular place for weighing the stone ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was weighed with a scale.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister said, in answer to a question from this side of the House, that this item of $115,000 would not be used for other places than those on Lake St. Peter, and yet as the item reads, the whole of it might be used elsewhere. If the minister's explanation is correct, I think the other words should be struck out.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I am satisfied ; let them be struck out.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. If I figure the price out rightly, it will amount to $12 per cord. The average price in Ontario would be about $4 per cord of 128 cubic yards.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know of any measure of that kind.

Mr. LALOR. I have had a good deal of experience in contracts, including government contracts, and I never heard of such a price paid for stone in my experience as that paid by the government in this instance.

Compensation in full and final settlement of all claims to the heirs of the late Joseph Paul, of the hydraulic dredge 'Jos. Israel Tarte,' who was accidentally killed by the explosion of a boiler November 3, 1903, $4,000.

Mr. BARR. How is it that this has been standing so long ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This session there was an investigation before the Public Accounts Committee to ascertain the cause of the accident. It was ascertained that there was no defect in the boiler but that the explosion was due to the carelessness of one of those who were killed. The Department of Justice held that consequently the government were responsible to the heirs of this man and recommended a settlement in the following manner. $1,000 was paid to the widow and $3,000 paid to tutors in trust for the children.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. minister expect a similar claim from the blowing up of the Scout ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think we will be obliged to pay something. When the item for repairs and expenses of service, item 87, comes up, I will be in a position to give full information as regards the claim.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the investigation over ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Further amount required for maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers and ice breakers, $75,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The amount voted for maintenance and repairs to Dominion steamers last year was $375,000. Since then two steamers, the 'Montcalm' and 'Champlain,' have been added to the fleet. The expenditure to the 30th April was $318,252, leaving a balance to the credit of the appropriation of $7,069. This balance has been held over for the payment of the wages of the crews, and in consequence there has been an accumulation of accounts for maintenance and repairs. The department has now four ice breakers in commission during the winter, and the fuel consumption of these steamers is very large. There is also a balance due for repairs to the 'Lady Laurier.' It will be remembered that this ship met with an accident going to the harbour at Lockeport and immediate repairs had to be made. Part of the cost was paid out of the appropriation of 1903-4 and the balance out of the appropriation for the current year. This was an altogether unforeseen accident and was charged to the vote for maintenance. The 'Stanley' and 'Minto' had also to have large repairs to machinery and engines to get them ready for the winter's work. The 'Stanley's' boilers were retubed and extra propeller blades imported from the builders for both these ships. The amount asked for will bring the appropriation this year up to $400,000, the same amount as is asked for next year. Last year it was pointed out that $325,000 would not be sufficient.

Mr. AMES. The minister will remember that on the 20th February I asked for a return with reference to supplies ordered by circular in connection with the maintenance of these Dominion steamers. That return is not yet down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I inquired this morning if all these papers had been laid before the House and was told they had been. I shall make further inquiry and bring down any that may be missing.

Mr. AMES. I understand that a return was ordered on the 13th February concerning the purchase of supplies and on the 20th February a similar return was ordered. Those two have not yet been brought down.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If not, I shall bring them down before getting through my estimates.

Mr. INGRAM. The cost of maintaining these steamers is growing pretty fast—at the rate of $100,000 every year. Last year it was $306,094 and now it is $400,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The number of the steamers has increased also. Formerly we had only one ice breaker and now we have four.

Mr. AMES. Is this $75,000 in addition to the $325,000 previously voted and will it enable the department to reach the end of the current fiscal year without any deficit ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Will the hon. minister give a little information as to the success of the experiment of sending an ice-breaker to Newfoundland to assist in-coming vessels ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Montcalm' was sent to Newfoundland to help steamers coming in, but unfortunately none of these steamers which were coming in had any Marconi apparatus on board and the apparatus was not working at the station. Therefore the 'Montcalm' was not able to get communication with the other steamers so as to be able to assist them. So, really, the trip was of no effect on account of there being no Marconi system on ships coming in.

Ocean and river service—to provide for the construction of new boilers and repairs to hull of steamer 'Aberdeen,' $17,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Late last fall when the 'Aberdeen' came into winter quarters in Quebec we found that her boil-

ers were out of order and had to be entirely renewed. We asked for and received a tender for the work from the Polson Iron Works. The tender was considered reasonable and we sent the boat to Toronto. She is being fitted with the boilers and is expected to be ready in two weeks.

Mr. INGRAM. Were tenders advertised for in the public press ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, they were a special boiler,—Thorneycroft Watertube boiler. Nobody but the Polsons could tender for them. Had we not done this we should have been obliged to send the steamer to England. The tender received was considered reasonable and was so reported by the special expert, the late Douglas Stevens.

Mr. INGRAM. What could be the object of asking for tenders, when as the minister says there was only one firm ? And this is another case where the contract was entered into before the money was voted.

An hon. MEMBER. More of that.

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, that is becoming quite common with this government.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Would the hon. gentleman expect us to delay until the vote was passed and so lose the whole summer of the boat and be obliged to hire another boat to do the work ? I think that would be rather poor policy on the part of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the department allow its steamers to get into such a condition that they are likely to explode so that the renewal of boilers becomes a matter of emergency ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was a matter of emergency.

Mr. INGRAM. If so, it is no wonder that we have explosions such as that in the case of the 'Scout.' We have boilers that are allowed to get into such condition that they cannot do their work and then the government must order renewals before the money is voted, instead of keeping boilers properly inspected and arranging for expenditures in due time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The boilers were properly inspected. As I have stated it was the end of the season and our officers thought the boilers should be renewed. We took the precaution to have them renewed so that the boat would be ready soon after the opening of navigation. Had it not been that the boat was delayed in the Soulanges canal by the ice she would have been ready now. Unfortunately she was caught in the ice, and we had to wait until the 1st of May to send her to Toronto to get the work done. The work is being done and will be completed in a fortnight.

Mr. AMES. It seems to me that this method of spending money before it is voted by parliament could be avoided by the several departments by including in their estimates a certain sum for unforeseen emergencies, to be expended by them at the discretion of the council. I think that would be much preferable to the system of calling for the money after it has been illegally spent. I am sure this House would be willing to vote a sum to each department that might be used to meet unforeseen emergencies. Parliament undoubtedly has the right to declare in advance whether the money shall be spent, and no cabinet, and no minister has the right to spend money which has not been voted.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I concur in the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames). The spending departments of the government have been considering such a scheme, though we have not yet perfected it. It is a most awkward thing when, at the end of the season, some unforeseen expenditure becomes necessary. It is always open to all sorts of criticism. If we could come to such an understanding as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) suggests, it would be in the interest of the public and of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. In the face of an unforeseen emergency making expenditure necessary, the department can always fall back upon a Governor General's warrant.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think the House was in session when we wanted the money.

Mr. SPROULE. In such a case, parliament can be applied to for a vote.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It would take too long ; it would lose the whole season.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that the government would be justified in drawing upon the public exchequer when the parliament is in session. The House never refuses to vote money if there is urgent need for it.

Ocean and river service—further amount required for investigations into wrecks, $2,000.

Mr. AMES. Is this for additional salaries and, if so, to whom is it to be paid ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, it is not for salaries. Parliament, voted $2,000, but the expenditure has been $4,317.95.

To pay Captain James Harrison, master of the steamship 'Grecian,' an allowance for expenses incurred by him in connection with the investigation into the stranding of the ship in Halifax harbour on February 19th, 1902, $750.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why is this ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. About two years ago an investigation was held in connection with the loss of the ss. 'Grecian' at Halifax. At the inquiry held Captain James Harrison's certificate was cancelled, but he subsequently went to England and appealed and his certificate was returned to him.

He now complains of the grave injustice that was done him and asks that his costs may be refunded to him. The appeal was instituted by the Scottish Shipmasters' Association, who consulted the highest legal authority and obtained an opinion that the master was entirely blameless in connection with the casualty to the ship. The expenses incurred by Capt. Harrison and the Scottish Shipmasters' Association amounted to the sum of $200. It would appear that Captain Harrison took a pilot on board before coming to Halifax harbour and gave full charge of the navigation of the ship into the port to the pilot. I may say that pilotage in Halifax harbour is compulsory, that is to say: the pilot is taken on board full pilotage dues are paid, but on the other hand, if the pilot is not employed only half pilotage can be collected from the ship. In England, pilotage is absolutely compulsory, and if a captain does not employ a pilot he renders himself liable to be fined or imprisoned. The Canadian law differs in this respect from the English law. The Canadian law, does not take away the responsibility from the captain, even when a pilot is on board, whether compulsory pilotage or otherwise. In England, under the compulsory pilotage, the pilot takes full charge of the navigation of the ship into port and, therefore, for any accident that may occur the pilot is solely to blame. It is a question whether the Scottish Shipmasters' Association and the legal authority they consulted, were acquainted with the Canadian law in connection with the compulsory pilotage. The department has, however, decided to refund Captain Harrison £150, towards the expenses he incurred in England and the loss of salary during the suspension of his certificate. It was more a question of fair play towards this captain than anything else. There was no legal obligation, but we thought that for the sake of the reputation of the department and the reputation of Canada we would not stand on a technicality, but we would pay the expenses of this captain in defending himself before the courts.

Further amount required for winter mail service, $3,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This service cost more last year than usual on account of the severity of the winter and the increased difficulty of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. BARR. Is the minister making any extra preparations for the coming winter? It is contended that all was not done last winter that could have been done in order to convey the mails backwards and forwards, that there was negligence on the part of the authorities. As we have no reason to suppose that the winters are getting any milder, I would like to know if there is any way of improving this service in order to make it more effective than it has been in the past?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last winter was more severe than usual, and navigation was interrupted a longer time than in any other year in the history of navigation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. There was no negligence on the part of the captains of the steamers, and no one has ever charged them with negligence; they did the best they could under the circumstances.

Further amount required for the extension of the coast service and surveys on the north and northwest coasts of Canada, $65,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is a very large item, and we would like some explanation. Is there some new expedition to be fitted out, or is it a continuation of what is already in existence?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is a continuation of the expenditure connected with the expedition of the 'Arctic' last year. We shall have to send a boat with coal, provisions and men to join the 'Arctic.' This boat is supposed to leave in June and return by the end of July, bringing back some of the men who are sick and disabled. She will also carry some men to complete the equipment of the 'Arctic' and to station at the posts.

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me we are spending a large amount of money in that region. I am not complaining of the amount at all, but it would be interesting to the House if reports somewhat extended could be given to the House that we may know the result of this expedition.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries he will find an extensive report by Mr. Low, made on his return last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am much obliged to the hon. gentleman for drawing my attention to that. I had not seen it. I was looking rather for some special report. Anything we can learn about that northern country will be of great interest.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the hon. gentleman will take communication of that report he will get a great deal of information, because it is very elaborate and complete.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask the minister how far northward the 'Arctic' has gone? Is there any attempt to get away into the region of the North Pole, so as to take possession of the islands lying north of the continent of North America, in the name of the King, and setting aside for ever any claim that the United States or some other country may make in that region of the world? We desire to avoid any complications such as we had in the case of Alaska. Is this expedition commanded by Captain Bernier?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Captain Bernier is the sailing master of the 'Arctic,' the expedition is commanded by Major Moodie.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have certainly a great deal of confidence in Captain Bernier's ability to sail those northern waters, or to sail waters in almost any part of the world. I think it is a great pity that the government did not avail itself some years ago of the services of Captain Bernier in exploring the northern regions of the continent of America. Even had they granted him the assistance which he came and pleaded for year after year, with a view to make that final effort to discover the North Pole, and thus advertise Canada all over the world, I think the government could have spent $100,000 with a great deal of satisfaction in that direction. We are now spending hundreds of thousands of dollars in surveying a portion of the coast of North America, which I think will bring very much less of interest to the people of this country than would have resulted from an expedition toward the Pole with a view of making that long coveted discovery. Now, here is $65,000 this year. If I mistake not, this expenditure already has gone up to the hundreds of thousands. As I said, I am not complaining about it, I think perhaps it may be money well spent, if it will be the means of preventing complications between ourselves and our neighbours to the south of us, who are also pushing out in that direction with a view to claiming something in these northern regions which we may not have laid our hands upon. I simply express my regret that the services of Captain Bernier were not obtained years ago, and that he was not placed at the head of an expedition that would once for all have settled the question of who was entitled to the sovereignty of those islands lying between the North Pole and the presently known continent of North America.

Mr. SPROULE. This is an item of $65,000. Will this be in addition to the amount which we voted last year for the same expedition ?

Mr. HENDERSON. This is supplementary.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The sum of $170,000 was transferred from the Northwest Mounted Police to the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the Hudson bay expedition. Out of that amount the department paid $29,018, balance due the High Commissioner in London for the purchase of the steamer 'Gauss,' afterwards called the 'Arctic.' The total sum paid for the 'Arctic' was $70,000 and $40,982 was paid out of the appropriation for 1903-04. The balance of the amount transferred from the Northwest Mounted Police was expended in fitting out the 'Erik' as a relief steamer for the 'Neptune.' The 'Erik' was charted from Job Brothers & Company, St. John's, to take coal and supplies to the 'Neptune.' The 'Arctic' was fitted out and provisioned at Quebec and it was found that the funds at the disposal of the government were not sufficient to meet the expenditure. Besides the 'Arctic,' the department had to make repairs to the 'Neptune' after it returned to Halifax. The 'Neptune' unfortunately met with an accident coming out of Hudson bay and the department was obliged to place the ship on the marine slip at Halifax for repairs. It was found besides damages to the bow that part of the keel was knocked off and other damages were sustained which required to be renewed. The amount asked for is required to meet all liabilities in connection with the expedition up to the 30th June.

As regards the remarks made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that we should have given charge of the expedition to Captain Bernier, I beg to disagree. The question of these expeditions was discussed two years ago and the first expedition was sent out under the charge of Mr. Low. It was composed of a certain number of members of the Northwest Mounted Police, because the government thought they should establish a post up there. Mr. Low made a report of the work he did and a certain number of mounted police were left there. While he was up there we thought we would send a boat, the Arctic,' up for three years to survey and visit the different points in Hudson bay, to go as far north as possible under the orders of Major Moodie, establish posts at different places, make researches, gather information and establish customs offices at different points because there is a great deal of fishing by Americans going on there. The instructions issued to Major Moodie were published at the time. They left in the month of September. They wintered at Fullerton bay. We received some letters and information from them by land during the month of April. The information that we received from Major Moodie was to the effect that some of the men would have to come back. Nobody had died, but some of the men were sick, some were unfit for service and a certain number of mounted policemen would have to be sent out to relieve them. In order to carry out the plan which was adopted by parliament another boat will have to be sent up there to take in coal and provisions as well as the men who are required to replace those who will have to be brought back. I think, after all, the best mode of asserting the authority of Canada in Hudson bay is by establishing posts in different places under resident officers of the government and by having our organization completed as much as possible with due regard to the right of the people who may be up there.

Mr. SPROULE. What has been the experience in regard to the navigability of Hudson bay and Hudson straits? I saw some time ago in some of the papers that the conditions had been found to be much more favourable than had been anticipated.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were not specially charged with that because there is in some departments of the government a report made some years ago by Captain Wakeham who was sent specially to ascertain the possibility of navigating the bay and the straits and the length of the season of navigation. I have not the report before me, but I know there was such a report made about five years ago, and there was also the report of Lieutenant Gordon made in 1881.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this expedition not charged with the duty of making observations as to that?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, they are charged with the duty of making observations and of obtaining all the information possible. We have no report yet as to that specially, because all we have received are some letters making urgent demands and not going into details.

Mr. INGRAM. How many officers are employed in connection with the 'Neptune'?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are none.

Mr. INGRAM. No officers?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no 'Neptune.' There was one sent up, but she has returned. That was the boat obtained in Newfoundland which was sent up there previously to the purchase of the 'Arctic' to explore the northern part of Hudson bay. She was under the command of Mr. Low whose report is to be found at page 116 of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. INGRAM. I have here quite a lengthy report signed by A. P. Low.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. This expedition appears to have taken place in the summer of 1903.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, that was the first expedition that was sent up.

Mr. INGRAM. Exactly, and he speaks of some small repairs to this boat. I understood the hon. minister to say that there were very extensive repairs made to this boat.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They were found to be extensive afterwards when they put her on the slip.

Mr. INGRAM. I know they put her on the slip, but it says here that the repairs were very small.

The ship was immediately placed in dry dock at St. John, where a few small repairs were made to her underbody, after which she was speedily sent to Halifax, arriving there on the 20th.

That would indicate that the repairs were very small.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That was before she sailed. The repairs to which I have reference were made at Halifax after Mr. Low had left the boat, I think.

Mr. AMES. There was an item in one of the newspapers—I thought that I could put my hand upon it, but as I cannot do so I will have to trust to my memory in quoting—which appeared within the last day or two intimating that Mr. Low had refused to go to the north because the department would not give him the 'Neptune.'

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The hon. gentleman refers to something which appeared within the last few days?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was a misapprehension. The papers were mis-informed. We do not intend to send anybody this year to do the work which we suppose the 'Arctic' will do. The 'Arctic' will have two seasons yet to patrol Hudson bay, this season and next year so that we thought there was no reason to send out the 'Neptune' this year to go over the same ground the 'Arctic' will go over. We will satisfy ourselves with sending simply an ordinary freight boat which we will hire, to carry the men that we are going to send to the 'Arctic' and the necessary supplies of coal, &c. That is what created the impression that Mr. Low has refused to go except in the 'Neptune.' We do not ask Mr. Low to go with any other boat, but we are not sending the 'Neptune' so that Mr. Low cannot go. We have the steamship 'Arctic' there already and so there is no necessity to send another similar boat.

Mr. AMES. Is there any truth in the statement that Mr. Low considered it was not safe to take his crew in the boat the department wanted to give him?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Low is not asked to take any crew, because the 'Neptune' has her own crew, and she is a rather expensive boat. As there was no necessity for exploring the same waters the 'Arctic' is going to explore next season and the season following, we thought it would be a saving to send a freight boat with its own captain and its own crew. In that way Mr. Low will not go.

Mr. TAYLOR. What boat are you getting?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have not decided; we are asking for prices.

Mr. AMES. Is it true that the department, on the advice of the hon. member for

Halifax (Mr. Roche), has decided to charter the 'Havana'?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is no such decision. We have asked Captain Patterson his charter price for the 'Havana' for freight purposes, and he made a proposition which is not satisfactory. He wanted to charter the boat at so much a day, and we wanted to rent her for the round trip. We have not closed yet with Captain Patterson.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is he the only gentleman you inquired from?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. We have inquired everywhere in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand that the 'Havana' is the only boat asked to give a price?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No; we have been inquiring for two months for prices in order to send a boat up there. We want a boat to carry supplies to meet the 'Arctic' and come back. It is not for an expedition, and we consider that the 'Neptune' is too expensive for that work. We may be obliged yet to take the 'Neptune' if we cannot get any other in Canada, but any way there is nothing decided.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it is purely a departmental affair, and it is not within the power of any members of the administration as a piece of patronage?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Not a bit of it. We try to get a Canadian vessel.

To pay an honorarium to Mr. A. P. Low for his services as commander of the expedition to the north and northwest coasts of Canada, $1,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What is Mr. Low's salary?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. He gets $1,800 a year, and every one knows that a man would not spend seven months in that isolated country without receiving something. Captain Wakeham and Captain Gordon, who were both employees of the government, and who were sent to the Hudson bay, were each voted an honorarium.

Mr. INGRAM. This is given as an extra on account of his taking the trip?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes; he is in the employ of the Department of the Interior as a technical officer.

Mr. SPROULE. As the House sat late last night and as to-morrow is a holiday, I suggest we should adjourn now.

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is a reasonable suggestion.

Some resolutions reported.

VACANCY IN LONDON.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have been notified that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the electoral district of the city of London, Ontario, by reason of the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by Charles S. Hyman, to wit, the office of Minister of Public Works. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up at the next sitting?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed in Committee of Supply with the estimates of the Minister of Militia, and later we will resume the estimates of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, May 25, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

VACANCY IN LEVIS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a notification that a vacancy has occurred in the representation of the electoral district of Lévis, by the death of Mr. Louis J. Demers. I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

QUESTIONS.

DISALLOWANCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ACTS.

Mr. SMITH—by Mr. Louis Lavergne—asked:

1. What are the reasons for the disallowance of the British Columbia statute entitled 'An Act to regulate Immigration into British Columbia'?
2. Was there any mention of any race discrimination in the Act?
3. What are the reasons for the disallowance of the British Columbia statute entitled 'An Act relating to the Employment on Works carried on under Franchises granted by Private Acts'?
4. Was there any mention of any race for discrimination in the Act?
5. What are the reasons for the disallowance of the British Columbia statute entitled 'An Act to further amend the Coal Miners' Regulation Act'?
6. Did the Act prohibit Japanese from employment in mines?
7. Was any discrimination made except Chinese?
8. Was the statute intended to safeguard the lives of English-speaking miners?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). These Acts were similar to Acts that have been passed already during the last few years, and have been disallowed for the reason that they were ultra vires and not in accordance with Dominion policy.

R. AIME TISON.

Mr. DESJARDINS (Translation) asked :

1. Did one R. Aimé Tison obtain from the Government a position in the Dominion Printing Bureau ?
2. If so, at what date ?
3. What is his salary ?
4. On whose recommendation was he so appointed ?
5. Has the said Tison passed the Civil Service examinations ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Translation) :

1. Yes.
2. On the first of May, 1905.
3. $18 a week.
4. The Secretary of State.

LOBSTERS IN JAMES BAY.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government made any investigation as to the existence of lobsters in James bay, or any of the waters of Hudson bay ? If so, what have been the results ?
2. Has the government any information from private individuals as to the existence of lobsters in the waters of James bay, or any of the waters of Hudson bay ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. Yes ; the investigations carried on in these localities involved inquiries into fish life, and no trace of the existence of lobsters was found.
2. No.

LIGHT AND WHISTLE AT POINT LEPREAUX, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Who is at present in charge of the light and whistle at Point Lepreaux, New Brunswick?
2. When was he appointed ?
3. Who had charge of this light and whistle prior to the appointment of the present incumbent ?
4. How long has he been in office ?
5. What amount had he contributed to the superannuation fund, and during how many years ?
6. Why was the late incumbent dismissed ?
7. Was there any investigation ? If so, by whom was it held ?
8. Has any superannuation been paid ? If not, why not ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. George H. Thomas is lightkeeper ; Robert Lewis Belding is the engineer of the fog whistle.
2. The keeper was appointed in 1884 and Robert Lewis Belding was appointed engineer by Order in Council of April 11th, 1904.

3. George Thomas was the former lightkeeper. Frank Frauley was the engineer of the fog whistle.
4. The lightkeeper has over twenty years' service. Robert Lewis Belding, the engineer, took charge on the 1st January, 1904, and has had over seventeen months' service at the station.
5. George Thomas, the former keeper, paid about $125. Frank Frauley, the former engineer, did not contribute to the superannuation fund.
6. The lightkeeper and the engineer were not dismissed.
7. There was no investigation in either case.
8. The former keeper was in the service in 1898, when he died. Frank Frauley, the engineer is still in the service of the government, but does not contribute to the superannuation fund, as lightkeepers entering the service after 1st July, 1882, are not eligible for superannuation.

PATENT MEADOW CREEK RANCHING COMPANY.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has any lease or patent of lands in the Northwest Territories been granted to the Meadow Creek Ranching Company ? If so, when, and upon what terms ? If a lease, for what period, and upon what conditions ?
2. How much land was granted or leased ?
3. What is the annual rental charged therefor ?
4. What is the class of land covered by such lease or patent ?
5. Who applied for such lease or patent, and when ?
6. Where, when and how was the Meadow Creek Ranching Company incorporated ?
7. Who are the incorporators so far as known?
8. Have the lessees or patentees any cattle on such lands ? If so, how many ?
9. Is such transaction in accordance with the policy of the Department of the Interior ?
10. If not, what, if any, exceptional circumstances existed to justify the transaction ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. An application has been made in the name of the Meadow Creek Ranching Company for a grazing lease. The conditions have been complied with, and a lease will be issued in due course.
2. 4,800 acres.
3. The regulation rental of 2 cents per acre per annum.
4. The report of the inspector shows that the land is not fitted for agricultural purposes.
5. John R. Craig, as manager of the company, 18th April, 1904, and 27th December, 1904.
6. Have no information as to the incorporation of the company.
7. The names of the members of the company are not known by the department.
8. The inspector's report showed that the applicant had stock on the land, but did not give the number.

9. Instructions have been issued not to grant further applications for grazing leases pending an examination into and possible revision of the regulations.

10. The lease is being granted under the regulations then in force, there being no exceptional circumstances.

ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. WALSH asked :

1. Has this government the right to dispose of and grant titles to the islands lying in the St. Lawrence river opposite the Indian Reserve of St. Regis ?

2. Has any correspondence taken place between this government and the Quebec legislature on the matter ?

3. Has any understanding been reached in regard to it ? If so, what is the arrangement or understanding ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The islands in the St. Lawrence river, opposite the St. Regis Indian Reserve, are under the control of this government for the benefit of the Iroquois band of St. Regis, and the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs has the right, under the Indian Act, to sell or lease after surrender by the Indians ; or, in the case of an Indian who occupies an island with the consent of the band, the same may be leased at his request, without surrender.

2. No correspondence has taken place between this government and the Quebec legislature in the matter.

3. No understanding has been had with the Quebec government or legislature regarding the disposition of these islands.

POSTMASTER AT STE. MARGUERITE DE DORCHESTER.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. What were the reasons for the dismissal of Louis LaFlamme, postmaster at Ste. Marguerite, Dorchester county, province of Quebec, by the Post Office Department ?

2. Who recommended his dismissal ?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). It was discovered that the postmaster at Ste. Marguerite de Dorchester had during a considerable period of time improperly disposed of postage stamps, with a view to the illegal inflation of the revenue of his office and to his thereby obtaining payment of a larger salary than he was legitimately entitled to. For this reason he was dismissed from office. The dismissal was purely departmental and not made on the recommendation of any person outside of the department.

SUPPLY—SALE OF ISLANDS IN GEORGIAN BAY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. WRIGHT (Muskoka). I would like to draw the attention of the government to the condition of affairs in relation to some islands in the Georgian bay adjacent to the shores of the districts of Muskoka and Parry Sound. I understand that there have been some differences of opinion between the Dominion government and the Ontario provincial government as to jurisdiction in reference to these islands, and I would like to know whether any arrangement has been arrived at. If they are under the jurisdiction of this government I would point out that some of these islands adjacent to the township of Baxter and in that neighbourhood are assuming some considerable commercial importance. There has been a demand for these islands for summer hotel and summer residence purposes. The development of this territory is of considerable importance to some of my constituents who live on the mainland adjacent to these islands. These people find work there and also find a market for commodities which they are in a position to supply. It is of very great importance to them that these islands should not find their way into the hands of people who will hold them for speculative purposes ; it is important to them that this district should be developed and opportunities given to those who wish to build there and develop that section of country. I think the question is of sufficient importance to justify me asking the government whether they have any settled policy with regard to the disposition of these and other islands that may be under the control of the Dominion government which are somewhat similarly situated. There should be some fixed policy and I wish to ask the government what that policy is.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The hon. member, as I understand, has asked as to the course taken by the Indian Department in dealing with those islands. I may say that I was courteously given notice some days ago of the intention to make this inquiry and I have asked for the preparation of a memorandum on the subject which I shall take the liberty of reading to the House in answer to the question asked. The memorandum is as follows :

The islands on the east shore of the Georgian bay south of Moose Deer Point are claimed by this department on behalf of the Indians, Chippewas, of Lake Huron and Simcoe, who, on the 5th of June, 1856, surrendered them to the Crown to be sold for their benefit.

The first sale of islands under this surrender was made on the 24th of March, 1884, and a number of islands were sold between that date and 1887, each application being dealt with on its merits.

In 1887 the department decided as to disposition of islands generally in the following manner :

One purchaser to be allowed an area of not more than 25 acres, when an island of larger area could be conveniently divided.

As regards smaller islands, 5 acres in extent, only one to be sold to the same person, and in case of very small islands when contiguous, one purchaser to be allowed two islands.

For islands of 10 acres and over the price was $1 per acre cash.

For islands less than 10 acres, when only one was sold, the price was $10 cash, and where a purchaser was allowed two small contiguous islands the price of the two was $15 cash.

The purchaser was required to furnish at his own expense plan, description and field notes by a qualified surveyor of the island or islands applied for.

Under the above arrangement sales of a number of islands took place up to September, 1895, when it was decided to temporarily withdraw from sale the islands in the Georgian bay under the control of this department, exception only being made in cases where the survey had already been made or had actually begun. Surveys of the islands in question were made by Mr. Charles E. Fitton, Ontario Land Surveyor, Orillia, and J. G. Sing, Ontario Land Surveyor, Meaford, under instructions given them on the 4th and 17th of June, 1896.

In July, 1897, it was decided to dispose of by tender the surveyed islands in the Georgian bay, and tenders were accordingly called as per advertisement, copy of which is attached hereto. They were islands situated in the Georgian bay, opposite the townships of Baxter and Gibson in the district of Muskoka and the township of Tay in the county of Simcoe. On the 30th of July, 1897, a protest was received from the Hon. A. S. Hardy, Attorney General for Ontario, with request to either postpone the sale until a conference could be held upon the subject, or entirely abandoned, and the sale was abandoned pending settlement of question of title to the islands.

In October, 1901, the question of the disposition of islands was under consideration when the minister decided that if the islands were sold all previous applicants must be considered in order of priority or the islands must be sold by auction. A number of sales have taken place to first applicants or their assignees with the consent in each case of the Ontario government at the upset prices placed on the islands by the surveyors.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. About how many ?

Mr. OLIVER. The list of sales extends over the period from March 24th, 1884, to May 11, 1905.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. I think it was about the year 1895 that my attention was called to these islands by a number of persons who wished to become purchasers, and I at that time saw the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, or the Deputy Minister, in reference thereto. It was then decided as the minister states to withdraw all these islands from sale. I had never understood that in 1901 the then minister had made any announcement that there would be a sale of these islands either publicly or by tender, and I was rather surprised to learn later—because I live in the neighbourhood—that the government had commenced to dispose of these islands in a manner detrimental to the interests of the Indian Department which is mostly interested. To-day the minister stated that in the case of the St. Regis reserve he would not make any sales unless with the consent of the Indians, and yet his department is selling these islands now without any consent on the part of the Indians. The department is simply throwing them away, and I need hardly say that they are thrown away to party friends. In looking over this list I see that lot 38 Island 144 Baxter township is sold to F. W. Grant for $140. May I ask the minister is that Mr. Grant a brother of the hon. member for North Ontario—well I may tell the minister that he is. I can tell the minister further that if this valuable island which is sold to this Mr. Grant for $140 were to be put up for public auction now, I have no doubt it would bring $800 or $1,000. There is about 40 acres in the portion of the island sold to Mr. Grant, and I know that islands not nearly so advantageously situated, and also points on the mainland are being sold for $75 to $100 per quarter acre. And yet, here is the pick and choice of the whole of these islands given away to the brother of a member of this House for the paltry consideration of $140. Has the minister any applications in his office for this very island ?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not make inquiry on that point ; I merely made inquiries as to the points covered by the question. I would imagine that applications in the office have been dealt with. I understand from the information given that the islands were surveyed by the surveyors mentioned and a valuation placed upon them, and that the applications for the purchase of the islands were dealt with in the order of priority and the islands sold at the prices fixed by the surveyors when they made the surveys.

Mr. BENNETT. Had it not been for the political upset in Ontario the minister would never have been troubled about these islands, because I find from inquiries made at Toronto that this Mr. Grant and other gentlemen of the same political faith had been endeavouring to steer deals through the Crown Lands Department, but that when the political change took place in Ontario it drove them to come to Ottawa. I am going to ask the minister : Has the patent issued for the grant of this lot 38 to Mr. Grant at $140 ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that at the moment, but I will find out and give an answer later.

Mr. BENNETT. I made inquiry at the department the other day and over the signature of Mr. Pedley, I got this answer :

Letters patent have issued to Messrs. James Hall Telfer and Pringle Kerr Perry for lot 38, concession 4, township of Baxter, situate on Baxter Island, and a sale has been made to Mr. F. W. Grant of lot 38, concession 13, Baxter Island.

Might I ask the minister : Have the Indians consented to these sales being made, as he stated to-day was required in the St. Regis case ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware of the facts of the matter, but I take it for granted there must have been a general consent given by the Indians to these sales as far back as some time previous to 1884, or, the sales which have been made since that time would not have been made. I have not asked for that information, but of course I can get it. I would certainly say that the system of dealing with these islands which has been continued for 21 years may fairly be considered to be in accordance with the usual policy of considering the wishes of the Indians before it was acted upon.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister is unfortunate in this, that that policy was departed from, because on the remonstrance of myself and others in the year 1895, the islands were withdrawn from that process of giving them away for almost nothing. They were then advertised and bids asked for, and no one objected to that system of open sale. I remember that several friends of mine went up there and looked over the islands, and I can tell the minister that had the islands been sold when the sale was advertised an honest price would have been obtained, because there would have been keen competition. That was in 1897 before a single hotel had been built in that neighbourhood where there are now three or four; before a house had been built where there are now several splendid houses, and when there was no regular boat service while to-day there is a good boat service. The minister will see that in 1897 the then minister withdrew these islands from sale and was intending to make an honest sale of them. Then came the protest of the Ontario government and in 1901 the minister announced that the policy to be followed was that persons who made prior applications would first be considered. That was fair. If a man had gone on to these islands and built a house it was only fair that he should have the first chance to tender. The minister (Mr. Oliver) cannot go back to what happened twenty years ago, because his own predecessor said in 1897 that the policy of dealing with the islands was unfair and that there should be an open sale. It is also unfortunate for the minister that most of these purchases are strong political friends. D. S. Pratt, figures for island 35, I do not know what island that is and I cannot conjecture its worth. It is a rather striking thing that from the 23rd February down there have been some five grants of these islands. There was a perfect real estate business done by this Mr. Grant who is now an applicant for this island and I regret to see that it is handed over to him. They were stopped with the Ontario government from getting these islands, and of course they had to follow down here to Ottawa with the rest of the army of grafters. Here we have forty acres sold for $140, when I met a gentleman here yesterday who had paid at the rate of $75 for a quarter of an acre on the mainland which in point of position was very inferior to this valuable island. Might I ask if the minister made this grant of island 38 on the 11th May?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer at the moment; if I did I must be responsible for it.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the minister in office on the 11th May?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly I was in office and acting at that time.

Mr. BENNETT. Had the minister made inquiries of his department he would find that in 1897 the then Minister of the Interior stated that there was to be an honest sale of the islands, free from political pull and that they should be sold open and above board. Then came the conflict of authority between the local and Dominion government. Then came the principle laid down in 1901, that any person who had made a prior application for any of these islands would be entitled to the first chance of purchase. Now, I will state, and it cannot be contradicted, that this Mr. Grant had made no application in 1901, and that the minister was acting against all the precedents in his department. This is a particularly desirable island, one of the very choicest, as is borne out by the fact that here and at Toronto, I am informed from a search that was made, about half a dozen people were after this island; and from some of the names, I know that they were people who would be prepared to pay a large price for it. The minister has in his department to-day an offer of $450 for this island which he is selling for $140. I met a friend in my town a few days ago who asked me if these islands were being sold. There is a suspicion around that they are being sold in this underhanded manner, and at prices which are not fair and honest. I would ask the minister, was not application made to him personally by Mr. Grant, the hon. member for North Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. I answer most unreservedly there was not. I had no knowledge of Mr. Grant in the transaction. If the sale went through since I took office, I suppose I must be responsible for it.

Mr. BENNETT. Since the minister cannot unreservedly say whether or not the application was made to him personally by Mr. Grant, I assume that is the way it came about.

Mr. OLIVER. Excuse me. I said most unreservedly that there was no interview between Mr. Grant and myself in regard to this matter.

Mr. BENNETT. Nor correspondence?

Mr. OLIVER. There was no correspondence between Mr. Grant and myself either

personally, by letter or in any other way. My first knowledge of it is from what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the minister came into office and found that his predecessors had laid it down that there were to be no grants or sales of these islands in this manner, and yet he overrides this decision. I believe the minister has an offer for this very portion at an increased price; and yet he is selling it, in defiance of the Indian law—because I think I am within the facts when I say that there have been no surrenders on the part of the Indians of these islands. May I ask the minister finally, in regard to lot 38 on island 144, sold to F. W. Grant for $140, whether, if the patent has not been issued, he will cancel the sale, and cause this and other islands to be offered for sale publicly and above board ?

Mr. OLIVER. I can hardly be expected to make a definite answer to a question like that on a legal point at such very short notice; but I would think that, the arrangements having been made before I took office, it would be only proper that I should carry out those arrangements. If I find that to be the correct state of the case on inquiry, I will certainly not cancel the sale to Mr. Grant.

Mr. BENNETT. If that is the stand the minister is going to take, I am rather surprised. I had expected different from the hon. gentleman. When his attention is called to the fact that he has in his department to-day a letter offering three times the price for this island at which it is being sold to Mr. Grant, he proposes to carry out and consummate this deal. Whether the minister wants to accept my assurance or not, I can tell him that if these forty-five acres were put up to public sale to-day, I believe over $1,000 could be realized for them. It is unfortunate if the hon. gentleman should start the work of his department with actions of this kind in that part of the country. In the Public Works Department, as I said before, nobody up there expects anything straightforward, above board or honest; in the Marine and Fisheries Department it is the same; and if the Minister of the Interior is going to make a record for himself in that part of the country which will be on a par with the records of these other departments, he will pretty nearly excel the conduct of the Ontario government in regard to the Crown lands there. While there may not be as speedy an investigation of these matters as there has been of the Crown lands affairs in that part of Ontario, I can tell the hon. gentleman, from what I have seen of some of the revelations, that they are going to be very spicy indeed, as to how the province has been defrauded for years of its Crown timber dues, and how the Crown authorities have endeavoured to cover up the frauds. I expected better things of the hon. gentleman; and yet he is going to hand over this island for $140 to the brother of an hon. gentleman who has already made inroads on the Department of Marine. The hon. gentleman was in the House last session when it was shown that through the influence of the hon. member for North Ontario and this very applicant, the timber on Hope Island to the value of $3,000 or $4,000 had been given away to a party friend for a paltry $100. It is true, this is perhaps not as big a steal as that was ; but I am sorry to see that the minister has no disposition to nip in the bud transactions of this kind when they are pointed out to him as plainly as this has been. His conduct will not commend itself to his political friends in that neighbourhood ; and I need not say it will not commend itself to his political opponents. I know of Liberals who are anxious to buy these islands, and all they ask is that they shall be sold openly and above board, instead of being disposed of in the way this has been, at the cost of the general public for the benefit of some party hangers-on.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, if I have the privilege, I will only say that my hon. friend has taken care to leave upon the House the impression that there have been improper transactions in connection with these lands in general, and this island in particular, and has as far as possible connected myself with these alleged improper transactions. I will not follow him in that line of argument. I merely want to place the rights of the case, as I understand them, before the House. My hon. friend has seen fit to say that the department was trespassing upon the rights of the Indians in selling these lands. That is a very serious allegation, to which I certainly would not wish to be subject; but I would point out to the House that if the department of to-day is guilty of that offence, the department of 1884 was the one which in the first place was guilty of it and continued to be guilty of it until 1896. My hon. friend will notice, in the list of sales, a series of sales which took place in March, 1896. As to the statement made by my hon. friend that a special case is made of this particular island, part of which is being sold to Mr. Grant, I do not think the record will bear out his statement. I think the list of sales which has been placed in his hands demonstrates very clearly that his statement was absolutely and utterly unwarranted, and that there have been sales to others under similar circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister allow me to state that I find that Mr. Telfer was granted part of the same island for $240 and I would give twice as much for the part which Mr. Grant is getting.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not the point I was dealing with at the moment. I hope

I shall be allowed to make my statement continuously. What I said was that the hon. member, in making the statement that Mr. Grant was being dealt with in an exceptional manner in that a sale was being made to him under circumstances under which sales were not being made to other people, was making a statement of which he had the proof to the contrary actually in his hands and under his eyes at the time.

Mr. BENNETT. I call attention to the fact that there was another political friend, Mr. Pratt, given an island for a paltry $30. I do not know this particular island, so that I cannot express an opinion upon it.

Mr. OLIVER. I say the hon. gentleman is absolutely unwarranted in making the statement because he had the proof to the contrary in his hands and under his eyes. As to the method of sale, I have not been administering the department long enough to become familiar with all the details, but when I find that a certain system has been in vogue for a number of years I do not feel free to change it before making fair and reasonable inquiry. According to the memo. put into my hands, the method pursued in selling the islands is this : A valuation was placed upon them by the surveyor at the time of the survey, and sales are being made at the price so fixed, and the applicants get the preference according to priority. That may not be the best way but it may very well be accepted as a fair way, and had it not been for exceptional circumstances, such as the establishment of summer hotels on these islands, that valuation would probably stand good to-day. But, possibly, owing to these exceptional circumstances, it has varied to such a degree as to make desirable a revaluation and a revision of the system. In 1897, the minister then administering the department made preparations for a general sale of these islands by auction. At that time the government of Ontario intervened and successfully intervened, though on what grounds my memo. does not say. The intervention of the Ontario government prevented the sale. I submit that the administrator of the department is in a somewhat difficult position. If he should wish to sell the islands by auction, there comes an objection from the government of Ontario which claims to have some right in the islands. Then when he proceeds to sell them at private sale, at the price fixed by surveyors, to applicants in order of priority, he is met with objection. I would respectfully ask what hon. gentlemen opposite suggest should be done with the islands ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it considered that the government of Ontario had any right to intervene ?

Mr. OLIVER. According to the memo. in my hands, the government of Ontario intervened to prevent sale by auction, I do not know the reason.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister should have full opportunity of making himself acquainted with this subject. I would suggest that when he comes down again, he should be prepared to answer all reasonable questions. Why is it now the policy of the department to sell these islands by private sale when up to a certain time the policy was to sell by public tender. I do not see that the intervention of the Ontario government has anything at all to do with that question. The government can come to a conclusion as to the extent to which it will regard the wishes of the province of Ontario, but surely it cannot allow that province to control it. What we are concerned with is that these islands should not be disposed of to friends of the administration at one-third or one-quarter of what other people are willing to give. That is what I would like my hon. friend to explain when bringing down further information.

Mr. OLIVER. I was proceeding to say that after the Ontario government intervened and stopped the sale by auction, the department afterwards offered them at private sale at the public schedule prices, with the consent of the Ontario government, and that again is objected to. I ask how are the islands to be disposed of ?

Mr. BENNETT. In 1897 they were not put on the basis of so much an acre. I remember several of them were tendered for by friends of my own and they were put up to the highest bidder. Nobody has any cause to complain of that. And had this been put up to the highest bidder, though it was not worth one quarter as much then, it would have brought $400 or $500. To-day it is worth twice as much.

Mr. TAYLOR. When was the valuation made by the surveyor ? If it was about fifteen or twenty years ago, they were then worthless whereas now they are most valuable. If the government have gone on selling on the valuation of the engineers made twenty or thirty years ago, they are not selling them at anything reasonable compared with their value to-day.

Mr. OLIVER. The survey was made in 1895 or 1897.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The surveys of the islands in question were made under instructions given June 14, 1896.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I understood that the policy of the department was to put these islands up in small lots of not more than five acres. I would like to know the cause of the departure from that policy ?

Mr. OLIVER. The papers state that the regulation, adopted in 1887, was that the lots should not be larger than twenty

acres each ; that is if an island was larger than twenty acres, it was divided into lots and the price was fixed accordingly. Of the smaller, those islands, down to five acres, were sold separately. And where there were two islands of less than five acres near together, they might be sold together. What I wanted to say was that, apparently, there is some claim to a right in these islands on the part of the Ontario government.

Mr. BENNETT. They have given up their claim.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not so understand it from the terms of this memorandum ; for it says specifically that all these sales that have been made have been made subject to the approval of the Ontario government. So, I should fancy there still remains some claim as to the ownership of the islands and that, while that question of ownership remains, it is not possible for the Indian Department to dispose of the islands except with the concurrence of the Ontario government. If that is the fact, of course, this department may be to blame for not having arrived at a conclusion in regard to absolute ownership—there may be some fault to be found on that ground. But I submit that there is evidence before the House that the department have made reasonable efforts to secure the disposal of the islands at prices in the best interest of all parties.

Mr. EDWARD COCHRANE. Will the hon. minister allow me one question ? He appears to be somewhat confused why we should find fault when the Ontario government steps in and interferes with a sale by private auction. Now, somebody interferes when the minister sells by private sale. What I would like to ask is this : If he has power to sell by private sale, why has he not power to sell by public auction ?

Mr. OLIVER. The sale by public auction was the sale of all the islands. And, in that case, of course, the Ontario government's rights would have been——

Mr. COCHRANE. But if the minister has power to sell one island by private sale, has he not full power to sell them all by public auction ?

Mr. OLIVER. The difference is that the Ontario government might forego their rights in one island, but if the sale of the whole——

Mr. COCHRANE. Why don't you answer my question ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am answering it.

Mr. COCHRANE. You are going a long way around, so that nobody can understand you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With reference to the question asked a moment ago, by the leader of the opposition as to the interest of the Ontario government in these islands, I cannot say that I can give an explanation that will be absolutely satisfactory even to myself, because I speak from recollection and it is some time since I have refreshed my memory on the subject. I believe that in this case is involved the same question that was settled in the case of the St. Catharines Milling Company. I do not know whether my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) remembers that case. It involved a conflict of jurisdiction between the Ontario government and the Dominion government as to which could sell the timber on certain lands. It was claimed by the government of Ontario because all the lands belonged to the government of the province. On the other hand, it was claimed by the government of the Dominion because this was land reserved for the Indians and the Dominion has the management of the Indians. So there will be the same case here, and that probably is the basis of the Ontario government's claim that they were the owners of the land though that land was occupied by and administered for the Indians.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest that there cannot be any good reason which would enable us to dispose of these lands at private sale for apparently much less than they can be disposed of at public auction, and yet would prevent us from disposing of them in the regular way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a part of the question. That is another aspect of the question——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The practical aspect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That may be the more practical side of the case. At present, I would not be prepared to give an answer on the subject. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) will have to inform himself on the subject. At one time these islands had very little value. If they have increased it is only of late. The Minister of the Interior will look into the matter and give an explanation.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. When the Minister of the Interior brings down the papers on this subject, I hope he will include the correspondence between the Ontario government and this government in reference to the ownership of the island. I think that perhaps the same objection was made by the Ontario government as they made to the sale of certain islands of the St. Lawrence. I remember perfectly well that their objection was not that the Dominion government had not jurisdiction over the islands at all, but that, in the interest of the public of Ontario, all these islands should be reserved for common use. They made application, I remember, to the Dom-

inion government to make an offer of what the government would take for the whole of them. Their intention—not stated, but easily understood—was to reserve the islands as a park for the use of the general public. I am not in a position to state with certainty that the same point is involved in this case of the Georgian bay islands. But there is no answer to my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane)—if you have the power to sell at all why have not you power to sell by auction as well as by any other way ?

Mr. OLIVER. That was not his point at all.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the statement he made. The minister shelters himself behind the statement that these islands were offered at an upset price and given to applicants in the order of their application. But he must remember that the statement was made in this House by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) that that state of affairs should no longer continue, that the public would have the right to purchase the islands by competition. That was set aside as the Minister of Interior (Mr. Oliver) says, because of any protest in the Ontario government. But since that he has exercised the power to sell without informing the House as to the altered disposition of the department in reference to these lands. We had the statement made in the House that these lands would no longer be sold by public competition. Nothing has happened since that statement was made that prevents the minister from carrying out that promise. There has been no interference of the government of Ontario that would cause or excuse any such change. The minister says that we make the sales with the consent of the Ontario government. The consent of the Ontario government would only be as to the fact of sales. If the people of Ontario have any right in these islands, their interest must be, like that of the Indian Department. that the largest sum possible should be received from the sale of them. But, instead of that, the Minister of the Interior leaves himself open to the charge of favouritism by selling to a brother of one of the members of this House one of these islands at a price, as my hon. friend has said, only one-tenth of what should have been paid for it.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. If that matter is disposed of I would like to bring to the attention of the government another question—the scrip of non-resident half-breeds. My remarks on this subject the other day were intended to bring out information and not to take a one-sided or partisan view of the matter. To-day, my remarks shall be in the same strain. I am going to ask the minister to bring down certain papers in order to show up the whole transaction, so that we may find out the facts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In a strictly non-partisan way.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) looks rather quizzical when I make that statement ; but if he will watch, he will see that I do not go far beyond the strictly business aspect of it to-day. My right hon. friend will remember that in 1900 or 1901, this whole question of giving money-scrip and land-scrip to the half-breeds who had not been served before was debated in this House. That is the first point I make—that after the policy of the government was clearly stated, after objection to it by members on this side—and probably by some on the other side, though I do not remember,—and after a thorough discussion of that policy, the government's policy prevailed.

Now as a result of the conference with parliament—for that is what it was—the government got the right to dispose of a certain amount of the public domain towards the satisfaction of the claims of the half-breeds. It was upon that conference and public discussion in parliament that the first commission was appointed, of which Mr. McKenna was a prominent member, though I think the commission consisted of three, or four, or five, and I am quite certain there were others besides civil servants or employees of the government on it. It was a general commission. That commission went all over the ground—that is the second point I want to make—they visited the localities they conferred, after due notification was given with all and sundry who were interested, heard the evidence, made their investigation and came to their conclusions. That report was handed in in 1901, it was approved by Order in Council on the 6th of June, 1901. Now what were the principles laid down, after discussion in parliament and the revelation of the government's policy, and after that policy prevailed ? I am not going to take up every point of it, but on one point it was explicit, that with reference to certain half-breeds, those, for instance, who were not resident in Canada, who had gone to the United States and had gone upon the Indian or half-breed reservations there, and were supposed to participate in the advantages of the residence in the United States on those reservations—it was absolute in this respect that their claims were not to be allowed. I will read a summary of the report :

The claims of such half-breeds, namely, half-breeds who were born in the Northwest Territories between the 15th of July, 1870, and the end of the year 1885, the claims of such half-breeds were not prejudiced on account of their residence outside of the Northwest Territories, provided their parents had been permanent residents of the Northwest Territories at the time of their birth, but under clause 6 of the regulations subsequently established and approved by Order in Council of the 6th June,

1901, half-breeds who had left Canada and taken up their residence on Indian reservations in the United States and participated in the benefits of Indian life thereon, as well as all half-breed children admitted to the United States Indian schools, were excluded from participating in the grant of scrip.

That is an excerpt from the report which was approved by Order in Council. Well, now, commencing after this public avowal of the government's policy, after consulting parliament with reference to it, and after the acquiescence of parliament, the government got the right to dispose of public moneys to the amount of $240 to each half-breed, and to give scrip to the amount of 240 acres of land to each half-breed entitled to it, to dispose of the public domain up to that amount. Now this went on for three years or thereabouts, when a change is made, and in 1904 this policy was absolutely reversed, and under the reversal of policy, the very class of claims which had been excluded, after discussion in parliament, after the investigation of the half-breed commission, after the approval of Council—that very policy and that very class of claims were reversed absolutely. On whose authority? Not on the authority of parliament, not even after a consultation with parliament that it was proposed to reverse that policy. Parliament was not consulted at all in the matter; but the minister himself, off his own bat, undertook to recommend that money and public domain which had not been authorized to be disposed of by this parliament, by conference or by acquiescence in any way, should be dispensed to a class of claims that both parliament and the government had declared should not participate in it. That is the second fact that I want hon. gentlemen to keep in their minds as we discuss it.

Mr. HAGGART. How did parliament declare it?

Mr. FOSTER. I take the ground that parliament declared it in this way: That the government did what was right before they undertook to dispose of a lot of the domain of the country and of the money of the country, and they brought the matter before parliament, and we discussed it fully. Now it was an acquiescence by parliament; whether any motion against it was moved. I do not know. If a motion against it was not moved, parliament approved of it. If there was no motion against it, then, after discussion, even though dissent was made, there was an acquiescence by parliament. It was not in the form of an enactment, because the Dominion Lands Act, I believe, is wide enough to cover even that, though I do not believe it ought to be—that is a point I will come to a little later. So I say it was really by authorization made, I am correct in saying it was with the acquiescence and assent of parliament at least. Now for three years that went on, when suddenly this change took place, on the initiative of the minister himself, on the 13th of August 1904. Now there might be sufficient reasons why a change should be made. There might be an agitation by those whose claims had been disallowed, thinking they had been unjustly treated, and that consequently their case should be taken up again. In the Order in Council authorizing it that is not given as a reason. It might be that friends of the half-breeds interesting themselves for the benefit of the half-breeds, would bring the matter before the government and make a plea with that old idea that the policy should be reversed and that these people should get their claims satisfied. That is not given as a reason in the Order in Council. The chief reason that is given by the minister himself is this, that it was an interference with vested interests which he did not believe ought to be any longer persisted in. Well, now, is not vested interests one of the most apparent forms of property which, from time immemorial, almost, under constitutional governments, has been discussed and is absolutely well known by governments, by members of governments and by members of parliament? The minister himself in the very Council and in the very parliament in which this former policy was avowed and in which it was sanctioned, the very members of the government, the keenest minded of them, were there then just as they are now; and other members of the government at that time, like Sir Oliver Mowat, like the Hon. David Mills and other men, legal men, well versed and old politicians, were there. The question of vested rights had no force in parliament in 1901, had no force in the cabinet in 1901, had no force all the time that this policy was being discussed and was being formulated and carried out. But suddenly, in August, 1904, the Minister of the Interior makes the discovery that there has been a gross abuse and violation of vested interests, and in his report to Council he recommends that this be reversed, and he opens a way by his recommendation to have all these claims taken up. Now what is the way in which he opens up the road to these claims?

When in 1900 it was proposed to give away the public domain or the public money and a commission was mooted, found favour and was adopted, it was a public commission which was appointed. Did the minister propose to appoint a public commission? No, in the Order in Council he recommends that an officer of his department, a private employee of the department, shall have the same power that the commission had in 1900, shall traverse this question and shall take up the claims which were disallowed under that commission, investigate them and report upon them. His name is Coté and I believe he was on the former commission or

secretary of it ; I am saying nothing against him, my point is that when the minister proposes to open a way to the giving away of a large portion of the public domain or public money he does not follow the precedent in the former case but appoints an employee of his own department and obtains authority to start him on examination. It does not appear from these papers that the employee so given such powers ever advertised to the public interested that he was going to undertake another investigation, ever travelled through the portions of country where these men would be found, assembled them together, took evidence or anything of the kind. I believe from what I get from these papers that all he did was to take the disallowed claims, go over the evidence that had been submitted and make his report therefrom. It does not appear from these papers that he advertised the claimants or the holdings of meetings at which to take evidence or that he took any new evidence and then he reports, and it is on this report of his that this action is taken. The minister has not brought that report down and I do not know whether it was ever given to the minister or to the council in the shape of a formal report or whether he simply gave his conclusions to the minister and to the council, but the conclusions are all that are embodied in the papers which I have. By the former commission I think 468 claims were allowed, and 388 were rejected. Mr. Coté takes up 375 of these 388 rejected claims and his conclusions are that of those 136 are to be allowed, 69 are to be held over for further consideration and are still pending, and the remainder about 170 are to be rejected. This is the new commission, a private party, an employee of the department who without advertising, without taking new evidence, seemingly without any authorization of any public investigation so far as we can tell other than that which I have mentioned, brings in the number that I have mentioned out of the claims disallowed by the former commission and reports them as having been allowed. Now what is the next thing that takes place. So far as I can learn that was done in August, 1904, but no notification of this was given in the 'Canada Gazette' until October, 1904. I think it was on October 15, 1904, that the Order in Council was published in the 'Canada Gazette.' The work was done in August, 1904. The resolution was confirmed by the Order in Council in August, 1904, but no public notice of it was allowed until October 15, of the same year. That is a point which is worth while taking into consideration as well. So far as I can learn—and I want to draw the attention of the minister to this—no notification was ever given to the half-breeds interested and no notification was given to the land agents ; there is no evidence so far as this intimation goes that the land agents were notified until March 10th, 1905. Now the most important circumstance comes in just here. As the memorandum states, as the Order in Council states, it has been the invariable rule of the department which was embodied in a regulation and passed by Order in Council that no land scrip of these half-breeds could be located without the personal attendance of the scrip holder himself. This is a most important thing to bear in mind because with people with traits of characted such as these have, amiable in many ways, but not of the most thrifty and frugal kind, it was, I suppose, found to be the only way in which they could be safeguarded from giving up their scrip improperly, or having it taken from them improperly and so the regulation of the department, authorized and approved by Order in Council, was that there should be no assignments, no powers of attorney with reference to this land scrip, that it should not be located unless located in person by the man to whom the scrip belonged and was granted and the most stringent conditions were imposed to insure that even if his scrip were transmitted to him it should be transmitted to him in a way which would ensure its being safely carried into his very presence and given into his very hand. But shortly after the passage of this Order in Council in August, 1904, in the month of December—no I do not see that there has been any letting up of that condition which I have stated in any other way than the way that I am about to bring to the attention of the committee. The only information, the first information which comes out in these papers, is that on the 10th day of March, 1905, a departmental letter was written to the Indian agents informing them that now and from that time on this land bearing scrip could be located without the personal attendance of the person to whom it was granted.

I want the Prime Minister to pay attention to this because I think it is a grave thing for us to consider, unless other information takes away from its gravity, and I am not going to say that there is not other information to be brought down. While the invariable rule was made so by a regulation approved by Council, there does not appear to have been any approval of Council to the reversal of that rule and to the carrying out of the policy of the departmental letter written in March, 1905. If I am correct and if this is all the information there is in this respect, the Minister of the Interior himself turned down the regulation made by Order in Council for the purpose of guarding the rights of the half-breed, and by his own ministerial will reversed that policy and intimated to his land agents that personal attendance was not longer a necessity. If that is so it is rather a grave matter ; there may be information which would make that different and if there is we would like to have it brought down. It was an Order in Council too, that in the matter of the assignments of scrip—referring to money

scrip I suppose largely but made generally—if there was one assignment and after it another came in and then another from different parties, it was an Order in Council that the first assignment was to be the legal one. On the 17th December, 1904, the Minister of the Interior had that rescinded by Order in Council and had left the whole matter as to which of these applications should receive his assent to his own will or his own whim. It was taken out from the Order in Council which would make it go before the council; taken out from the order which would rule him, and left entirely indefinite in his own hands. Now, I come to this other point. What reason was there why, after this policy had been settled on and carried out for three years, that in August of 1904, without a scintilla of evidence to show there was pressure by these half-breeds, the minister comes in and changes this whole policy. Why? No pressure, no public interests, no anything; nothing shown except the minister's scrupulous desire that vested rights should not be any longer violated as they had been. Nothing other than that his innate sense of justice and his burning indignation which after three or four years got to the bursting out point made it impossible for him any longer to sit in Council under the idea that the vested rights of these non-resident half-breeds should not be satisfied. The uncharitable view might be, and may be a view not uncharitable, that it was the near approach of the election that stirred the matter. The elections were held in November, 1904; on August 31, 1904, the pipe-line was commenced to be laid. What else happened? If it is true that any notification was given to the half-breeds themselves who were primarily and solely interested, that their claims disallowed in 1900 had been taken up again and were now allowed; if there was any notification by the government or by the department to the half-breeds, it does not appear. But it does appear that there was notification; if not notification that information percolated to various interested persons not half-breeds; persons not interested in the welfare of the half-breeds, not caring a bawbee for all the half-breeds put altogether, but who belong to that class of people that are always clinging on the skirts of the government trying to find out something to get on to that they may make a penny out of it. Well they got on to it evidently, for about that time—after August and between August and October when the first public intimation of this went out in the 'Gazette'—various things were taking place. A man turned up somewhere in Dakota affirming that he was an agent of the Dominion government; having various Dominion papers and forms about him. But a notable thing about it was that although he said he had come to investigate half-breed claims, the thing he wanted and the only thing he tried to get was an assignment from those who formerly had rejected claims, for his own person and in his own name. I cannot do better than read an item which I find in a newspaper, which states:

> Dunseith, North Dakota, May 13.—One of the most interesting sights North Dakota has been treated to for some time occurred a few days ago between this town and St. Johns, on the highway. Early last fall——

That was in the fall of 1904, after this pipe-line had been laid and before notice was given to the country that the pipe-line was laid.

> —a man came from Winnipeg who represented himself as being sent by Dominion government to take evidence in certain half-breed cases that were entitled to Canadian scrip. He was regaled with all the paraphernalia incidental to government officials, even to the very forms used by the government, and apparently supplied by the Dominion government. With a great deal of eclat he and his henchman and two hirelings from St. Johns took a great deal of evidence, but the evidence chiefly consisted in securing orders from the half-breeds for the delivery of their scrip, to which they are entitled, to this scrip buyer. He told them it might be impossible to get the scrip, but if he did, and it would entail a great deal of trouble and expense, he would pay them $200 each for it.

He was very generous.

> These orders were sent to Ottawa and the scrip in due time issued. Another Winnipeg man, Mr. Robinson, who appeared to know a good deal about scrip, and who had paid some of the half-breeds for their scrip some time ago, found out from Ottawa that much of this scrip was issued to another agent last November, and some of it even located on Canadian lands, came amongst us a few weeks ago to claim his scrip or a refund of his money. The half-breeds told him they had never received that scrip. Mr. Robinson showed them letters from Ottawa saying their scrip was issued and even told their sections of land it was located upon. Trouble began to brew among the half-breeds and indignation meetings were being held, when suddenly the agent appeared with some money—sufficient, he thought, to satisfy the more obstreperous ones. They refused to take $200 when they were worth $1,000. The half-breeds grew more indignant, and threats were made. Warrants were sworn out and an attempt made to serve the agent. An interesting chase occurred between the deputy sheriff and the agent for Rolla, each seeing who could get there first in order to secure the ear of the states attorney. Next day, at the hearing, there were some interesting developments, when many of the half-breeds swore they did not sign the orders upon which their scrip was issued. Theibert, who was supposed to be witness to all signatures, swore he did not see many of the half-breeds sign orders on whose behalf scrip had been received. It is said Mr. Robinson scored the agent very severely in his cross-examination, and as both parties were Winnipeggers, the attorney thought the civil part had better be fought out there, but the half-breeds are making up a fund to fight their cases, and some interesting developments are expected.

That is a telegram or a communication from Dunseith, North Dakota, dated May 13, and published in the newspapers. I give it to the House for what it is worth; it shows, however, there is some smoke and may be a good deal of fire down there over this matter. Now look at the peculiar opportunities given by the method in which this had been carried out. Just before the elections, in August, 1904, the way made easy; no notification of it to parties interested or to the public until the 15th of October; in the meantime the opportunity (which according to this had been improved upon) to interested parties who must have known of it in some way or other, of getting down among the half-breeds and urging them for assignments of their scrip, offering small sums wherever they could get it, and it is said collaring quite a large proportion of them. Competition takes place in a trade, and sometimes the same scrip is assigned or is supposed to have been assigned to different persons, and these claims clash. The two persons who got the assignment at different times send in their claims. The one who had a prior right formerly has no prior right now; that is absolished; everything is in the hands of the minister alone.

That is the statement of the case up to the present time, and it is rather a grave statement of the case, no matter whether it applies to the party opposite or to any other party. All of us in this House are interested in knowing either that this is false; or, if it is true, in finding a very speedy and very sure remedy for it. Look what takes place. One hundred and thirty-six claims have been allowed of these disallowed claims. Three years or three years and a half ago you notify these half-breeds that there is nothing more for them. Do they treasure up in their memories a hope of a reversal of that policy? It drops out of their memory, and suddenly, three years afterwards, some insinuating man drops in among them and tells them: It is quite possible I may get you some scrip; I do not know; but if I do, I will give you so much for it. They look on this offer as a God-send, and are glad to accept it. One hundred and thirty-six claims of 240 acres each amount to 32,640 acres. There is 32,640 acres of good land in the Northwest, the best it is possible to get, alienated in fact from the public domain, and for whose benefit? The benefit of the half-breed claimants? Not except in the slightest degree. For the benefit of the lucky individual who gets the information and who hustles when he gets it, secures possession of the scrip and makes the location. That is made very easy now, because it is not necessary to bring the half-breed up from North Dakota and have him make his location personally. When this question was being discussed in 1900, I remember taking very strong ground against that departure. I said to my right hon. friend: I will go as far as you will in giving the half-breeds their rights and giving them what will help them; but do you think you are going to help them by giving them scrip which they can sell, the day after they get it, for a bottle of whisky, or for $10, or even for $100? You give them land scrip, but do you help them if you put into their hands the right to sell it for a mere song? If the land scrip is given, it should be given to those who would go on the land and improve it, and the government should go to some expense in inducing the half-breeds to abandon their nomadic habits and settle on these lands. My right hon. friend agreed with the principle, but, as is so often the case, he did not agree with the practice of it. His argument was: What can we do with these people? After all, we do our duty towards them when we provide them with the scrip, and if they sell it for a mere song, that is their concern; we are rid of the responsibility. I did not think that was a wise or sufficient answer, or the answer which people who had really at heart the welfare of the half-breeds should have given. However, that was the answer given, and that was the way the matter was decided at that time. What took place? Four hundred and sixty-eight claims were allowed and scrip issued, each representing $240 in money or 240 acres of land. That was $112,320 in money, or, if in land, four or five times that amount, which was actually put into the hands of speculators. Now, the Minister of the Interior may know more about this than I do, or the members from the west may know more about it than I do; but I mention this. At the moment that commission went out, and just as fast as they travelled, at their heels followed the speculators or their agents, who dogged the commission, and drugged or whiskied or wheedled the men who got the scrip, and they had it in their pockets almost before the scrip was dry after being issued, or an assignment of it. Fortunately, after all, it did not amount to very much, because up to that time the man who had the land scrip was protected, because he had to go in person and locate the land. Four years ago I was myself in the Northwest, and I heard a tale which was not a fairy tale. Somebody noticed very early in the morning a light in the land office at Yorkton. I was there at the time. Inquisitive minds act quickly in small places, and it was found out what kept the land agent up at night and through the wee hours of the morning. What was it? It was the men who had been on the trail, party followers of this government, some of whom have been highly rewarded by this government, who had the scrip, had herded up the half-breeds, and had twenty or thirty of them there putting them through personally in the small hours of the night. What benefit did these half-breeds get? I venture to say that if an investigation were made to-day, it would be found that nineteen-twentieths of those claims fell into the

hands of knowing and friendly speculators within six months of the time that the commission sat. What is being done in these cases ? 32,640 acres of land, 240 acres for each scrip, that have to be located—for whose benefit ? The half-breeds ? Not a whit. For the benefit of the lucky one who got the information. How much has he paid for the scrip ? I do not believe on the average he has paid $100 for each certificate. Suppose he has, there are 32,640 acres of land which to-day is worth at least $6 per acre. In many sections of the country the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is not to-day selling a bit of land except to settlers at less than $6 an acre ; and the settler has to pay $5 an acre at the minimum, and $6 in a large part of the country. That land then represents a cash value of $200,000 ; and suppose that the minister, bold, audacious and unscrupulous, as he was—not my hon. friend who is sitting there, but his predecessor. My hon. friend cannot have all the honey without having some of the gall. If he takes the benefit of the office, he must take on his shoulders the iniquities of the previous minister. If the minister, audacious and unscrupulous as he was known to be, had come down with a proposition to take $200,000 of the people's money, and had got past the Auditor General, and had given it away to his friends, there would be something like a mild riot, though not on that side of the House. There might be some dissent on that side, but I verily believe the minister would look to his supporters to see him through. He would swear that vested rights were in question and that $200,000 was not too much to pay under the circumstances. But is it worse to take $200,000 in hard cash, unauthorized by parliament, than to take $200,000 worth of the public domain and alienate it without any parliamentary warrant ? My right hon. friend and the Minister of the Interior may plead that this is legalized by the Dominion Lands Act ; but if that power is there, ought it to be exercised by a government whose duty it is to guard the public domain and the interests of this country ? That is the way the matter stands. I am not going to condemn the Minister of the Interior ; I am not going to say anything harsher than I have just said, but what I want is to get the papers down and all of them. I want the three Orders in Council which are still missing. I want that departmental letter discussed March 10, usurping the authority of the government. I want all the applications for those scrip and the lands they represent and all the correspondence in that connection, so as to ascertain what force was brought on the minister from the outside to stir him up, if he was stirred up from the outside at all. In fact I want everything concerning this transaction. If the transaction turns out to be right, the department shall have the benefit of the adjudication, but it is now lying under grave suspicion. If this transaction is anything like what it is stated to be, it is time for this House and country to do a little serious thinking regarding the manner in which our public affairs are being carried on.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish at all to impede progress but I think it is only fair that a request for papers should be made in definite form so that we may know exactly what we are called on to produce.

Mr. FOSTER. I have made out a memo. of what I think ought to be brought down. If the minister thinks I am asking too much, let him say so. If he thinks I am not asking enough, he can supply what is wanting.

Mr. OLIVER. I merely make this request because on several occasions recently I have been asked off-hand for information, and the department is put at considerable disadvantage when such requests are not definite. No doubt it is the privilege of the hon. gentleman to criticise as severely as he can the conduct of the government and represent the action of any department in as unfavourable a light as possible, but in connection with this matter let me make this explanation. The first Order in Council defining the rights of the half-breeds to scrip was definite and comprehensive. But in giving effect to it, the commissioner saw fit to put restrictions upon the issue of scrip which had never been imposed before. There have been several issues of scrip in the Northwest. In 1885 there was an issue. Again in 1899 in the Athabaska district ; again in 1900 and 1901. It was only in 1901 that the commissioner saw fit to make this restriction debarring half-breeds, who otherwise had a right to the scrip, from participating in the grant because of their status in a foreign country. I have never been able to understand the justice of that decision. However it was given and acted upon ; but instead of the half-breeds letting the matter drop from their minds, as my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said, they kept it very strongly in their minds. If my hon. friend knew the half-breeds as well as I do, he would know that they are a people who retain in their minds a long time a sense of injury suffered. In their opinion, the decision of the commissioner was unjust. What reason may have actuated the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) in moving for a new Order in Council and remedying that injustice, I am not prepared to say ; but if a substantial injustice was done, the fact that an election was approaching, was no reason why it should not be remedied. That might give grounds for the suggestion of improper motives ; but if the business of the country is to stand still because of an election, we are about to create a most remarkable and unwarranted condition of af-

fairs. From the standpoint of the half-breeds at any rate and of the people of the west, who are more or less intimately acquainted with them, there was a general belief that the decision of the commission was unjust and that the remedying of that injustice was very proper. That remedy affected lands to the amount of 32,640 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all land scrip.

Mr. OLIVER. I take it for granted that it is.

Mr. HAGGART. In what respect was the decision of the commissioner unjust? And why does the hon. minister differ from him?

Mr. OLIVER. In my opinion, if these people had certain rights by reason of their birth, these rights were not vitiated by the fact of their removing to the United States. Until they had become citizens of the United States they still were considered as entitled to the rights they had acquired by birth. It was only such of these half-breeds as had become, in fact, through a greater or less degree, Indians of the United States that were held to have lost their rights as Northwest half-breeds.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understood the minister correctly, the mere fact that they were considered Indians in the United States was not sufficient, but the point was that some of them had participated in the reservations set aside for the Indians of the United States, were receiving the annual grants and getting the benefit of the Indian schools. Was that not the reason?

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand, it was not confined to that. Any half-breed who had placed himself, directly or indirectly, partially or wholly in the position of an Indian in the United States, was debarred. The view taken by the half-breed himself—

Mr. HAGGART. I would like to get the minister's view. That view was different from the views of the commission. I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to give reasons?

Mr. OLIVER. I have tried to state the reasons already, but I will repeat them. The reason why I hold a different view is the same as that which governs the opinion of the half-breed himself—that the birth of a half-breed was his title, and that his action after his removal to the United States did not in any way violate his birthright. That birthright could not be affected by his subsequent action in a foreign country. That was the view subsequently taken by the Minister of the Interior, I believe, after a full review and consideration of all the circumstances of the case—and, I believe a just and fair view. And the Order in Council of the 13th August last, was passed in consequence of that view having been taken. Now, again I say, the result of this Order in Council and of granting to these half-breeds what they and a large number of the people of the west believed to be the right, has resulted or will result, in the alienation of 32,640 acres of land. Now, whatever wrong is done to the Dominion of Canada, whatever alienation of that public domain has taken place, whatever disadvantage may accrue to this country has occurred because of this Act of, what we will say is, justice to these people, and not because of any subsequent action that has been taken. Either these half-breeds had to be refused the scrip to which they believed they were entitled as their birthright, or else that land must be alienated. There is no choice, and my hon. friend who is so very logical must take either one position or the other. That being established, I do not know that there is much more to be said. The fact that departmental instructions were issued to the land agencies to permit of entry for the land without the presence of the person to whom the scrip was issued is certainly a departure from the rule that has hitherto been allowed.

Mr. FOSTER. Do all the minister's regulations have to be approved by Order in Council?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes. But this, I understand, was not a regulation, but an order of the minister to the land agent. I am not able to answer for the minister as to the reasons for taking that action, nor am I responsible to the same degree as in the case of the Order in Council. But I take it for granted that the reasons for this permission, quoted in this case were: The non-residence of these people in Canada; there residence at a very great distance from the office at which they must locate; their residence under the jurisdiction of a foreign country; and, possibly, the fact that, being connected as they were supposed to be connected, with the Indian Department of the United States, and deprived them, the privilege of removal that they would otherwise have. I cannot say what the reason was; but I will say this—that to have required these people to come from their residence in the United States to make their location in the land office in which they have been compelled to make it would not have relieved the country from the alienation of this land, nor would it in any way have assisted the half-breeds in holding their title to that land. It would not have inured in any way to benefit either the country or the half-breeds, it would simply have been that much money that the half-breeds would not have had in connection with the handling of his scrip. It is the half-breed, who, in one way or another, would have had to pay this cost of transportation from his residence to the land office.

Now, I am not, at the moment, going

to say that it was a proper policy or that it was not a proper policy, to give this order. I am simply trying to remove the impression that was created, or attempted to be created, by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that in some way this permission resulted in injury to the half-breeds or loss to the country. It resulted in neither injury to the half-breed nor loss to the country. There is another point to which the hon. member alluded. I think he was under a wrong impression, and I am sure he will be glad to be corrected in regard to it. In the Order in Council of the 13th of August, to which he refers, the concluding paragraph as to the assignment of scrip, is as follows :

> The minister further recommends that in case of conflicting claims from assignees of such scrip, the assignee whose assignment is filed in the department first in order of time shall be held to be the legal assignee.

My information from the officials of the department is that in this paragraph, that word 'assignment' is used in error, and that the department has never recognized assignments of land scrip.

Mr. FOSTER. But of money-scrip they have ?

Mr OLIVER. There is no assignment necessary in the case of money-scrip, I understand ; it passes from hand to hand the same as money.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, why was it put in the Order in Council ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am explaining. It was not intended to be put in the Order in Council as recognizing assignments ; it was put in the Order in Council, as I am informed by the officers of the department, in mistake. The intention was to state that orders for scrip would be accepted in the order in which they came in. And the necessity for that arises from this fact—supposing an order has come in and a subsequent order comes in in regard to the same matter. The ordinary rule is that the last order cancels all the previous orders. Now the intention in inserting this paragraph was to provide that the orders should be dealt with in the order in which they came in, that the first order should be considered first, the second order next, and so on, instead of in the way such things are usually handled, namely, that the last order cancels the previous order. But the word 'assignment' is improperly used instead of the word 'order.'

Mr. FOSTER. If that is so, of course it explains the matter in hand, but it is not an endorsement of the efficiency of the departmental officers and of the minister himself.

Mr. OLIVER. Now to prove what I say that there was in some sense an error, I may say that under that paragraph, which evidently contemplated assignments of scrip, there have been no assignments recognized. It was in force from the 5th of November, 1904, until the publication of the cancellation in February, 1905, but during that time no assignments were accepted. The cancellation took place in September, but the publication was not made until some time afterwards. It was cancelled in December because it was recognized as being an error. If the hon. member will give me a memo. of the papers he requires I will be glad to have them brought down if possible.

Mr. J. HERRON. I would ask the minister if he is aware of the fact that there are a number of half-breeds in the Northwest at the present moment who think they have not been justly dealt with, and who think they still have claims for scrip or land. In the section where I live, there are quite a number of people with such claims. They went before the commission, but they think they were not properly dealt with in some way, that their representations were not given due weight, that their claims were rejected without proper consideration. I believe that they expect even yet that a commission will go up again and take up these unsettled claims. During the winter I have received several requests to bring this matter before the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not give an answer to that question at the moment, but I take it for granted that if it shall be shown that substantial injustice has been done, an effort will be made to remedy that injustice. But I do not think there is any probability that a new issue of half-breed scrip will be made on any other terms than issues have already been made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course there are reasons I suppose, set out in these Orders in Council—which I have not had an opportunity to examine very carefully—upon which is founded the decision of the department to set apart by means of this scrip a certain amount of the public domain of this country for half-breeds residing in the United States and proposing to make the United States their permanent place of abode. Unless there is something in the statutes or in the compact of by-gone days which makes that necessary, I would not think it a very desirable policy. I would think it far better to restrict the allotment to such of the half-breeds of the United States as propose to return to this country to take up their permanent residence ; otherwise I think that it might not be an unfair mode of dealing with the subject, to take those portions of the public domain which otherwise would have gone to these men who have left this country and gone to the United States, and allot them to such as have chosen to remain in Canada and make this country their home. Under the statement of facts made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), it looks as if it were not so much the interest of the half-breeds that

was being regarded as the interest of friends of this government; and that after all, probably not 10 per cent of the land, at least, which has been allotted under this arrangement ever benefited the half-breeds in any respect whatever; and I would infer from the facts laid before this House, that at least nine-tenths of it have gone to the comfort and sustenance of certain gentlemen who happen to be very close in touch with one or more departments of this government, and who have been enabled, by means of this arrangement undertaken in the month of August last on the eve of a general election, very considerably to improve their financial condition. However, we will have the rest of the papers down, and we will have a discussion on the subject. This seems to me to belong to the same class of cases as the wire fence case we discussed the other day, the fishing privileges which were mentioned not long ago, the islands in the Georgian bay which have been discussed this afternoon, and the bitulithic pavement contract which was also mentioned in this House a few days ago. These all seem to be very much in the same category. But of course, as the minister is not yet very familiar with his department, and as he has not yet been able to ascertain exactly what the House demands, it is only right that he should have an opportunity of bringing down the papers, when we shall make any criticism which may be called for by the additional information.

Mr. FOSTER. I would ask the minister in this connection as to whether the Nixon papers are approaching completion?

Mr. OLIVER. They are ready, I have been negligent in bringing them down.

Mr. R. BLAIN. I wish to refer a moment to the sale of islands in the Georgian bay. I think the minister should be able to give to the House a statement of the policy of his department in future as to the sale of islands not only in the Georgian bay but in other parts of Canada. When this government came into power they put an advertisement in the papers offering to sell 1,000 islands in the Georgian bay, by public tender. I have a copy of the advertisement in my hand, bearing date, Ottawa, 16 July, 1897. Tenders were received up to noon of the 2nd day of August in that year, for about 1,000 islands situate in the Georgian bay. Without reading the whole of the advertisement, it says:

> The highest or any tender will not necessarily be accepted.

For myself I wish to say that I do not think this is the best mode of selling islands in this country at the present time. While it may be thought better to sell them by tender rather than to sell them by private sale, yet I am of opinion that the proper way to sell islands and other parts of the public domain is by public auction. I think the minister should make it clear to the House this afternoon that, whatever the policy has been in the past, for the future no islands will be disposed of in the Georgian bay district except they are well advertised in different newspapers in this country, and a day fixed so that every man may have an opportunity of coming in and giving his highest price. A survey was made of these islands in 1896——

> Surveys of the islands in question were made by Mr. Charles E. Fitton, Ontario Land Surveyor, Orillia, and Mr. J. G. Sing, Ontario Land Surveyor, Meaford, under instructions given them on the 4th and 17th of June, 1896.

This advertisement was published asking for tenders, and a protest was entered by the Ontario government, showing that the latter did not agree with that policy, and therefore no sale was made. But the matter was revived in 1901, and from 1901 down to the present time several sales have been made. Since this parliament has been in session, five sales have been made to friends of the government, one sale on the 23rd of February, 1905, to Robert Wood, for $105; another sale on the 23rd of February to S. Grozelle, for $45; another made on the 25th of March to Emma Poole, for $20; another on the 12th of April to A. W. Mitchell, for $50; another on the 11th of May to F. W. Grant, for $140.

My hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) who is familiar with the island purchased by Mr. T. W. Grant, a brother of the sitting member in this House for North Ontario, who is well acquainted with that section of the country and is conversant with its values has made the statement this afternoon that if that island had been sold by public competition it would have brought in the neighbourhood of $1,000 to the treasury of this country instead of $140 when sold to a political supporter for $140. If those five islands that I have referred to had been put up for sale by public competition and the value of the other four were equal to the value of the one referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe, then instead of $360 being found in the treasury for these five islands, the sum of $2,160 would have been paid into the treasury and every man in this country would have been satisfied were he a supporter of the government or a supporter of the opposition. I do not wish to enter into a further discussion now as some other papers are to be brought down. I wish to direct my remarks for a moment to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. While we do not wish to hold him altogether responsible for the sins of his predecessor in office yet my hon. friend has had due notice of this question because the hon. member for East Simcoe wrote him on May 18, saying that he wished to bring this matter up at the first opportunity. My hon. friend has since that date had this matter under his consid-

eration. The hon. member for East Simcoe objected and said that in his opinion the sales should be made by public competition and now that this matter is before the minister, before the House and before the country as well—because the country takes a very deep interest in this matter and there have been charges from every province in Canada, and particularly from the province of Ontario against this government that there are certain public domains being sold to political supporters of the government in power—I thought my hon. friend would be anxious to clear the government of that condemnation if it is possible for them to clear themselves, and therefore I ask the minister if he is prepared this afternoon, and if not this afternoon if he will be prepared within a few days, to make a statement to the House that hereafter no islands in the Georgian bay district will be offered for sale by private tender or sold to a political supporter, but that every island in future shall be advertised and sold by public auction at a fixed date that may be advertised to the public.

Mr. OLIVER. If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that it is perhaps well to use the time of the country at the expense which is entailed by the sitting of parliament, in the discussion at very much greater length of the sale of these islands. The hon. member for Peel has suggested a hope that I will later on make a statement according to the suggestion that he makes. Let me point out that while on one hand that may be a good suggestion in the administration of these lands, on the other hand it may not.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear, for the boys.

Mr. OLIVER. There are there, islands I understand, varying in size from an acre or less up to thirty or forty acres. They are not, if I understand the matter aright, of any value agriculturally, but they are valuable as summer resorts to put it mildly. Now while one or two or a few of those islands may be especially valuable as sites for summer resorts, I think everybody will admit that there is not a demand for a thousand valuable summer resorts on the shores of the Georgian bay.

Mr. BENNETT. You try a sale.

Mr. OLIVER. I am suggesting the idea that if some person comes along and wishes to build a cottage upon an island in the Georgian bay that has an area of an acre, and the soil of which is as nearly pure rock as it can be, then if the country is compelled to go to the expense of advertising the sale of that island, hiring an auctioneer and selling it by auction, the system will be open to very grave objections from the point of view of the man who wants to buy an island to build a cottage on. The attempt of the government in 1897 was to sell all the islands at a single auction or rather by tender.

Mr. FOSTER. One or more?

Mr. OLIVER. I understood it was to sell them all. They were all offered for sale.

Mr. BENNETT. The advertisement was read and the minister said no tender will necessarily be accepted.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely all advertisements read in that way.

Mr. BLAIN. That is one of the chief objections, that the highest or any tender may not necessarily be accepted.

Mr. OLIVER. All government advertisements asking for tenders for supplies of any kind say that the lowest or any tender shall not necessarily be accepted and I presume the same rule is quite as applicable in the case of islands that the highest or any tender shall not necessarily be accepted because the tender may not be high enough to warrant the government in disposing of the island. That is a saving clause that must necessarily be inserted if the public interest is to be protected. I know I am not justified in taking up time to point out these details to the House, but I think since so much has been said it may be worth while considering whether there shall be an invariable rule of advertising and selling by auction every island for wich an application may be made. Let me briefly sketch the facts of the case. The islands were surveyed and they were valued by the surveyors. This schedule and these prices, as I understand, were available to applicants for the islands. Applications have been dealt with in the order in which they were made and I submit that however improvident the action of the government or whatever loss may have resulted to the country by their adopting that principle the charge of political favouritism does not lie against the government if that is the system and it has been followed.

Mr. BENNETT. In 1897, the hon. gentleman's predecessor laid it down that the highest bidder would get them.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. member will not say for an instant that the government should advertise a sale of islands and say that the highest bidder should get them.

Mr. BENNETT. Not if you want your friends to get them. It is all they have left now, it is their only graft.

Some hon. members. Order, order.

Mr. OLIVER. I think I have fairly pointed out that there is no graft in this transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. Try a sale and see.

Mr. OLIVER. The arrangement has been open and above board; and if it is a fact that owing to the circumstance of the increased value of some of these islands the revenue of the Indians is suffering, that of course is a matter to be fairly taken into consideration and some arrangement possibly made, but I submit that the fact that one or two islands may have achieved a value of $140 or $400 is not sufficient ground under the circumstances of these various sales to make a charge of political favouritism. I will go so far as to say that I do not think that in this country or any other country, a man is to be debarred from ordinary business transactions because he happens to be related to a member of parliament who happens to be supporting the government.

Mr. FOSTER. Nobody contends that.

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that since these islands began to be sold, since the question of the Indian rights in the islands was settled by the action of the government in 1884, there have been altogether 104 islands sold. Prior to July, 1896, 69 sales were made of islands, or parts of islands, of a total area of 1,012·36 acres, and the price realized was $1,846.95. Subsequent to July, 1896, 35 islands have been sold, with a total area of 438·74 acres, and the price realized was $3,002.75.

Mr. BLAIN. You would not compare the value of the islands fifteen years ago with their value to-day?

Mr. OLIVER. I am only giving the facts; I am not making any comparison. Of these islands which have been sold since July, 1896, seven were sold for the benefit of the Indians to the Marine Department for sites for lighthouses or other marine improvements, with an area of 189·60 acres and at the price of $1,377.75. I submit that the facts and figures do not show that this government has been negligent of the interests of the Indians.

YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, some days ago a question arose here as to the disposition of our Canadian territories after the proposed provinces have been established, and on that occasion the right hon. the Prime Minister suggested that it would be perhaps good policy if the provinces when erected would take care of the territories that remained; the idea being that the territories referred to would be allotted to the various provinces. The newspapers of British Columbia seized upon this incident to discuss the position of the Yukon Territory, and I wish upon this occasion to go upon record, as the representative of the Yukon, against any idea of that sort. I avail myself of this the first opportunity to refer to the matter, because were I to remain silent my silence might be construed to mean that the people of the Yukon, whom I have the honour to represent, were indifferent as to the disposition of their territory. I hope on another occasion to have the honour of submitting the reasons why the Yukon Territory, at any rate, should not be annexed to any province of the Dominion. We in the Yukon hope to have a future of our own.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Militia—pay and allowances—further amount required, $110,000.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). This vote is for the permanent force, which has been increased by some 200 or 300 men, and, in addition to which fact, under the Act of last session, there has been an increase in the pay, amounting to something like 20 or 25 per cent beyond the preveious rate. I may say that under an arrangement, which is not now absolutely complete, but which will be within a few days, between the imperial government and this government, by which the Militia Department is to take over the garrison at Halifax, some 400 men have been recently enlisted, and $25,000 of this vote is to pay for these men prior to the 1st July.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was announced some time ago that the imperial troops were to be withdrawn from Halifax and that their place was to be taken by men enrolled by the Militia Department. I mentioned the matter before, but the Minister of Militia was not then able to give full particulars. About ten days ago there was an announcement in the public press—I do not know whether it was authoritative or not—which declared that the imperial troops are to be retained in Halifax for about two years longer, and that the contemplated change is not to be carried out on account of the difficulty of enlisting men here.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no authority whatever for that statement. There is no difficulty in enlisting men so far as the infantry is concerned, which composes at least two-thirds of the garrison. There will be perhaps some difficulty in enlisting artillery, and very considerable difficulty in enlisting engineers, but we expect to overcome this difficulty by obtaining permission from the imperial authorities—I may say this permission has been to some extent already secured—to enlist reservists of the imperial army. In addition to that, we hope to be allowed to enlist some of the men in the artillery and engineers now at Halifax, whose time is about to expire. It is believed by General Lake that the department will be able to assume full responsibility on the 1st July, or as soon thereafter as the imperial troops may be ready to vacate Halifax.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some six or eight weeks ago, when I brought the question of the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt

to the attention of the hon. Minister of Militia, he said that he purposed to make a general statement as to the intention of the government on that subject. When are we to expect that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend knows that there has not been an opportunity during the last six or eight weeks; but I am ready to make the statement whenever the opportunity offers and I hope to do so within a few days. I thought it would be more convenient to make it upon the item in the main estimates which was left over for that purpose, as that was a sort of notice given to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House who are interested in military matters. I hope within a few days to make a full statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you require $85,000 more than you thought you would require last year ? Is it because more men are to undergo a system of drill ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This does not refer to drill. It refers to the permanent force, which I explained has been increased by about 200 beyond what was expected, and whose pay has been increased from 20 per cent to 25 per cent by Act of Parliament passed last session ; and since then the matter of taking over the Halifax garrison has come up, and some 400 men have been enlisted for that purpose.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN How many men do you expect to enroll at Halifax and Esquimalt ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The present number at Halifax is about 2,000 and at Esquimalt between 300 and 400. I am led to understand that we shall be able to reduce the number at Halifax to some extent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there to be the same equipment at Halifax in the way of guns and munitions of war ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not in a position yet to make a positive statement in reference to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope, when the minister makes his statement, that he will make it full enough to cover that point. By some it is argued that we are doing a very large thing in taking upon ourselves the defence of Canada as regards these two forts. It is important to know whether the defence will be a complete and full one or not, or whether we are to have simply a company of soldiers occupying the vacant space from which the real and sufficient warriors have gone ; whether it is to be a mere station or a defensible and defending portion of our protection ; what it will entail, that is, how much load we are lifting, which may be we should have lifted long ago, in this matter of imperial defence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may say that it is the intention of the government to preserve these garrisons in a state of efficiency. It may be that a smaller garrison will be sufficient owing to some changes which have been made by the imperial authorities with reference to the requirements of Halifax and Esquimalt as naval bases.

Annual drill—further amount required, $100,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the main vote?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The main vote was $600,000, and this makes the total $700,000. This is for the camps that are to come on between now and the 1st of July.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did you not ask for it last year ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is always some uncertainty as to the dates at which these camps will take place. It has been the custom, ever since I have been a minister, to take a supplementary vote during the session of the year during which some of the camps take place. That is one reason, viz.:—the uncertainty as to the dates. Another is that the pay was considerably increased by the Act of last year, and we could not tell exactly what that increase would amount to. The increase depends upon the number of years the militiaman has served. A militiaman who has served one year receives 20 cents a day additional. One who has served two years receives forty cents a day additional ; and one who has served three years receives fifty cents a day additional. The experience of last year was necessary in order to enable us to estimate at all correctly the amount involved in the increase. We are drilling more men and are getting a very large percentage who have been drilled before. A man who has had three years previous training is now getting a dollar a day. The man who has served two years is getting ninety cents a day. The man who has only served one year gets 70 cents a day. Twenty cents per day is added each year, and it is added on the ground of efficiency. The pay of the militiaman is still 50 cents. That is all the country agrees to give him unless he is efficient, but during his first year, if he proves efficient, he gets seventy cents ; during his second year he gets 90 cents, and the third year a dollar. And if he chooses to re-enlist he has a dollar a day.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is the judge of efficiency ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The captain and officers. We have never had as good camps, as good order and as good results in every way as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How many days drill now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Twelve days, including the day coming to camp and the day going.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose none who went out last year received only 50 cents per day ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very few. They were all so efficient that they all received the additional pay.

Mr. FOSTER. Or the officers were so indulgent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many men do you expect to drill this summer ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 35,000.

Militia stores—further amount required, $25,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. These are stores for the camps.

Transport and freight—further amount required, $5,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The vote is $50,000. Of this amount $34,500 had been expended to the 30th January last as follows : Staff A, $8,440.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the staff here ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, and at district headquarters.

Mr. FOSTER. Has it always been the custom to take travelling expenses for headquarters staff out of the general vote ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is a special vote out of which is paid the travelling expenses of the headquarters staff. The largest item is freight. There are some other items. The inspector general and the inspecting officer are paid travelling expenses out of this vote. Also the district staff officer and the officer who comes from England.

Mr. FOSTER. Has that been the usual practice ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the total amount paid last year for annual drill ? Could the hon. gentleman give us the total for the last two or three years ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are all in the report. The annual drill, including supplies and transport, 1902-03, cost $385,190. For the year ending 30th June, 1904, it was $749,985, out of which there should be a deduction of about $142,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the amount for 1905 ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About $700,000, largely due to increase in pay.

Dominion arsenal—to increase the pay of Lieut.-Col. F. M. Gaudet, superintendent to $3,200 per annum, $700.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the Dominion arsenal ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The cartridge factory. It is turning out now ten million rounds a year instead of something less than a million. We are increasing Colonel Gaudet's salary from $2,500 to $3,200.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has he been appointed ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For many years. I found him there when I came in. He is a graduate of the Royal Military College and a most excellent man. The position is a most dangerous one. You cannot get life insurance in it, and we thought as he had done excellent service for a number of years, he was entitled to the increase.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Indians—Nova Scotia, $7,925.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a decrease of $1,250 from the estimates of the current year. Of this reduction, $1,000 is due to the fact that in the previous year that amount was spent to provide shelters for indigent members of the band, which expense need not be repeated this year. There is also a reduction of $250 through the omission this year of an estimate for repair of roads made last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not imagine that the minister will be able to give the information I desire at once, but I would ask him to make note of the case that I call to his attention. I have a communication from a thoroughly responsible correspondent. I know nothing personally of the circumstances, but the facts as stated in this communication are in effect these: In the fall of 1903, Mr. J. L. McDonald, was appointed teacher of the Indians at Barra Head or Salmon River, being recommended to the Indian Department by the Indian agent. He conducted the school well and the Indians had great regard for him. Without warning, about the end of March last he received a letter from the Indian agent stating that he had heard bad reports of him and that he understood these reports had been sent to the Indian Department and that the teacher would undoubtedly be dismissed unless he resigned. The agent advised him to tender his resignation. This letter was dated March 23rd, 1905. This was followed two days later by a letter which dismissed him from his position as teacher. This letter contained some very harsh adjectives in regard to this young man's character and told him to go home and never show his face again in Salmon river where he had created such a scandal. The young man was entirely ignorant of what the offence charged against him was. He became alarmed and sent in his resigna-

tion and desired to know the cause of his dismissal. He has not had any explanation since but, in consequence of his dismissal and of what has been said, reports have been circulated against him which are very prejudicial to his character. It seems that afterwards the agent sent a letter, dated April 3rd, in which he told the young man that he felt that he would be re-instated provided he could get a certificate of good moral character. This he procured. It was forwarded to the agent. But no further notice has been taken of the matter. Another teacher has been appointed. Mr. McDonald, who is a very young man, desired an investigation and still desires it. He does not wish to begin life under the stigma of having been dismissed in disgrace by the Indian Department, especially as he has no idea of the cause of his dismissal. What I would like to know is: Why Mr. McDonald was dismissed; whether there were any charges made against him; if so, what was the nature of the charges; why he was dismissed without the holding of an investigation · whether it is or is not true that he was threatened with dismissal before he resigned, and, generally, all the information to cover the matter as I have referred to it. If the minister will be good enough to have one of his officials make a note of this matter and will give the information on some subsequent occasion when his estmates are before the House, I shall be very glad. I have every confidence that my correspondent, who is a man in very high position, would not make these representations to me unless he felt absolutely that the facts are as stated. Of course, it is possible that he may have been deceived; but so far as he is concerned, I am sure that everything has been stated exactly as he believes the facts to be.

Mr. OLIVER. Note will be taken of the case, and the officials will also have the opportunity of consulting what appears in 'Hansard.' An inquiry will be made and the result laid before the House.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the amount spent for these Indians increasing or decreasing?

Mr. OLIVER. As I explained, this is a decrease.

Mr. BLAIN. Yes, but how is it as compared with five or ten years ago?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure, taken for a period of ten years, is about stationary.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the policy in these matters?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians are dependent upon the Indian Department, and that fact is recognized. In this case there were a number of widows and other destitute persons who were not provided with shelter. To prevent suffering it was deemed advisable that shelter should be provided for them.

Indians—New Brunswick—salaries, $1,308.

Mr. BLAIN. How many officers receive payment from this amount?

Mr. OLIVER. Ten.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the duties of the leading officers?

Mr. OLIVER. The ordinary duties of an Indian agent. The province of New Brunswick is divided into two agencies under superintendents. The Indians are grouped in small bands in different parts of the province. The northwest part is under Mr. Carter and the southeast part under Mr. Farrell. Their duties are merely to oversee the bands on the different reservations.

Relief and seed grain, $2,500.

Mr. BARKER. There is an increase here, while there is a decrease in a similar item in Nova Scotia.

Mr. OLIVER. The explanation of the increase for relief and seed grain is that the circumstances governing the requirements vary from year to year, and it happens that in this case certain bands in New Brunswick require a small increase, whereas in Nova Scotia circumstances have permitted a small decrease.

Mr. BARKER. I suppose the minister knows the peculiar circumstances that justify a decrease of $1,000 in one case and an increase in the other?

Mr. OLIVER. I have already explained the reason for the increase of $1,000 in Nova Scotia; it was to provide shelter for certain indigent members of the band last year; it was a special provision which does not require to be repeated this year, and therefore does not appear in the estimates this year. But in the case of New Brunswick there was nothing special of that kind, and this increase of $200 is merely because of small requirements, both in the matter of relief and seed grain.

Medical attendance and medicine, $3,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would the minister kindly tell us how many Indians there are altogether in New Brunswick?

Mr. OLIVER. 1,694.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the minister please explain this increase of $500 over last year?

Mr. OLIVER. The explanation is that the demands in previous years have been rather more than the estimates, and this year it is desired to provide fully for the requirements.

Mr. BARKER. If the demands have been greater in previous years, how have they been met? Has the hon. gentleman been paying without authority?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the original vote in previous years has generally been added to by a supplementary vote. This year the desire is to take the full requirements in the first vote, so that no supplementary will be required.

Mr. TAYLOR. How many physicians does the hon. gentleman employ altogether in looking after the Indians in New Brunswick ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are thirteen physicians employed, whose payments amount to $1,915.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any dismissals during the past year or new appointments ?

Mr. OLIVER. There have been no changes in the staff during the year.

Miscellaneous and unforeseen, $600.

Mr. OLIVER. There is an increase of $300, the reason of which is the same as in the case of the medical atendance vote, that is, that the requirements have not been met by the ordinary vote of previous years and had to be supplemented. It is desired now to make the main estimates of the present year cover the total expenditure.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman will see that that hardly amounts to an explanation, because all the grants of last year, including supplementaries, were only $300 ; in the other item he refers to all the grants were only $3,000. He is now taking more in both cases than the total of last year, so the supplementary explanation does not quite meet the case.

Mr. OLIVER. In the appropriation accounts for 1903-4 the amount for miscellaneous and unforeseen in New Brunswick is $600, and the amount actually expended was $503.77, leaving a balance of $96.23. It is desired to have the total amount available that was voted last year.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman will see that in 1904 the vote of $300 sufficed ; why does he want to double it this year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have pointed out that in the year ending June 30, 1904, there was a total expenditure of something over $500, and there was a vote last year of $600 in the main and supplementary estimates. For the current year, now about to close, the vote was $300, but that will not be sufficient to meet the expenditure of the year, and some of the expenditure will have to be carried forward and paid out of the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. BARKER. Some of this $600 will be taken to pay last year's debts. Is that it?

Mr. OLIVER. It will have to be.

Mr. BARKER. That seems to be a rather general feature of the administration of this government. We had on Tuesday several instances when the government were granted a certain sum of money to carry on the department, they spent just what they pleased and then they come in this year and ask for a vote to cover the deficiency.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the fact is evident from the figures I have given that the department have asked for a sufficient appropriation for the year ending June 30, 1904. They have a small balance to the good of some $90 odd. Then last year, in the hope I presume of still further reducing the expenditure, they only asked for $300. I am informed that this will probably not be sufficient to pay all the bills and therefore an amount equal to what was asked in previous years is asked for the coming year in order that we may have enough money to pay the bills.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Why not put it in the supplementaries?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not put in any supplementaries.

Mr. BARKER. You asked during the last day or two for a lot of supplementary votes to cover money that you required to meet last year's expenditure, and why not do the same thing here, why have a different system?

Mr. OLIVER. The other votes were for different departments. The reason for this is that medical expenses are not a fixed amount. Medical expenditure of course depends a good deal on circumstances which are not within control, and I am given to understand that the expenditures have not been so under control as to be kept within the amount, but the bills are not in and we cannot tell how much the bills will be yet. As the amount was not great and the bills were not available, as the vote was evidently very small, it seems to be not unreasonable that the bills should be paid out of the vote for the year in which the bills came in.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this thing is getting altogther too common. How are we on this side of the House to keep track of expenditures if the minister is going to permit one year's business to run into another, to simply take money that we vote to meet this service for 1905-6 and pay liabilities incurred in 1904-5. It seems to me that the minister is getting very far away from what is right and proper in the expenditure of public money. Do I understand that the Auditor General permits that sort of thing or whose fault is it? Possibly he cannot help himself but surely some restriction is placed upon the minister that will prevent this proceeding. We are voting money for 1905-6. I tell the minister that he has no right to put his hand on one dollar of that to pay any expendi-

ture incurred in 1904-5. If he does he is committing an outrage on this parliament. He has his remedy. We have before us supplementaries for nearly every department. Why did he not see that a sufficient amount was placed in the supplementaries of 1904-5 to meet any possible balance that was not provided for in the main estimates of last year? Certainly that was his duty. As I said a night or two ago, we do not want to be repeating these things day after day but we certainly want the business of the country carried on in a business way. We understand that this is a business government, a government of business men. I am afraid that their reputation as business men and their business practices have all disappeared, because certainly they do not adopt business methods. I tell the Minister of the Interior that he has no more right to put his hand in the public chest and take one dollar for the purpose of meeting a balance or meeting accounts incurred in 1904-5, out of the appropriations which he is now asking, then I have a right to do it—and I am positively sure that I have no right nor has any other member of this House. It is a miserable practice, a bad practice, and if such a practice is to continue, I fail to see how any man can keep a check on the expenditure of this country. I hope and trust that even yet before the 1st of July the minister will see that a supplementary estimate is brought down containing a sufficient amount to meet what was unprovided for in the last year's estimates and that he will come down to the House and will obtain its sanction and then he will have a right to expend that money for the purposes for which we vote it. But he must be careful not to put his hand on a single dollar that we vote now to meet any expenditure incurred prior to the 1st of July. I think I have made myself plain to the minister and I regret that I am obliged to repeat these things day after day, but I intend to raise my voice in protest every time this occurs. It is occurring altogether too frequently, and surely when the minister has the opportunity before him, as he has yet over a month in which to secure the sanction of His Excellency to a further supplementary estimate to meet just the very items that he tells us are unprovided for. If he asks for too much, the balance unused will simply lapse on the 1st of July and drop out of sight. There will be no money lost, let him ask for plenty, but let him do it in a constitutional way. The House has never refused to cheerfully vote money for the support of Indians and their medical attendance and so forth, but we want to know exactly what we are doing and that the money we vote is applied for the purpose we vote it. I trust this will be the last time I shall have to call the minister to account for this thing.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister to explain—and I would point out to the minister that this is not a matter for amusement either for the minister himself or for his department whether it is $300 as it is here or $300,000 as it was the day before yesterday, the matter is a matter of business and of system and we want to know just about where we are about these things—I would like to ask the minister how he expects to pay one dollar of last year's accounts out of money that we are granting for the coming year. I want an explicit answer to that because he is asking this money for that purpose. The only way I can see in which he intends to do it is by the abuse, the intentional, deliberate abuse of the credit account system which has been the subject of so much discussion and complaint on the part of the Auditor General, a system by which departments get a credit account of very many thousands of dollars and pay just what they please, and after the horse is stolen we expect the Auditor General to lock the stable door. Now we want to stop that. I can tell the new Minister of the Interior that there has been a great deal of this going on, especially, as we believe, in his department. We had an item of $300,000, some days ago, for immigration of which a similar explanation was given. That money granted last year had been partly appropriated for debts of the preceding year, an absolutely illegal thing to do. Because this is a very little item of $300, the hon. gentleman laughs and seems to think our criticism is a matter for amusement. It is not the amount we are criticising, it is the act. If inquiry had not been made we would have supposed we were voting this money for next year. How does the minister intend to use this money to pay his accounts of last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am glad to see that when the Auditor General's resignation is accepted, as it may be before long, we will not have far to go to get other equally able and useful critics of expenditure. The hon. gentlemen have asked me many questions, and I would ask them, how they expect a vote in the supplementary estimates for the current year would be used to pay medical accounts which were not presented until that year had expired. Do they think the Auditor General would allow the money voted in the supplementaries this year which expires on the 30th of June, to be applied to pay accounts that did not come up for payment until some time in July ?

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest that you should ask the Minister of Finance how that could be done.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Halton was fairer than the hon. member for

Hamilton. He said that he would not ask that the estimate should be within possibly $100 of the expenditure, and if he will read this estimate in that light he will find we are not asking for anything more than that amount of latitude. The hon. member (Mr. Barker) accused me of treating this item with levity because it was small. I was not treating the item with levity but I was treating with levity the idea that we could control an expenditure for medical assistance. If we could get some arrangement with the Indians and the Auditor General, that the Indians would not get sick more than up to a certain amount and within a certain time then we could control the expenditure ; but unless we can do that, if we are going to give the Indians medical assistance, we have to treat them when they are sick and we have to pay for that treatment. Instead of the hon. members accusing the department of outrunning the estimates they would do well to turn their guns upon the Indians who get ill without regard to whether the estimate is large or small. It is of course very inconsiderate on their part and certainly it is leaving the department in an unfortunate position, but so far we have been unable to reason them out of that attitude.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I called the minister's attention to the fact that we are discussing 'miscellaneous and unforseen expenditure,' and I would ask him what is that expenditure generally for ?

Mr. OLIVER. The memorandum given to me is : for some time past the money appropriated for this service has not exceeded $300. It frequently has to be supplemented in order to meet the ordinary demands for contingencies and travel. For last year the expenditure under this sub-head is $503.77 the greater portion of which was spent for the ordinary contingencies of travel to agents. It will therefore be seen that the increase in the main appropriation of $300 is demanded by the circumstances of the case.

Mr. J. D. REID. This is not for medical attendance ?

Mr. OLIVER. It includes medical attendance.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say that there were some thirteen physicians employed, and the cost was $900.

Mr. OLIVER. I said $1,915. That is the allowance paid to the physicians to attend the different bands scattered around the province.

Mr. TAYLOR. I find from the Auditor General's Report of last year that some twelve physicians drew pay, whether they earned it or not, amounting to $1,874. I do not see a dollar charged for medicine, but I find that J. S. Benson, M.D., Chatham, got $125, J. F. Desmond, M.D., Newcastle, $250 and so on up to $1,874. I am sure that each and every one of these physicians is a political friend of the Minister of the Interior and just got these snaps. I would like to see a detailed account of any of these physicians, the number of trips they made and the number of patients they attended because out of the total vote of $2,339 there was paid to physicians $1,874.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of the Interior says : turn your guns on the Indians. I do not think the Indians have votes and I suppose they would not be so useful to the minister as that interesting list, read to us the other night, of names that are incapable of being pronounced. The Minister of the Interior proposes to turn his guns upon an efficient public servant, namely, the Auditor General. We have been making an effort since the beginning of this session to get information from the government as to what they propose to do in this matter. In the early days of the session when the Minister of Finance was in Europe, inquiry was made and we were told that nothing could be decided until his return. When he did return he said that the matter was under consideration as to whether there would be an amendment to the Audit Act, and later he gave the information that he knew of no necessity for changing the Audit Act and he did not anticipate any change would be made. Now we have something definite. The junior member of the administration, the latest addition to the ministry, is more candid than some of his colleagues, and he announces that in all probability the resignation of the Auditor General will be accepted.

Mr. OLIVER. May I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon ; I did not make any such announcement.

Mr. LENNOX. What did the hon. minister say ?

Mr. OLIVER. I say I did not make any such announcement.

Mr. LENNOX. What did the minister say ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. minister will see in 'Hansard' what I said.

Mr. LENNOX. I will take it for the present that the minister, whether he said it in so many words or not, did intimate, with a good deal of glee, that we would probably soon have another Auditor General. I do not suppose he said that without knowing something of what he was talking about, and it is quite in line with what we have seen of the workings of the present administration, including the Minister of the Interior, that there is on their part a cheerful looking forward to the time when they will get rid of the Auditor General. But I want to tell the Minister of the Interior, and particularly the Minister of Finance, that although they may get rid of the Auditor

General and refuse to bring in a law which will give that efficient officer an opportunity to perform his duties efficiently in the interest of the public, they will not get rid of the public sentiment which is abroad in this country that the government have a desire to keep the law in a state of inefficiency, and if possible force the Auditor General out of the position of watchfulness which he has assumed in the interest of the public. It is just as well that the people should know it. We have time in this House for almost everything except the financial interests of this country. The Minister of Agriculture is a notable instance of that. He has time for everything except the business of the department over which he presides. We have time for every corporation which wishes to exploit anything, but we have not yet had time to take into consideration the finances of this country, which represent an expenditure which is climbing up by leaps and bounds every year, the very supplementary estimates now before the House being a notable evidence of this. I want to warn the ministry that they have not heard half as much as they will hear from the public about this very question of the Auditor General; but the Minister of the Interior has probably done a public service in announcing definitely and distinctly, if not in so many words, yet in substance, that the government are likely to get rid of the Auditor General; and he is probable saying to himself, oh, let it be soon—the sooner the better, in the estimate of the ministry.

Mr. FIELDING. As the hon. gentleman has stated that the government are very anxious to get rid of the Auditor General, perhaps it would be as well for me to remind him that the Auditor General tendered his resignation some months ago and the government declined to accept it. As for the rest, the speech which my hon. friend made about the tremendous feeling in the country in regard to the Auditor General is simply a repetition of what he said some months ago in a more extended manner. He had the assistance of the Auditor General, who expounded his views from time to time in public interviews, in the public press, and in other ways, and the result of it all was that the hon. gentleman failed to satisfy the public mind that there was any grievance against the government in that respect. The situation has not changed.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the Minister of Finance be kind enough to say that the Auditor General's resignation was brought down by the refusal of the government to amend the Audit Act?

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General is not the best judge of the policy of this country. The government of Canada with the advice of this parliament, will decide when the Audit Act needs amendment.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. INGRAM. I hope my hon. friend is not going to lose his temper.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I did. I thought I was very amiable.

Mr. INGRAM. I was asking my hon. friend if the Auditor General did not tender his resignation because the government refused to amend the Audit Act?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. gentleman had better ask the Auditor General.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand that the Auditor General makes that statement.

Mr. FIELDING. Very well, I do not object to it.

Mr. INGRAM. And that is the reason the Auditor General is resigning. But the Minister of Finance wanted the House and the country to believe something altogether different, in reply to the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. FIELDING. I stated that the hon. member for South Simcoe remarked that the government were very anxious to get rid of the Auditor General, but that as the Auditor General had some months ago tendered his resignation, the government could have accepted it if they wished. They did not do so, and the Auditor General remained in office.

Mr. INGRAM. And the government had a very good reason for not accepting his resignation.

Mr. FIELDING. The government have no desire to interfere with the Auditor General. Whether he resigns or remains in office is entirely his own business.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman will remember that at the time of the general election the government were not so indifferent to the Auditor General. They were particularly eager that he should remain in office until after the general election.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has no warrant whatever for that statement. The Auditor General is free to resign or remain just as he thinks fit. No effort is made to interfere with his freedom of action in that respect. The statement that the government were trying to get rid of the Auditor General is entirely unwarranted.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not say that.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman did not, but the hon. gentleman who started the discussion did.

Mr. INGRAM. The government could have prevented the resignation of the Auditor General by agreeing to amend the Audit Act?

Mr. FIELDING. Why ought we?

Mr. TAYLOR. To guard the treasury.

Mr. FIELDING. The treasury is all right.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the country is under the impression that the Auditor General has a better knowledge of what is necessary in the administration of his department than even some members of the cabinet.

Mr. FIELDING. The country did not indicate that.

Mr. INGRAM. The question of the Auditor General was not in issue during the last general election.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend tried to make it so.

Mr. INGRAM. If the government had shown as much independence as the hon. gentleman has shown to-night, and had accepted the resignation of the Auditor General before the last general election, the country would have expressed their opinion in strong language. The government knew that, and were only too eager to keep him.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member for South Simcoe says we are trying to get rid of the Auditor General, and the hon. member for East Elgin tells us that we were trying to keep him.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance has lost his temper; but it always points in the same direction. The hon. gentleman is probably one of the mildest speakers in the House except when he gets into a tight box; but whenever he does, I am sorry to say that hon. gentleman loses his temper, and his voice rises, as it did to-night. The hon. gentleman said he wanted to instruct me that the Auditor General had tendered his resignation. If the hon. minister had informed me and the other members of this House weeks ago of that circumstance, he would have discharged his duty according to British parliamentary traditions and according to the fundamental principles of government in a British country. But he has not seen fit to do so. Weeks ago the Auditor General sent in a report pointing out the difficulties which exist to-day, and the Minister of Finance, knowing that the Auditor General is not the servant of the cabinet, but an officer of parliament, should have immediately laid that report before the House. But the minister kept perfectly silent on that question until his hand was forced to-night. He comes very late in the day indeed to instruct me that the Auditor General has tendered his resignation. But the minister cannot get away from the fact that the reason the Auditor General is tendering his resignation is that the government will not make such amendments in the law and bring about such changes as will enable him to have the proper means of curbing extravagant and in many cases dishonest expenditure of the public funds. Instead of working on that line, as I said, there was a prayer in the heart of the Minister of Finance, not this session or last session, but before that, to get rid of the Auditor General, the watch-dog of the treasury. That was evidenced by the fact that two or three years ago he brought in an Act, not to enlarge the powers of the Auditor General, but to make his position virtually a name, and nothing more. If the Minister of Finance would bring about that state of things, he would be happy. But we had a perfect right, from what was said by the First Minister at the opening of this session to anticipate that there would be a consideration of this question, with the view of making the Audit Act more efficient, having regard to the changed conditions which have been brought about in the last twenty-five or twenty-six years.

We had a perfect right to have this matter considered in a frank and candid way by the minister, instead of which we have been treated to a lecture. The hon. minister taunts me with having spoken on this subject last session and says it did not bring about a change of government. Perfectly true, these things require time to work. But if the government had accepted the resignation of the Auditor General last session, as it was thought they would, if they had not eaten humble pie as they did, they would have found a different story; and although it might not have driven them from power, would at least have weakened their position. Whenever they do accept the resignation of the Auditor General, they will be condemned for their action, not because of the personality of the Auditor General, but of the causes which brought about his resignation. Whether such condemnation would drive them from power is another question. That, however, is evidently the only thing the hon. minister thinks about. But he can take warning that this matter and these various scandles which force themselves on the public notice from time to time, and the way the electorate are being treated with regard to the great question before the House—all these things combined may prove too strong even for the government's tenure of office, which seems to be the only thing they take any interest in.

Mr. FIELDING. In my wildest dreams I did not attempt to picture any such possibility as that of the Tories coming to power; and nothing was further from my mind than to attempt to lecture my hon. friend. All I did was to point out that some of his statements were incorrect, and I am not aware that I went beyond that. He said that the Auditor General resigned and that it was my duty to inform the House some weeks or months ago, and I failed to do it. When did the Auditor Gen-

eral resign ? I do not understand what the hon. gentleman means.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say that the Auditor General had resigned. I did not understand that he had.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman did say so.

Mr. LENNOX. If I did, I certainly did not give expression to what I intended to say. I intended to convey the idea that the Auditor General had sent a report, and I think that 'Hansard' will show to-morrow that that is pretty nearly what I did say. He suggested amendments to the Audit Act, he pointed out the difficulties which existed, and said that about the 1st July, if improvements were not brought about or promised, he would resign. I said—and I repeat it—that it was the duty of the administration and particularly the duty of the Minister of Finance, when he got that report from a public official, a public document, a supplementary report of the Auditor General, to have laid it on the table and not let the House become aware of it merely through the press.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid that my hon. friend will now be open to the charge of doing the lecturing. He is telling me what is my duty, so that he is the sinner in that line. Let me say, however, that the Auditor General has presented no report which it was my duty to present to the House. He has been engaged in some public discussion of the question and has gone to the press for that purpose. I have no objection to his doing so. The document to which my hon. friend referred was given the public press before there was an opportunity to present it to parliament, if it were a proper document to bring before parliament, and every hon. gentleman interested in it is in possession of it now.

Mr. INGRAM. A short time ago the Minister of Finance said the government was in a better position to judge as to the amendments which should be made to the Audit Act. Well, two years ago he mustered up courage to bring in amendments to the Audit Act, but he had not the courage to force them through the House. The reason was the people gave him due notice they would not stand that kind of thing. Consequently he did not force through the amendment notwithstanding his big majority behind him. That is an indication of how the Auditor General controls this government in the matter of legislation. The elections are now over, and I suppose the government will take up again the amendments to the Audit Act which the Finance Minister proposed on a previous occasion. We had another instance of a prominent official, and ex-member of the cabinet, resigning. He was appointed to a very high position ; he knew the election was coming on. Why did he resign ? Because it was said that if the government were returned to power, he would get notice to quit, and he thought he would anticipate that notice. The Auditor General, however, is in a different position. He has asked parliament to make certain amendments to the Audit Act, and this side of the House approve of his policy. It is not unusual for an Auditor General to prepare documents and submit them to members of the opposition. He did it previous to 1896. Prominent members of the opposition in those days received very lengthy documents calling on the government and parliament to do certain things so that it was not unusual.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say it was unusual. I did not even say the Auditor General had done so. I did not refer to the Auditor General furnishing the hon. gentlemen opposite with any documents. I made no allusion to anything of the sort.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman said he furnished the press.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman spoke of documents being furnished to the opposition. I did not make any allusion of that sort. I am not raising any question as to what the Auditor General did. I am only answering observations as to what we had done or left undone. My answer to the first observation of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram) was that the amendment to the Audit Act was a matter of policy, and that in questions of that kind the government must take the responsibility of guiding and directing the House with regard to whatever action may be taken. It is not the business of the Auditor General to make amendments to the Audit Act. He may make suggestions, and the responsibility of acting must rest on the government. If they do not think the suggestions wise, they will not act upon them, and must take the responsibility at the proper time.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has not said why the government withdrew the amendments they did propose to the Audit Act. If these amendments were so important, why did they not carry out their ideas ?

Mr. FIELDING. The proposed legislation was intended to facilitate public business and overcome some difficulty which the Auditor General was placing in the way of carrying on public business, We hoped that these difficulties might be removed by the voluntary act of the Auditor General. Whether he has fully removed them or not is a debateable question. That is percisely the situation. We have no desire to interfere with him and would be much pleased if he would facilitate the transaction of public business in a way we thought he was not following. It was in order to facilitate the disposal of public business that these amendments were prepared.

Mr. INGRAM. Does not the same difficulty exist to-day that existed when these amendments were introduced ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not say the same, but I am bound to say that things are not moving as happily as they might ; but at that time we had in the House to call attention to some things in which the Auditor General had not facilitated the transaction of business. He took a different view. I am not questioning the propriety of his course, but it was a course that did not facilitate the prosecution of public business. I think that since that time the differences with him have been fewer. But I suppose that so long as there are Auditors General there will be ministers in parliament who are not always in accord with them.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to take the position that the government are the best judges, as a matter of policy, as to what should be comprised in the Audit Act.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly, I say that.

Mr. BARKER. I differ from the hon. gentleman, and I desire to say why. He seems to overlook the fact that he and his colleagues are the ones to be audited. The public, who desire the audit, are in a diametrically opposite position to that of the hon. gentleman. I can quite understand—not imputing any impropriety to the hon. minister and his colleagues—that if some little blunder or irregularity took place, the hon. gentleman might be inclined to look with a little indulgence upon an Auditor General who did not point it out to the public. It would be most surprising to the shareholders of a great company to be told by their treasurer that he did not think an audit was necessary, or that he was the best judge of how far the audit should go. The public of this country want to audit even the Finance Minister ; and the public, and certainly the opposition in this House, should have quite as much to say in that regard as the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches and who are to be audited. Now, this is an example of extreme irregularity in the different branches of the government in bringing down the estimates. We have a perfect right to point out, and, as the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said, we should continue to point out, so long as that irregularity continues, in what it consists. This session the government have brought down supplementary estimates for the year 1904-5, amounting to $6,379,342—an expenditure for the fiscal year which they had not provided for. But this amount included items for the year 1903-4, to which the Auditor General called attention, amounting to $280,551.

Mr. FIELDING. What were the items to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) refers ? I think he is referring to a purely formal item at the close which appears——

Mr. BARKER. I am pointing that out. We have the right to assume, in the absence of any remark in these estimates, that this $280,551 included everything for the year 1903-4 that had been overlooked. But two days ago the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), in giving us some of his very candid admissions, referring to item 32 for the year 1904-5, the amount of which was $300,000, said that had to be provided, because he had used the money granted last year, to pay for 1903-4. Surely that was an irregularity. When we come to the main estimates for the coming year, we have a right to assume that we are now getting truthfully and straightforwardly just what is required for the year. But when we ask the Minister of the Interior to explain increases, he laughs and tells us : Oh, we could not tell exactly last year what we wanted for particular services, and this item includes expenses for both years. But when, a few days ago, the government asked a supplementary vote of over $6,000,000 to cover the expenditure of last year, they have erred on the safe side and asked enough. What we find fault with is that we do not know for what year the money is actually being voted. How, then, can we criticise the accounts ? The time lost in the explanation given by the Minister of the Interior of this small item will cost nearly as much as is involved in the question. And we could avoid all this if a straightforward statement were given of the items as they come before us.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I fail to see the connection between the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Barker's) last criticism and the general statement he has made with regard to the Audit Act. If I understood aright, early in the discussion the complaint of hon. gentlemen opposite was that sums belonging to the service of the previous year had been paid out of this year's appropriation, and that this was illegal and improper. Am I right ?

Mr. BARKER. Yes, that was one complaint.

Mr. FIELDING. The Auditor General, who, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, always does right as against this government who always does wrong, has passed these illegal and improper items.

Mr. BARKER. I explained that.

Mr. FIELDING. But in the explanation it appears that the Auditor General passed these things which the hon. gentleman now says are illegal. I do not say they are illegal ; I do not join in the condemnation of the Auditor General. But I am pointing out that if these statements are correct, they are a condemnation of the Auditor General.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) wants to deceive this House by stating that the Auditor General was prepared to pass these items——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that he was prepared to pass them, but that he did pass them. At the beginning of the year some accounts of the previous year were paid out of this year's appropriation. I would much prefer that that kind of thing should be avoided. But it turns out that the accounts which hon. gentlemen opposite say have been illegally paid were passed by the Auditor General. I do not say that they were illegally paid ; I do not condemn the Auditor General in that way.

Mr. BARKER. We know that $280,551 was set forth in the report of the Auditor General.

Mr. FIELDING. That did not touch these items.

Mr. BARKER. That is the beginning of this series of misrepresentations. The Auditor General, at page C—4 of his report, gives the details of expenditure not provided for. The Minister of Finance asks us in a supplementary estimate for the money. That is all right. But what I complain of is that, while putting that in the supplementary estimates of 1904-5, the hon. gentleman includes other similar items in the main estimates for 1905-6, and says not a word about their being for the year 1904-5. We seek to ascertain the truth by cross-examining the Minister of the Interior, but generally that hon. gentleman who has just come into office does not know the facts.

Mr. INGRAM. There is more than that. As to this reflection on the Auditor General——

Mr. FIELDING. I did not make any reflection on the Auditor General. That was done by hon. gentlemen oposite.

Mr. INGRAM. But I want to consider the correctness of what the minister has said. The other evening, when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Prefontaine) was explaining his estimates, concerning one item he said that it was put in because the Auditor General would not pass the account, and it was necessary for him to ask for an Act of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING. There are such cases.

Mr. INGRAM. And why ? Because the government are not complying with the law. So it is hardly fair to say that the Auditor General passes these items so freely.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that he passed them freely ; I said he passed them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like once more to refer to a statement made by the Minister of the Interior. He attempted to draw on the sympathy of the House and to make it appear that we on this side were opposed to that provision which was necessary for the health of the Indians. He did this in an adroit way, attempting to create public sympathy, just as he did a few evenings ago when he attempted to excuse his estimate of $300,000 for the current year by saying that when the Barr colony was brought to this country it was necessary to provide attendance for the women and children, when we all knew that this attendance was paid for, and that provision was all made years ago, and had no connection whatever with the money he was asking for. So successful was he in drawing a herring across the track that he misled even the press into the belief that the opposition was doing something very wrong to the women and children of the Barr colony. To-night he is trying the same thing. I may just as well tell him that he is not sitting on a back bench. We want to treat the hon. gentleman as a minister of the Crown, but he must not bring up such miserable diatribes as he has done to-night, and did on a former occasion, by trying to draw a herring across the track in producing arguments that have no bearing at all on the question but merely to divert attention from the facts before us. This is the second time the hon. gentleman has done this. Now I am prepared to treat the hon. gentleman as a minister of the Crown, I wish to treat him with every respect, but in all the arguments he brings forward I want him to treat the opposition in the same way. Now we have said not a single word adverse to providing the Indians with all the services they require, under either the treaties or under the law. We are perfectly satisfied that they should be carried out to the extreme limit. But we do not want to be told that because we are finding fault with the manner in which the estimates come before this House, we are endeavouring to do a wrong to those people who are not here to speak for themselves.

I think the proposition of the hon. gentleman is highly improper, and that he should, before the 1st of July, bring down a further supplementary estimate and ask for sufficient money to meet the expenditures of the Indian Department in this province, to meet all the requirements up to the 1st of July, so that there will be no such a thing hereafter as a minister putting his hand upon funds which are sacred to the purposes of the Indians for the year 1905-6, and applying them to the payment of debts of bygone years. I do not know how the hon. gentleman intends to work this account, I suppose it is by means of what he calls a suspense account. He says, how are you going to meet this case? A debt is contracted in 1904-5, it is not presented until 1905-6, and how are you going to deal with it? Well, I am not familiar with the manner in which the accounts of the department have been kept, but I have every rea-

son to suppose that if a bill came in in 1904-5 for which money had been voted, that it would be charged up against that vote for the year 1904-5, and not of necessity charged against the vote for the following year. I assume that when the account is received it is charged up under what we may call a suspense account, it remains in that form until the 1st of July, and after that it is immediately charged up to the vote of the following year. That is a practice that I do not think should prevail. I do not see any necessity for it. I am quite sure that the minister has abundant clerical help in the shape of first-class accountants in his department to keep the two years entirely separate, and to give at the end of the year a full statement of the expenditure of that year. Now I understand that in the Post Office Department it may be two or three months before the accounts all come in for the past year, two or three months after the 1st of July. Postmasters, salaries thousands of miles away, mail carriers' salaries thousands of miles away, do not reach the department for months after the close of the fiscal year. But I understand that these accounts are charged back against the estimate of the previous year, the year to which they belong, and that when the Postmaster General brings down the report we get a statement exactly of what the expenditure of that year amounted to. Now we cannot tell what the expenditure of the Indian Department is for any year, because there is a system of running the one into the other, apparently, and we are kept in the dark. We may vote so much for 1904-5, we may vote again a certain sum for 1905-6, but we are told that the money voted for 1905-6 may be used to pay debts contracted in 1904-5. As I said before, the opposition has no means of keeping check upon the expenditure of the country. That, I think, is part of our business. I would fail in my duty did I not attempt to point out these irregularities, and I trust that after the ventilation this question has received during the past two or three days, some remedy will be applied, not only in the Department of the Interior, but in other departments, because, as I understand, this is a fault that applies to all the departments of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I want to take the remarks of the hon. member in the best possible spirit, and assure him that, as I understand it, the general vote of the Indian Department is not open to his criticisms. In regard to this particular vote for miscellaneous and unforeseen items, these things are not of a class that are capable of being accurately estimated for. Last year, as I have pointed out, there was an effort to bring that vote to a reasonable limit; but if it should turn out that owing to unforeseen occurrences the amount was overrun to a small extent, as it may have been, though I am not sure that it has, I am sure the hon. gentleman will not place the expenditure under that head in exactly the same category as he would an expenditure for definite and fixed purposes that could be foreseen. I plead for that much latitude in regard to this particular item, and beg to assure him that I think he will find in the general bookkeeping of the department, if he goes through the items, that his requirements are fully met. As far as the Indian Department is concerned, where a vote covers expenditures that can be foreseen, they are absolutely provided for, and there is no carrying forward from one year to another.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister not think that he can foresee practically all the expenditure that he will be called upon to meet under this head between the present day and the 1st of July? Does he suspect any extraordinary expenditure, or is there something that he is unable to anticipate? If he has not in his mind's eye any extraordinary expenditure, let him simply bring down an estimate of what, under ordinary circumstances, would meet the case. I am quite sure that if some accident occurred, something extraordinary occurred, there would be some means of meeting the case. There are means of meeting emergencies of that kind by the Governor General's warrant. I do not mean to say that it would be applicable to this particular case. But if some extraordinary epidemic was to occur among the Indians during the coming month and it was necessary to expend a very large sum of money, I do not think there is an hon. member in this House who would find fault if the expenditure was found to exceed the estimate. That is a matter that could be explained, but there is no explanation and no attempt to explain this case. It is a common thing in the estimates to have an item for unforeseen expenses, and it applies so plainly and so specially that a minister, putting together the items for ten, fifteen or twenty years, and striking an average, can certainly get very little astray in arriving at what would be a reasonable correct estimate. I wish to take this firm stand on this question, because I believe it would be in the interest of economy, in the interest of the country, in the interest of careful administration and careful expenditure. But if we are to allow the matter to go on hap-hazard year after year without having any safeguards thrown around it, as I have already said, we lose all control of the expenditure of the country, and practically know nothing about it, allowing the expenditure to grow on us year after year, wondering indeed what has become of the money of the country.

Mr. INGRAM. How many bands are there in New Brunswick? I understand there are about 1,600 Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. There were twenty bands.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include the Indians that were not settled on reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. There were twenty bands located but all the Indians are not settled in those particular settlements ; that is some Indians are not in the band settlements but there are twenty bands.

Mr. INGRAM. Some of them are not settled on reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. Exactly.

Mr. INGRAM. What does the government do with those not on the reserves that are included in those 1,600 ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are dealt with as though they were on reserves but of course they are not restrained to the reserve.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no restriction made between those settled on the reserves and those not settled on reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there is no difference. Their proper home is on the reserves, but I am given to understand they are not compelled to remain there and some of them choose to rather make their permanent residence elsewhere than on the reserve ; others prefer to make their permanent home on the reserve, but to spend the greater part of the time travelling about the province in their usual vocations of hunting, fishing and basket making.

Mr. INGRAM. Are those under the care of the doctors appointed by the department to look after the Indians of those several bands ?

Mr. OLIVER. They have the same claim upon the assistance of the medical department whether they are on the reserve or off it.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that where they are not on the regular reserves the death rate is higher, the sickness greater than on the reserves in New Brunswick ?

Mr. OLIVER. Such is not the information of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. I think there is a reference to this in the report. The death rate was higher your report says last year from various diseases. The argument used by the minister is that the reason why you are increasing the item this year is on account of the increase of sickness among the Indians and in the last item, ' Miscellaneous and Unforeseen' where you have an increase of $300 over last year you are giving as a reason that greater sickness may prevail and for that reason you are increasing the item. You have forgotten that you have increased the item above that by $500 more than last year ; it was $3,000 last year and now it is $3,500. Therefore the argument used by the minister with respect to the increased sickness on the reserve is already attended to by reason of the $500 increase for medical attendance, and the argument would not hold good for the last item for ' miscellaneous and unforeseen.'

Mr. OLIVER. The miscellaneous as will be understood is not all for medical service, but is mostly taken up in the travelling about of agents and contingencies and in case of sickness the agents have to travel about more and exercise closer supervision.

Mr. INGRAM. You have eleven doctors controlling twenty bands and the greatest difficulty, I apprehend, among those not settled on regular reserves, and the causes that brought about the increased sickness among the Indians not on the settled reserves, was the bad sanitary condition of their buildings. The same attention is not given to the Indians that are settled on other places than the regular reserves and that may account for the increased cost of medical attendance.

Mr. OLIVER. Under the treaty arrangement with the Indians it is not within the power of the department to compel them to live within the reserves. They have the privilege of living around where they please.

Mr. INGRAM. Surely Indians desiring to have the rights given to Indians must comply with the instructions of the Department of the Interior. They must reside on the reserves to be entitled to what the department grants them. Take at Munsey or any of the other Ontario reserves if the Indians will not remain on the reserves surely the department does not have to grant them what it gives to those who are on the reserves. If an Indian desires his freedom and wants to roam at will he must do it at his own expense and cost, and the department should not be called upon to treat him the same as they would Indians who are on the regular reserves.

Mr. OLIVER. The conditions in the maritime provinces are not the same as in the Northwest ; in fact the Indians in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia do not receive any treaty payments and the government does not take the responsibility of their support as is the case with the Indians of the Northwest. The Indians of the Northwest were deprived of their livelihood by the destruction of the buffalo. In the case of the maritime province Indians they are expected practically to make their own living. The government recognizes their responsibility towards them in various ways, and one of the ways is in giving medical attendance, but the able-bodied Indian of New Brunswick is expected to provide for his own support, and as every one knows a sedentary life does not agree with the mind or inclination of the Indian, and possibly does not give him the best opportunities. Therefore it is in the securing of a livelihood that the Indians wander from their reserves, and I would take it that if the government exercised pressure to keep them on the reserve the government would thereby incur a moral responsi-

bility to provide for their support to a degree that it is not called upon to do at the present time ?

Mr. INGRAM. That is not the point at all. If an Indian roams around at will and through his negligence becomes sick, surely it is not the intention of the department to follow that Indian around and provide medical attendance for him ?

Mr. BLAIN. The Indian report shows that the Indians of New Brunswick are divided into several bands, and there does not appear to be very much progress made by them. The inspector of the Eel river band reports :

They have no stock or farm implements ; they pay no attention whatever to education ; they are not making much progress.

The government should give some little attention to educating these Indians and especially so as the effort appears to be a success in the Northwest. Nobody objects to spending money for the welfare of the Indians, but some of it should be devoted to educating the younger Indians so that they may become self-supporting and cease to be a burden on us. The report as to the Bathurst band says :

They pay no attention to education ; they are not making any progress.

The report with reference to the Burnt Church band is more encouraging and it says :

There is a school house on this reserve and the school has been kept open for several years past. Many of the younger Indians can read and write. More interest is taken by them in education than in former years.

If the Indians of this band can be induced to educate themselves surely the same thing can be done with reference to other bands in the same province. The report as to the Red Bank band says :

Very little attention is given to education. These Indians are amongst the most progressive in this agency.

It looks as if these reports were stereotyped from year to year, and that the agent does very much as assessors do, namely look up last year's report to see what it said and then write the same thing for the current year. I hope that when the minister is installed in his office he will attend to these things, and that next year we will see a change. Some attention should be paid to educating the Indians on every one of these reserves.

Mr. OLIVER. A vote of $1,800 has already been passed for schools on Indian reserves in New Brunswick.

Prince Edward Island Indians—medical attendance, $650.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there any more doctors engaged this year than last ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are only two reserves on the island and the doctors are paid by fees according to attendance.

Mr. INGRAM. They seem to be paid a pretty fair fee ?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure last year was $562.80.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many Indians are there in Prince Edward Island ?

Mr. OLIVER. 292.

Mr. HENDERSON. May I ask if there is any grant made to the Indians at Indian Lorette in the province of Quebec ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is an agent there. They have medical attendance and relief is furnished to those who are destitute. They do not receive treaty money as do the Indians in the west, but in other respects they are dealt with in much the same way.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not finding fault with the expenditure and my question was merely a matter of curiosity. I had occasion to visit Indian Lorette not long ago and I was impressed with the comfortable conditions under which the Indians were living. Were it not that I was told it was an Indian village I never would have suspected they were Indians at all, with the exception of one or two people I saw there. They are certainly a very respectable looking class of people, and I presume that under the arrangement made with them long ago they are entitled to receive this consideration. I am glad to testify to the comfortable conditions in which the Lorette Indians appear to be.

Mr. OLIVER. They are practically self-supporting.

Indians—Manitoba and the Northwest—annuities, $141,365.

Mr. OLIVER. This item shows a net decrease of $52,307. There is a decrease in annuities, supplies of implements, seed, live stock, provisions, clothing, special clothing for chiefs, special grant to the Sault Indians, and in the expenditure on saw and grist mills and general expenses of management. There is an increase in the estimate for schools, day, boarding and industrial, of $5,910 ; a total net decrease of $52,307.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is the decrease in the annuities owing to a decrease in the number of Indians ?

Mr. OLIVER. No ; it was found that the vote in the estimates was a little larger than was necessary, and the estimate of this year is reduced accordingly.

Mr. LAKE. Has there been a decrease in the number of Indians in the last year or two ?

Mr. OLIVER. No ; they are just about at a standstill.

Indians—Manitoba and the Northwest Territories—seeds, field and garden, $1,864.

Mr. INGRAM. How are these distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that they are distributed from the commissioner's office at Winnipeg to the different agencies, and the distribution to the individual Indians on the reserve is at the discretion of the agent.

Mr. INGRAM. Without any interference from any other officer?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand so.

Indians—Manitoba and the Northwest Territories—live stock, $25,253.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the minister to explain the method by which this live stock is purchased for the department. Is any particular stockman asked to supply a certain number of head at a stipulated price, or have all stockmen an opportunity of competing?

Mr. OLIVER. The purchase of cattle is accomplished in various ways. This year Inspector Markle has purchased the greater number of cattle required, particularly the bulls. Some of the other stock has been purchased by other officers of the department under inspection by a veterinary. All stock is subject to inspection before it is paid for.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is the stock inspected before it is shipped? Does Inspector Markle go around and inspect it before it is placed on the cars to be shipped to different reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. He inspects and is responsible for the condition of that part of the stock which he purchases. The stock are subject to an inspection by a veterinary when they arrive at the different agencies, to see that they arrive in proper condition.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The reason I ask this is that I think the government have been paying an exorbitant price for a good deal of the stock they purchase. For instance, I know a stockman who gets $125 apiece for so-called thoroughbred cattle, which he sells to the government for the Indian reserves, and he sold about $9,000 worth last year; yet those who have sold animals to this stockman have informd me that they sold them to him for $45, $50 and $55 per head. One gentleman, whose veracity I can vouch for, informed me that he was offered by this same stockman his own selection of fifteen animals at $60 per head. It is common talk in that part of the country that the government has been imposed upon by the manner in which this stock has been sold to it. I have a little delicacy in mentioning this gentleman's name, but he himself has rather made a boast as to the amount of money he has made in selling this stock to the government at $125 per head, while it is well known to all the farmers of the neighbourhood that he purchased the animals at $45, $50 and $55 a head.

Mr. OLIVER. I can understand that there is a great difference of opinion as to the value of alleged thoroughbred stock, without the different valuators being in any way dishonest. I can easily imagine that the department may on occasions have paid more than a clever stock buyer would have been able to get the animals for; but the desire of the department is rather to procure good animals than cheap animals, while, of course, not paying improper prices. But I am pointing out that in the one case the object of the buyer is to get the animal as cheap as he can, while the object of the department is to get the animal as good as possible within a fixed limit of price.

Mr. COCHRANE. By paying $120 when you could have got them for $60.

Mr. OLIVER. I am merely stating a fact, which is in the knowledge of every man in Canada, that the value of a thorough bred animal is very largely a matter of opinion and judgment.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman is not answering the statement. The statement was that a stock owner sold 15 head of cattle to the government at $125 a head and had offered them to a merchant at $60 a head.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not disputing the statement at all, but I am merely pointing out that there is the possibility of a very wide margin of difference between two perfectly honest estimates of the value of the same animals, when the question of breeding is in issue.

Mr. COCHRANE. Everybody who knows anything about stock knows that if an animal is well bred, the breeding will show on the animal.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No one will know better than the original owner, and when an animal has been purchased for less than $60 from the original owner and then is offered to another party for $60, and is subsequently sold to the government for $125, there is something radically wrong. It is evidently a case of favouring a political friend. I do not know whether the particular inspector or Indian agent was a good judge of an animal as to breeding or not; but if he is limited to purchasing from men of a certain political complexion, he will have to pay correspondingly increased prices. Some other method of purchasing should be followed rather than that of going to certain political friends and asking them to supply so many head of cattle at so much per head.

Mr. OLIVER. If there be a discrepancy between the actual value of the animal and the price paid, some means will have to be taken to prevent future purchases of

that kind. The object of the department is to secure good animals and we have limited the price to a figure which should be sufficient for a good animal. Beyond that figure the purchaser cannot go, and he is bound to get the best animal he can for the price. That may not be the best way. It is said that the agent was instructed to purchase from certain firms or dealers. Well, there are certain people who make a specialty of thoroughbred stock, and the buyer might very well be instructed to go to such. For my part I think that in the western country, there is an opporunity to purchase thoroughbred stock on terms which do not leave the matter open to question from any point of view. There is a thoroughbred stock sale at Calgary every year, where thoroughbreds are brought from all parts, and are offered for sale at public competition. I have instructed my officers to attend that sale this year and purchase whatever animals might be required.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That would be a much preferable way to buying them from the middlemen. All these animals were purchased in Manitoba for shipment to the Territories. If you have stock sales at Calgary, you could buy them there and save freight and you could buy very much better where you have competition. As regards the other suggestion of the minister, it would be better for the superintendent of Indian agencies to go direct to the stock raisers, who are known to have a number of thoroughbred stock, and save the great profits of the middleman.

Mr. HERRON. In our country it is well known that the different Indian reserves pay three or four times the value for the stock they buy. I know of another instance where 100 head of cattle were put upon one of the reserves by a speculative friend of the government. He charged for these cattle $26 a head. They would not sell in the district where they were delivered for $10 a head. That fact I know personally, because I had something to do with their delivery and inspection. The agent refused to accept the cattle and the stockman and contractor simply sent for a very important member of the government and he instructed the agent to take them over. All the cattle supplied the reserves in that part of the country have been charged at the same rate.

Mr. LALOR. I think the Minister of the Interior made a rather candid statement when he said these mistakes were not to be repeated. That is the kind of statement this country wants. If the minister will follow that precedent, he will be acting more in the interests of the department than in trying to condone its acts of the past. Judging by the criticism of that department both in and out of the House, it would keep him rather busy to do that. And I hope that, when these questions come before the department he will be candid enough with the people not to condone the acts of the department in the past. I hope also that in the future such acts will not be repeated. I think the country will have confidence that under the hon. gentleman they will not be repeated. I think the people believe that they have an honest man at the head of the department at the present time, whatever they may have had in the past. I am glad to believe that the hon. gentleman will not repeat the mistakes made by his predecessors and buy cattle from the man who happens to be the Liberal candidate, at twice the price of what they are worth. I think that the explanation made that these cattle, bought from the farmers at $45 and $50 a head were sold to this government at $120 per head shows to some extent the extravagance of the department in the past. I do not think it should be repeated even though the gentleman selling the cattle happens to be the Liberal candidate.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. We have in this item a reduction from $53,895 for the current year to $25,253 for the coming year. Surely the fact of having had a general election last November had nothing to do with this.

Mr. OLIVER. I am told that the reason for the reduction this year is that the purchases of previous years have brought the amount of stock on the reserves up to about what is considered reasonable. Of course, it is not the policy of the department to continue buying breeding stock for the reserves. The intention is to buy a certain amount and depend upon the Indians themselves to take care of that stock and look after the increase. The whole intention of the purchase in years past was that these purchases should not continue in the future; but it is hoped that the difference between the estimate of the current year and that of the coming year on this account can be continued, and that with the purchases that have already been made, there will be an increase of stock on the reserves. In regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) I do not know that it is any part of my business either to admit mistakes on the part of the department or to condone any mistakes they may have made. I have undertaken a very serious responsibility in my present office, and shall hope to discharge that responsibility so as to meet the approval of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. At the same time, I must say, that though I am of a sanguine disposition, and however great my hopes, my expectation does not by any means reach such a height as that. With regard to this item, I think it can be no question that for the requirements of the reserves in the west, at least, so long as the Calgary sale is continued, it will be the best and most economical place to purchase

the thoroughbred stock. It is not the sale for other than thoroughbred stock—that other will have to be purchased elsewhere. I do not know now how this system of purchase can be improved upon, though if complaints made are well founded, perhaps its administration could be improved upon. But, in the case of thoroughbred stock, we can hardly hope to purchase the requirements for the eastern part of Canada at the western stock sale. We will try to devise something, possibly if the sale is kept up to the high standard and run on as good a basis.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. minister has an estimate here of over $25,000 for the coming year. I assume that he has details of the class of animals he will purchase with this money. Could he tell how many thoroughbreds and how many of the ordinary class of stock he intends to purchase?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman wants to know what animals are to be purchased and for what reserves?

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. And at what price.

Mr. OLIVER. The following is the estimate:

Manitoba.		
Portage La Prairie Agency—		
1 bull for Swan Lake Band..		$ 100
Manitowapah Agency—		
1 bull for Water Hen River Band.....		80
The Pas Agency—		
1 bull (grade) for Grand Rapids Band..		80
Northwest Territories.		
Crooked Lake Agency—		
1 bull (Shorthorn) at $100.. ..$	100	
10 work oxen at $50..	500	
		600
Touchwood Hills Agency—		
2 bulls (Shorthorn) at $100..		200
Saddle Lake Agency—		
2 bulls (Shorthorn) at $125..		250
Hobbema Agency—		
2 bulls (Shorthorn) at $125..		250
Stoney Agency—		
100 heifers at $28 and 2 stallions (range bred) at $175		3,150
Blackfoot Agency—		
12 bulls at $125..	$1,500	
200 heifers at $28..	5,600	
3 stallions at $175..	525	
		7,625
Peigan Agency—		
10 bulls at $125..	1,250	
400 heifers at $28..	11,200	
2 stallions at $150..	300	
		12,750
Total..		..25,253

Mr. HERRON. At what age are heifers required say for Stoney agency or the Piegan agency?

Mr. OLIVER. Two years old.

Mr. HERRON. Surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) does not think that two-year old heifers are worth $28 apiece in that country?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice, with reference to the Blackfoot agency that he said he intended to purchase during the coming year twelve males at $125 each.

Mr. OLIVER. Scarcely that. We are asking for that amount of money so that we may purchase at that price. We will purchase them at a lower price if we can. But we are anxious to keep within the hon. gentleman's restrictions as to overrunning our vote.

Mr. HENDERSON. At the same time, we expect the hon. gentleman, who is going to give $125 each, to buy a good animal for the Indians, and that he will not put them off with a poorer animal and use the balance of the money for something else. That would be getting back to the old system. In the same agency the department purchased twelve males only last year. Can it be possible that it is necessary to keep on renewing the thoroughbred stock at this excessive rate ? If so, it seems to me that something is wrong. I do not know much about the Blackfoot agency but it seems to me that the purchases are pretty large. There is also a supply of heifers at $28. It would appear that this is the standard price for heifers. It strikes me as very extraordinary that heifers raised in the Northwest Territories are so much alike that they are worth just $28, no more and no less. That seems to be the standing price. It looks to me as if the agent goes out and says, I want some good heifers, $28 is my price, turn out your heifers. They may be worth $20, they may be worth $15, but $28 seems to be the standard price for heifers, the same as $125 is for the male animal. Now does the minister really think, after purchasing 12 thoroughbreds, male animals for this agency last year, that it is absolutely necessary that twelve more should be purchased next year? It seems to me there is a good deal of uncalled for extravagance and waste of money. I think the Indians should be taught to make better use of what is provided for them; they should be trained to habits of economy and industry, to take care of what is given to them. It may be that some disease has crept in and the animals have died; but unless there are some extraordinary conditions, certainly there seems to be something wrong in the appropriation we are asked for.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a very large reservation, comprising 470 square miles, and containing 850 Indians. By treaty made with these Indians the government is under obligation to provide them with support. These Indians were formerly dependent upon the buffalo, and the treaty stipulated that when the buffalo disappeared, as they must disappear with the settlement of the country by white people, the government should provide for the support of these Indians. The government has carried out that part of the bargain, but at the same time it has been

our constant effort to get the Indians to be self-supporting. Although the reserve is a large one it is not generally agricultural, neither are the Indians agriculturally inclined; so you would have almost to make over the reserve and to make over the Indians before you could get them to support themselves by farming as we understand it. The only chance of getting them to be self-supporting is to encourage them to raise stock. Now the department has entered into this enterprise of providing these people with stock so that they may ultimately become self-supporting. It is still a difficult process to some extent, but that seems to be the only way by which we can bring them to that condition. I think it will be generally agreed that it would be a good policy to pursue towards the Indians to induce them to become self-supporting, and to that end we are providing them with stock by this vote.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. I would ask the hon. gentleman whether the Indians are in the habit of eating up their stock in the winter when they are pinched with hunger?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, the department retains a certain control over the stock, and the Indian is only allowed to kill and sell with the premission of the agent. Very strict care is exercised in that respect, and although stock is handed over to the Indians to be dealt with exactly as he pleases, at the same time certain control is retained by the agent, so far as is consistent with the encouragement of the idea of independence and of property in the mind of the Indian.

Mr. HERRON. I may tell the minister that these cattle are not worth $28, $22 to $23 would be a good price for them. You can get almost the best cattle in the North-west Territories for that price.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the hon. gentleman is thoroughly posted in that matter, and I will request the officers of the department to take notice of his opinion. But as I have pointed out, we are not asking this money necessarily with the intention of paying that price for cattle, but we are asking it for the purpose of covering all contingencies, so that we may not have to overrun our estimate.

Mr. LAKE. In connection with these items I desire to make a remark regarding the practice of allowing Indian agents to act as magistrates. They do so under the statutes of 1886, ex-officio an Indian agent is a justice of the peace. Then he has the power of two justices of the peace in certain cases which are enumerated in that Act. He deals not only with the Indians but also with white people. A little excitement has been created in a portion of the district which I represent in regard to this matter. Now that settlements have become fairly thick throughout the Territories, and there are likely to be a good many cases in which both whites and Indians are mixed up, I think it would be just as well to have that provision removed; and if it is considered advisable that special authority should be given to the agents in respect to the Indians, then it should be confined to those agencies in the more remote districts. It will be readily understood that an Indian agent, if he is any good as such, looks upon the Indians as his especial charge, as his wards, and in any cases which come before him where Indians and whites are concerned, his judgment is likely to be biased in favour of the Indians. For instance, there are the cases where some one has taken wood or timber off an Indian reserve. The agent in the first place sets on foot inquiries as to who is likely to have taken the wood. After he thinks he has discovered the guilty parties he takes the necessary proceedings to summon them before him; so that after having acted as prosecutor he also becomes the judge. It seems to me absolutely wrong in principle that the same person should be both prosecutor and judge. In the older established settlements there are many gentlemen who are capable of acting as magistrates, and could act in all cases in which whites and Indians are concerned. So far as I can see in the Act there is no provision for an Indian agent to take an oath of office; I do not know whether he takes an oath to act in the capacity of justice of the peace, perhaps the minister will be able to tell me. Further than that, every justice of the peace who is appointed by the local government in the Northwest has to make regular returns to the Attorney General of cases which come before him, also returns to the Supreme Court of cases heard and convictions made. I would like to know whether the Indian agent acting as two—for he has the power of two—justices of the peace, makes regular reports to the Department of Justice or to the Supreme Court; what check there is upon him in that respect. I may say that I am strongly of opinion that he should not act in cases of this nature and that it would be advisable to have the act changed in this respect this session.

Mr. OLIVER. The agent is ex-officio a magistrate; he does not take an oath of office and makes his report to the head of the Indian Department. The idea of course is that the Indians are not in a position to protect themselves in law and that it is desirable they should have adequate protection within the limits of their reserve. Of course the jurisdiction of the agent only applies within the limits of the reserve and therefore can only be exercised in connection with matters that are entirely under the Indian Act or disputes between Indians and other people under that Act. While my friend admits that this is still necessary on reserves which are situated in a thinly settled country——

Mr. LAKE. I do not admit it.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, if my friend does not admit the propriety of this provision in any case, I am quite prepared to admit that with the settlement of the country and the change of conditions it is quite possible that what may have been a necessary provision at one time is not a necessary provision now and the subject is very well worthy of consideration. But at the same time, even though we do consider the changed conditions, there is one condition that is not changed, that the Indians are as has always been said the wards of the government. They are a special responsibility on the Dominion government and therefore under its special protection and it is something to be considered very carefully before a conclusion is arrived at as to whether it would be desirable to withdraw from the Indians that protection which this government is now able to accord them through the position of the agent as a justice of the peace in administering the special legal provisions which are applicable only within the limits of the reserve and which are generally considered necessary to the well being of the Indians on the reserve.

Mr. LAKE. Let me put a specific case before the minister. A number of white settlers take wood off a reserve. They may have done it deliberately or they may have done it inadvertently. It is very difficult, as the minister knows, sometimes to know where an Indian reserve begins and where it ends ; there is nothing particular to show. The agent, if he is a good agent, having the interest of the Indians thoroughly at heart, immediately that this matter is reported to him by the Indians sets to work to try and find who has been guilty of taking the wood. As soon as he thinks he has located the guilty parties he issues summonses and they appear before him. Now I contend that he is not a proper person under those circumstances to judge the white settlers, it may be, who have been brought before him in this way. He has been the man who has started out to find the offenders and then he becomes the judge as to whether those are the offenders whom he has caught, and the judge as to the extent to which they shall be punished for the offence, if he finds he has been successful in capturing the right persons. Certainly it seems to me that in all places where there are civilian justices of the peace within reach it becomes his duty to take that matter before the civilian justices of the peace. Surely the minister will not contend that the agent cannot get as full justice for the Indians before the ordinary justices of the peace as he could by taking the case himself. I agree that the Indians are the wards of the government and should be well looked after and their rights preserved to them, but we have the agents who are in a position to look after these rights and see that they are preserved to the Indians and they can do it, in my opinion, perfectly well without acting as justices of the peace between them and the neighbouring settlers.

Mr. INGRAM. With respect to the inspection of agencies, take for instance the Qu'Appelle agency, how many officers are connected with that agency ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are nine officials connected with the Qu'Appelle agency and besides that Inspector Graham who is inspector of the eastern division of agencies, has special charge of this agency of which he was formerly agent. He was afterwards appointed inspector with headquarters in this agency and special supervision over it.

Mr. INGRAM. Take the Assiniboine agency and the Moose Mountain agency for instance. Would the inspector inspect those, and if he did would his report be submitted to the department and would it be published in this report here ?

Mr. OLIVER. He is inspector of the two agencies mentioned, and his report would be printed in the next report of the department.

Mr. INGRAM. What I want to get at is who inspected it previous to the date of this report, and where is the report to be found that ought to be included in this report ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the former inspector named Leveque, died, after a long illness, and did not make the usual annual report as inspector. The agent's report appears as usual. Mr. Graham was appointed, but he has only reported in regard to the schools, as he has not been long enough in office to make a full report.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister make further inquiry into this matter and give us a little better explanation a little later ? It seems a very remarkable thing that a report should not have been submitted. Is it not a fact that the report was suppressed ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed I have given the only explanation there is.

Mr. INGRAM. We are perfectly satisfied to allow that explanation to go for the present. At a later period we will perhaps be able to make some explanation too ; we are informed the minister's explanation is hardly in accordance with the facts.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to ask the minister if some provision cannot be made to keep the Stoney Indians on their reserve and prevent them exterminating the game in the Rocky mountains ? I do not suppose that the government is saving very much in the matter of maintenance by allowing those Indians to travel over the Rocky mountains, hunting the year round and depleting the greatest game country on this continent of

elk, deer, mountain sheep, goat, grizzly bear and several other kinds of game. The Indians seem to be exempt from all the game laws which govern the white people, and they make a regular practise of slaughtering the game and selling the carcase. I am sure the people of all Canada would be sorry to think that our Rocky mountain game may be exterminated as the buffalo have been exterminated from the prairies. Of course, the advance of agriculture would have removed the buffalo anyway, but the Rocky mountain country is not suitable for agriculture, and its game is a great advantage in many respects. Both the minister and the hon. member for Strathcona are aware of the facts, and I trust that some steps will be taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) to provide a remedy.

Mr. OLIVER. This matter has been under the consideration of the department for a number of years, and the facts as stated by the hon. member (Mr. Herron) are recognized, but there are grave difficulties in the way of providing a remedy. The Indians, by their treaty, have the right to hunt anywhere on the reserve or off it, and it is considered a very doubtful policy to undertake to abrogate arbitrarily that treaty right. It seems to be a case of either the Indians exterminating the game or of our exterminating the Indians. If we prevent them it might mean the violation of a very solemn treaty obligation entered into by this government, and that is a very serious step to take. I do not say that some solution of the difficulty may not be found, and it will be my endeavour to find it, but I wish it to be understood that it is a very difficult matter. This reserve is not suitable for agriculture, but the department has endeavoured to induce the Indians to take to stock raising by supplying them with stock. So far that endeavour has met with no marked success. They are good hunters and there is good game in the mountains, and it suits their temperament better to follow the game than to herd the cattle. The situation is difficult, but I can assure the hon. member that the facts are within my knowledge as they are within his, and I shall make every effort to meet the difficulty, although I cannot make any promise as to the measure of success I may meet with.

Mr. HERRON. I am very glad the minister has recognized the importance of this question, in which the people of the west as well as the people of the east are interested. I look to some solution of the difficulty, because I know that the minister will do his best.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has stated that the Indian agents in their capacity as justices of the peace made returns to the department. Amongst the most important part of the returns of ordinary justices of the peace is the rendering of accounts of the fines and forfeitures, but, so far as I can see from the Auditor General's Report, there appear to have been none last year. Is that the case ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that there are returns of fines and forfeitures made to the government.

Mr. LAKE. I am glad to hear it. I hope the hon. minister will look into this question, which is really a very serious one, of Indian agents acting as magistrates, with the power of two justices of the peace, in cases in which whites are concerned, and see if he cannot eliminate this provision with respect to localities where there are civilian justices of the peace.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. When the minister states that there are returns of fines to this government, does that merely apply to the Territories, or does it include fines collected in the province of Manitoba, where the administration of justice is entirely in the hands of provincial officers ? I am aware that trials have taken place there in which Indian agents have acted as magistrates.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the fines will go to the Dominion.

Indians—Manitoba and Northwest Territories —provisions, &c., $162,521.

Mr. INGRAM. How are these provisions bought ?

Mr. OLIVER. The rule is to purchase all these supplies by tender after public advertisement, except when the supplies tendered for have been exhausted, and the term required to be filled is not long enough to warrant a further advertisement. The great bulk of the supplies are purchased by tender after public advertisement.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some of the prices seem to me to be very high indeed. For instance, I find an item like this : 100 pounds of biscuits, at 20 cents per pound. These must be very much better than the biscuits that were sent to South Africa for the volunteers. I do not object to the Indians getting a good article, but we must see that too high a price is not paid for it. Another item is 75 pounds of cheese at 16 cents per pound. I notice that there is a charge of the Canadian Pacific Railway freight on supplies, so that these prices would be exclusive of the freight paid to the Blood agency. Another item is 12 bottles of extract of lemon at 35 cents. I think it would surprise a great many housewives to learn that the Indians of the Northwest were supplied with an article of this kind costing three times as much as it does in Ontario. Another item is 200 pounds of rice at 8 cents per pound. Most people consider rice at 5 cents per pound a satisfactory food. Another item is rolled oats, 500 pounds, at 3½ cents per pound. I do not know whether this is Tilson's pan-dried ; if it is, it must be a very superior quality.

I do not think people in this part of the country are in the habit of having 3½ cent meal made into porridge. Then we have 24 cans of salmon at 15 cents. If it is British Columbia salmon, it seems to get cheaper the further east it comes. Then we have 900 pounds of sugar at 6 cents. We in this part of the country were satisfied to pay 4 cents a pound for standard granulated at the time this was bought. Then we have 4 gallons of vinegar at 80 cents a gallon. That must be a very superior quality; possibly it was adulterated with some kind of alcohol. These are a few illustrations. It seems to me that these prices are altogether out of the ordinary, and I am surprised to learn that these goods are bought by tender. I notice that 75 cwt. of lime was bought at 75 cents per cwt. Is there no stone in that part of the country? To my mind that is an extraordinary price. In the Edmonton agency, I notice that a very high price was paid for the same article—55 cents a bushel.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I have paid 75 cents a bushel for it.

Mr. HENDERSON. That must be a splendid place to sell lime. Some energetic, pushing man selling lime there could make a fortune in a few years. This is freight paid, and I have no doubt that for half the price some sensible business man would have taken hold of the matter. I am surprised at the government paying those extravagant prices. My hon. friend gets big prices for what he sells. I notice here that he sold four bulls at $125 each. A man who gets that price for his bulls can well afford to pay 75 cents for lime.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I supplied five bulls but one of them died after being taken down there and I did not get paid for it. I lost $75 on the transaction.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps it was sick when sold and the hon. gentleman was not entitled to be paid for it. I regret very much that he lost his bull.

Mr. P. TALBOT. The price was $40 less than the average price I received at the Calgary sale for three yeas.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that $125 is the ordinary price. I am not saying that the hon. gentleman got any more for his bulls than did other stockmen. From $80 up to $125 seems to be the common price. I am not accusing the hon. gentleman of having done anything unfair. I do not believe he would be capable of doing anything of the kind because he comes from pretty near the same section as myself, and I know something of his family, and I am not charging him with any dishonesty at all. But I am pointing out that there is something peculiar about these prices. Why had such large figures to be paid? Had heavy freights to be paid, it would be different, but I understand the Canadian Pacific Railway is paid for conveying those articles to their destination, and consequently they should be laid down there as cheaply as at Ottawa or Toronto.

Mr. OLIVER. During the visit of His Excellency to that part of the country, at his special request, these animals were purchased, and they were paid for at the ordinary retail price of the locality.

Mr. TAYLOR. But the great bulk of supplies were bought by tender?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly. The hon. gentleman was in error when he said that the price paid is the price less freight. The tenders all called for prices delivered.

Surveys, $7,000.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask whether the hon. minister has any idea that the Indians will sell any portion of their reserves. I know that for some time past, that question has been raised with regard to the Crooked lakes agency. There is a very large extent of territory in that agency quite close to the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is not used by Indians, and is quite in excess of their requirements. The Indians might be persuaded to sell that territory. I presume it is their property which they can sell or not if they choose. Could the department encourage them in any way to give up any of the land which they really do not require in order to promote settlement? There would be a large settlement there if the Indians would dispose of any of their land.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that there is an arrangement for the surrender of 5,000 acres of the Assiniboia reserve south of the Sintaluta. That will be dealt with during the coming summer. At other places also efforts are being made to induce the Indians to part with portions of their reserves which they do not need, and for which they will receive the full price that may be received by the government acting as their trustees. It is not possible for the government to enforce a surrender because the land is absolutely the property of the Indians.

Mr. LAKE. Is there any idea of selling any portion of the Pasqua's reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. Up to the present I have had no communications with regard to that.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the explanation of paying $15 a day to Dr. Jamieson in connection with the Berens river agency?

Mr. OLIVER. The medical attendant accompanies the agent in making the annual treaty payments.

Mr. INGRAM. Why should the doctor be paid $15 a day and $162.50 for expenses?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been the custom for many years to take the opportunity of the gathering of the Indians at the treaty points to make a medical examination of them and render them such medical assistance as may be possible at the time.

Mr. INGRAM. We had a similar case last year. I find $162.50 charged up for expenses of the same Dr. Jamieson. Does he accompany the Rev. J. Semmens ?

Mr. OLIVER. He did the last year. The Rev. Mr. Semmens was agent.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, and this Dr. Jamieson gets $15 a day, and he has $160 in addition for expenses. He travelled around with this man for a trip I suppose to enjoy himself in this particular agency. The same rule does not apply in any other place. And then these gentlemen have rather an exalted idea of their duties, they charter boats and go into this thing very liberally.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are no special cars?

Mr. INGRAM. There are no special cars but here we have schooners $73. I do not know whether they are lager beer schooners or not. Then they have 'entertaining a party, $3.50,' 'expert interpreter, $11.' There are several items here that should be looked into as they really are very liberal and I think this Dr. Thompson has had a very good thing now for a couple of years and he should give some one else a chance. It should not be confined to this one particular agency.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. We will have that looked right into.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what can be said in regard to this more than to repeat that it has been the custom for many years to make a medical inspection of the treaty bands at the time of making the treaty payments. It is usual to have the services of a physician. I do not know what the ordinary stipend of the position is, but fancy that $15 a day is not more than most of those talented professional gentlemen would ask especially for a trip such as this around the Berens River agency, the reserves of which are situated around the shores of Lake Winnipeg, and the chartering of boats is a necessity if the trip is to be made unless the agent and the medical man either swim or wade. There are no railroads or roads of any kind between several of the agencies, and the only means of communication is by boat and it is natural to suppose that the medical man if he is of good standing and his services are worth anything will not make such a trip as that for anything but a very fair consideration.

Mr. BLAIN. Is such a medical inspection made of all the different bands of the province of Manitoba ?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand so.

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, nonsense. On this page there are several other agencies and will the minister be good enough to turn over his report and find such an inspection for the Clandeboye reserve, the Birtle reserve, the Blackfoot reserve, or the Blood or any of them. There is not a single doctor mentioned in his report as receiving $15 a day and his expenses included.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps the shooting was not as good at the other agencies. There was not the same inducement for a doctor to go out for a holiday.

Mr. OLIVER. The medical service on the reserve of the Clandeboye agency is done by a Dr. Steep who receives a yearly salary of $900.

Mr. INGRAM. I think I can say there is not another agency in the whole list in which there can be found a doctor receiving $15 a day either by the year or any other way. I understand now that the Minister of the Interior support this, and thinks it is a proper payment and that it should be paid and continued. That is what I understand from his justification of this item.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no hesitation whatever in saying that according to the custom of the department and the principle which has guided the department in dealing with the Indians for the last 20 years it is certainly a proper principle, and I fully believe it is a proper payment. At any rate if it is not a proper payment the impropriety is not in the amount of the payment or for the services supposed to be rendered, or it would only be in the qualification of the physician whose services are engaged. If he is a properly qualified physician he is worth that money.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to point out again that in this report here the health of the band is stated to have been fairly good throughout the year. It makes a good report in that respect and the other cases are more or less like that, but there is no doctor going around and getting such high fees. It would be far better to pay a permanent doctor $600 a year so that he could be available every day in the year if necessary. But this man, for only 45 days, gets $15 a day and $150 odd for expenses.

Mr. OLIVER. A little while ago the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) accused me of finding fault with members of the committee on improper grounds ; accused me of trying to arouse sympathy in favour of the unfortunate immigrants or Indians as against the members of the opposition. Now I hope he will not accuse me in this instance when I say that in this particular case the geographical circumstances are such that it would be useless to appoint a salaried Indian medical attendant such as gives the medical attendance on all other reserves, I am given to understand, through-

out Manitoba and the Northwest. This particular agency is in a peculiar geographical position. It is situated along the shores of Lake Winnipeg and various agencies can only be reached by boat in the summer and for practical purposes cannot be reached in the winter, and I think when a member such as the member for East Elgin has seen fit to do, takes the ground of strongly objecting to the medical attendance that is given to those Indians, which has been the custom of the department all the time, it is only fair that the hon. member who makes that objection and takes that position should accept and take full responsibility for it.

Mr. INGRAM. I accept the responsibility for everything I say in the House. I do not seek to shelter myself behind any person. I say that if the Indians on that reserve have health so good that the doctor's services are not required for more than 45 days in the whole year and the department pays $600, I say the department is not taking a wise course or doing a wise thing, and I understand the minister is defending this. This doctor is engaged for only 45 days out of the 365 days in the year, but is paid $15 a day and the poor Indians suffer without a doctor for the remaining 320 days, and these 45 days are all on the one trip. As my hon. friend beside me suggests, he fixed them so well in the 45 days that they have been in good health for the balance of the days.

Indians—British Columbia—medical attendance and medicines, $20,000.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister might give some explanation of that medicine.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to point out that when the next general election comes round the hon. gentleman from Brockville will be on record as objecting to a proper criticism of these items.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. No; I am not finding a word of fault. I asked the minister myself for further explanation of the medicine.

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure during the past few years has been as follows :—1901-2, $20,468 ; 1902-3, $18,341 ; 1903-4, $15,534. Medical attendance and medicines are provided for the Indians who cannot afford to pay for them. The physicians are either upon salaries, which represent a fair remuneration for their services, the medicines being supplied ; or, when paid by grants, they are allowed the lowest charges made to poor white patients. The medicines are supplied to medical missionaries, who distribute them to Indians under their charge. Although there was a balance of $4,456 unexpended in 1903-4, it is thought inadvisable to reduce the appropriation, as some doctors are asking for an increased salary, and some provision is always necessary for a possible outbreak of small-pox or other infectious disease amongst the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER.

Industrial and boarding schools, $84,500.

Mr. OLIVER. There is an increase of $5,950. That is occasioned by establishing a new industrial school at Kootenay ; renewing tools for carpenter and blacksmith ; protection against fire for industrial school at Metlakatla ; to pay balance of cost of erection of a new school at Schelt ; providing grant for 50 pupils at $60 each ; unforeseen expenses, of which a large amount is required to provide stationery and school material.

Mr. BLAIN. How many teachers are engaged, and what are their qualifications ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are thirty-two day schools. The teachers have the equivalent of a third-class Ontario certificate. These are not industrial schools, and do not teach trades ; they are merely day schools.

Mr. BLAIN. Are they subject to general inspection ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes ; the department has a school inspector, to whom they are subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are these schools attended exclusively by children of Indian parents ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the experience of the department in regard to these children when they arrive at an age to leave school? Do they go back to their old haunts, or do they take advantage of the education they have received and enter into industrial pursuits, prompted by the education given to them in these schools ? Are we really getting any material advantage from this work ?

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the British Columbia industrial schools, I am informed by the officers of the department that it is believed considerable benefit results to the Indians from their education in these schools. The Indians of the coast and in the interior have, owing to their environment and other considerations, more of an industrial turn than have the Indians on the plains, who have no tendency in that way whatever. Probably we have better results from the industrial schools in British Columbia than from a similar class of schools on the plains.

Travelling expenses, $6,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. There is an increase of $1,000 here. Who took that trip costing $1,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. This increase is on account of the travelling expenses of the school inspector. He has to travel all over British Columbia, and visit forty or fifty schools. He was only recently appointed. He is the Reverend Mr. Green, of Vancouver.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand there was no inspector heretofore ?

Mr. OLIVER. No regular inspector. The schools were subject to the inspection of the agents in that locality.

Mr. BLAIN. As I understand the hon. minister, until the Rev. Mr. Green was appointed the schools were inspected by agents in charge of the different schools. I suppose this new appointment was made on the recommendation of some one who was conversant with the wants of the schools. May I ask if such recommendation was made, who this gentleman is and what qualifications he has for this position ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Rev. Mr. Green has been a Methodist preacher, but was a school teacher formerly, and is considered to be a very suitable man as inspector of these schools. It was thought desirable, where the government is handling so many of the said schools, that they should be under the inspection of a person educationally qualified and also with the knowledge of what a school should be, which the Indian agent would not necessarily have. Through the work of this inspector the government hope to secure more uniform efficiency in the Indian schools throughout the province.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the inspector's salary ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is $1,000 and travelling expenses.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know nothing of this Rev. Mr. Green, who may be a thoroughly good man. I would like to ask if he is qualified to speak all the various dialects in use throughout British Columbia ?

Mr. OLIVER. These schools are all taught English, that being one of the great objects of these schools. There are many dialects among the Indians of British Columbia, I understand, but, as most people know, there is a common Indian language, the Chinook.

Mr. HENDERSON. To my mind it is very commendable to teach the Indians the English language as soon as possible and not have half a dozen languages spoken by them. I believe that this course will inure to their advantage and to the advantage of the people generally.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the Rev. Mr. Green originally from Bruce county ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say where he came from originally, but I am informed that he has been a resident of British Columbia for a considerable time. He is recognized as a British Columbian.

Mr. INGRAM. Did the hon. gentleman say that this inspector had been teaching school previous to his appointment ?

Mr. OLIVER. The initials are A. B. Green, and I am informed that his work as teacher was done some time ago, and that he was preaching up to a short time before his appointment as school inspector :

Indians—general—P. H. Bryce, M.D., medical inspector, part of salary, $1,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What Bryce is that ?

Mr. OLIVER. He was at one time in the service of the Ontario government. This is in payment of part of his salary. The Indian Department and the Interior Department combine to pay his salary.

Mr. INGRAM. Is he still an officer of the Ontario government ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Indians—general—printing and stationery—outside service, &c., $6,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Who does this printing ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that it is all done at the King's Printing Bureau.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if he will bring down the return which I asked for on the 6th of March showing the residents in the Northwest who have been authorized to purchase land under certain conditions ?

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We shall proceed with supply, taking up the supplementary estimates for the current year, and attempting to dispose of them if possible, reserving the main estimates for future consideration.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, May 26, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PATENTS OF HERBERT McCORMACK AND PHILLIP M. SHARPLES.

Mr. W. S. CALVERT (West Middlesex) moved :

That the petition of C. A. Masten, presented this day, praying to be permitted to lay before the House the petition of Herbert McCormack and Phillip M. Sharples for the passing of an Act for their relief in respect to certain patents for improvements in centrifugal liquid separators, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for presenting petitions for private Bills, be read now and received, and referred to the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Explain.

Mr. CALVERT. I understand that this is a firm of Americans whose patents were issued in 1902, and who wish to manufac-

ture cream separators in Canada. They were not until recently aware of the fact that a law was passed in 1903 amending the Patent Act. Their patents have not expired, but I believe they wish to come under the Patent Act of 1903. This has been submitted to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and I believe he has no objection. The only objection there can be is that the time has expired for presenting petitions, but I think it would be no injury to the House or to the country to allow this petition to be presented.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would advise my hon. friend (Mr. Calvert) not to press his motion, but to withdraw it to-day, because I shall have to take exception to it. The reasons he has advanced do not seem adequate for introducing a motion of this kind at this late stage of the session. I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion.

Mr. CALVERT. I have no objection to withdraw the motion.

Mr. D. HENDERSON. I was under the impression that two or three years ago a Bill was put through the House by which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) took power to deal with all these matters. Am I mistaken in that? Has the hon. Minister of Agriculture any power to deal with these matters exclusively of an Act of parliament?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The Act in question gave me power up to a certain date. These people did not make their application before that date, and consequently I cannot deal with their patents. That is the law in regard to old patents already issued. In regard to new patents being issued, there is a certain delay within which this section of the law could be applied, but in regard to old patents issued before the passing of the Act, I had only up to a certain date in which to deal with them. That date was allowed to pass without these people making any application. I would say in regard to this particular Bill that I do not in any way commit myself to its passage. I reserve my opinion in regard to it until I see the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. INGRAM. Do we understand that the patents have lapsed?

Mr. CALVERT. Not yet.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the details sufficiently to say. I was asked if I had any objection to the Bill, and I said that I could not say that until I saw the full provisions of the Bill. As far as the introduction of the Bill is concerned, that is a matter for the House to deal with, because the time for the introduction of private Bills has long ago expired. It is a matter with which I do not deal.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. CALVERT.

PAYMENT OF DEPUTY RETURNING OFFICERS.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) the cause of the delay in paying some officials who acted as officers of the government in connection with the last Dominion election. I am in receipt of a letter from Millwood, in the county of Marquette, which reads as follows:

Millwood Post Office, May 16, 1905.

Dr. Roche, M.P.

Dear Sir,—Can you inform me if there is any legal reason for the delay of payment to deputy returning officers of their claims in respect to last general election, in November, now six months past? Not only my own fees as deputy returning officer, but those of poll clerk, school rent and travelling expenses out of pocket, are still unpaid for this polling district of Millwood and I presume of other districts also.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) EDWARD WALKER,
D. R. O. and P. M.

I think this is an unwarrantable delay. These officials are out of pocket personally and have been for six months, although this is an old settled portion of the country. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister if there have been many cases of that kind, and if so, what is the reason?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) will send me that letter, I will try to give him the information on Monday. I will make inquiry. If the facts are as stated, I agree with him that the delay seems to be an unwarranted one, and it is one for which I do not know what reason can exist.

SUPPLY—HALF-BREED SCRIP.

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

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before going into supply, I want to say just a word in continuation of the subject which we had up yesterday concerning land scrip. Since that I have been looking into the papers somewhat, and have received other communications and information, and if I had to go over the matter again to-day that I went over yesterday, I am certain that my language would not be any milder than that which I used yesterday; and in my view of the case, it seems to be much more grave than it did under my previous information. I find I will require some more information, and particularly what I want to ask the minister is this: Have the certificates for scrip of these half-breeds, which we have had under discussion, been already issued, or are they now in process of issuing, and is land being located and patents being granted, or are they under

process, as a result of Mr. Coté's investigation ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer off-hand, but I shall be able to give the information to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. What I wanted to bring to the minister's attention is the question whether, if they are so under process, it would not be a wise thing to stop all processes of that kind until we have an opportunity of getting at the bottom of it, if we possibly can—and I think we can. As I see it to-day, the whole operation does not in the first place tend to benefit the half-breed, quite the opposite, and I am not quite sure that I would be making too strong a statement if I said that in addition to the injustice perpetrated upon the half-breed, fraud and misrepresentation play a part in this transaction so far as the information I have at hand is concerned. In order to make sure about it a deal of information is wanted for part of which I have already asked the minister and which he has kindly consented to bring down at once. Other information I am going to ask for to-day, and I wish to ask him to consider carefully whether it would not be the part of prudence to go no further in the issuance of these scrips and in the granting of land upon them and the issuing of patents until we have an opportunity of coming to our conclusion as to what underlies this whole business. You might say this is scarcely fair to the people who want the scrip and who want the locations, but I think that is offset by this consideration, that in no single case do I believe the interest of the half-breed will be harmed in the least by delay. I am afraid it has passed entirely out of the hands of the half-breed and the only plea of any justice on account of delay would be a plea which would have to be made by the speculator and we ought not to have too tender hearts for the speculator in matters of this kind. The information I want in addition to what I asked yesterday would be :

Re the Coté Commission :

Instructions to Mr. Coté, report of Mr. Coté. Number of certificates issued to date, date of issue, name and address of person to whom issued, name and address of person to whom sent, either direct or in 'care of.' In case of those sent in 'care of' names and address of persons to whose care they were addressed and date of sending, the number of locations made, date of location, name and address of person making location, description of land located. The number and date of patents issued and name and address of each patentee. Any assignments or quit claim deeds in respect of above filed with department, name and address of the assignee or party of second part. Names of all persons other than the half-breeds whose interests are concerned who have applied either as purporting to represent the half-breeds, or in their own interests as having negotiated for or purchased in whole or part the claims of the same and the dates of filing or presenting these claims and particulars of the same. The amount of money paid each half-breed as to consideration for his claim by the purchasers thereof.

That may be a difficult matter for the administration to get, but if it is so it is their own fault. I find in tracing up the history of this matter that in the case of the McKenna commission, the commissioners laid down absolutely all the way through a rule that before money scrip could be handed over to any person other than the half-breed in whose name it was given, the commissioners should be satisfied that the half-breed had been paid the full current rate for the scrip, and a good deal of the time of the commission was taken up in ascertaining that and making sure that it was done. That was with reference to money scrip. With reference to land scrip in no case would they even talk about an assignment or purchase. That went absolutely to the half-breed to whom it was adjudged and it could not be sold and was not allowed to be sold. Now the government, through its commission, at that time took care to see that with reference to money scrip the half-breed was not defrauded and that he got at least the current rate. With reference to land scrip they saw that it was not sold under any consideration ; it was not saleable. In this regard I am afraid that the department has not in any way interested itself as to what the half-breed living south of the line got from the speculator, whether he sold his land scrip for little or more and consequently it may be difficult for the department and the government to give the amounts which were received by these half-breeds. The commission remedied that by making the purchaser state what he gave right before them and the government if it had looked after the interests of the half-breeds in this case should have also insisted on the same information before making any transfer or any location and they may yet be able to get that information. That, however, may be a little difficult. I also want with reference to the first commission :

Papers wanted re McKenna commission :

Order in Council authorizing appointment of commission in 1900, plus instructions, if any, to the commissioners. The reports of said commission, the total number of claims acted upon by this commission—number allowed, rejected, reserve.

The total number of certificates issued as results of same.

1. For money scrip.
2. For land scrip.
3. The number of money scrips redeemed.
4. The number of land scrips redeemed by location, and acreage covered by same.

I hope the minister will facilitate the bringing down of this information and I would respectfully and strongly urge upon him that delay should be ordered with reference to the issuance of these scrips or locations or patents until we have an oppor-

tunity of seeing all the papers and coming to our conclusion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Might I add a request to the minister to also look into the question of the sale or purchase of some Indian reserves in the Northwest. I understand the reserve at Fort à la Corne and another reserve near Prince Albert are abandoned by the Indians or rather taken back by the Indian Department and that these reserves have been sold, I presume possibly on public notice, but I want to know on what notice and in what papers the notice was inserted, and how many times it was inserted for the sale of these Indian reserves. I also want to know if there are any reservations being made by the department for societies or bodies or companies, church organizations, in regard to lands in the Northwest any more. I understand this has been the custom in the past and I want to know if there are any reservations being made for the future. Are homestead lands being withheld from settlement by agreement with certain companies or certain bodies of men representing land companies or representing themselves in order that they may thereby offer greater inducements in the sale of their lands by having an agreement with the department that these lands are reserved from homestead, and that no squatters are allowed on them for a certain time. I would be glad if the minister would look into another matter that has been currently rumoured as to the manner in which scrip has been secured. I shall give a detailed case. A half-breed sells his scrip, no matter what price he obtains, and it is possibly a very inconvenient matter to bring that half-breed 200 or 300 or even 500 or 600 miles and get him to enter for his scrip at the land office at that distance from where he lives. I understand the Indian agents are not always very particular whether they recognize the gentleman who presents himself as representing the owner of the scrip or not. The point I want to bring out to the minister is not the misrepresentation of some half-breed for another half-breed, but to suggest that a convenient way is to have the lands located anywhere.

I am told that there are areas in various places in the Northwest where the half-breeds have located the land quite conveniently in a muskeg. This is done by collusion with the land agent, and application is made for this area for settlement. Forthwith the holder of the land through the purchase of the scrip from the half-breed regretfully yields to the urgent wish of the department and surrenders his land, receiving in return the certificate of the department for so many acres of land. This certificate he can present at the land office at any time without bringing along his half-breed, and the land office has to recognize it. I would like the minister to kindly look into that, and see what lands have been alienated on certificates of that kind, and to what extent that practice has been carried on in recent years, and whether it is going to be recognized in the future?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). My hon. friends from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) are certainly asking for mountains of information, and I hope they will not be impatient if it takes some little time to give the information. I received a memorandum of his inquiries from the hon. member for North Toronto, and I would ask the hon. member for Victoria to be kind enough to put his inquiries in brief written shape, that I may be able to better guide the officers of the department in collecting the information. In regard to the suggestion of the hon. member for North Toronto that the procedure for the issue of a title in connection with the scrip issues under discussion should be delayed, I think it would be fair to draw a distinction between the question of the policy and administration of the department, and the question of the propriety of action on the part of those who are interested in securing the scrip. The department, I take it, is bound to carry on its affairs, and if the orders for scrip are in, and they seem to be legitimate and according to the rules of the department, it is scarcely in order to ask that delay should be made simply because the policy of the administration of the department is called in question. If there is a definite allegation of fraud in connection with this scrip, then certainly I would say it was necessary that the issue should be delayed; but I would like to have the distinction sharply drawn between a definite allegation of fraud on the part of some person or persons more or less known, and a calling in question of the policy and administration of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is this. I think I made it pretty clear that in this particular instance it is not the interest of the half-breed that will be prejudiced by delay. My hon. friend knows just as well as I or any other member of this House, that the camp of speculators and dodgers have been following the government and the department. It is they who profit by this kind of thing and get hold of the information. They are wise enough not to locate the lands in their own names. They sell them to others and locate them in other names, and it is they who will reap the profit. I think I have made a fairly strong statement of the case; I have not made it too strong; and do not propose to make it stronger unless I have the evidence to back it up. I cannot as a member of parliament charge fraud, because I have not the papers to enable me to do so; but I say that there are evidences that usurpation and fraud have entered into this thing. If you do not prejudice the half-breed, the first claimant in the case, if you

save the public domain, and if nobody is to suffer but the speculator and the profit maker, I think it is fair for the minister to call a delay and rush down the papers and let us ascertain the facts. Because a grave injustice will be done if the thing is carried out on the basis of our conversation of yesterday and to-day. There is another point. I do not know whether I am right, as I am not a lawyer; but suppose the speculator gets the land scrip, no matter how he has got it, and then he gets the location for that, and a third party becomes possessed of that location, and gets a title to it under the Torrens system, you cannot touch that third party, it seems to me. What redress is there, then? The land is absolutely gone, as it has been alienated from the public domain, the party who holds it is innocent, and it is not the best of restitution to have a mere chance of proceeding against some man in between who is sharp enough to carry on the work.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). From the statement made by the Minister of the Interior yesterday, he should have no trouble whatever in correcting this fraud, if it is a fraud, that has been perpetrated on these half-breeds. His statement was that an Act was passed by parliament and that an Order in Council was issued upon that Act, providing, in order to protect the half-breeds, that they must present themselves at a land agency, no matter to whom they had assigned their scrip, in order that the patent should be issued for it. From the statement of the minister, the Order in Council is still in effect; and I doubt very much whether a departmental order has the slightest effect in overriding the Order in Council. My opinion is that all these issues to the parties who have the scrip, being made in error or through fraud, are void, because there has been no overriding of the Order in Council by competent authority authorizing the agents to issue the patents for the land. The Minister of the Interior can promise that he will see that the Order in Council is for the future carried out, and will make inquiries as to how an issue of that kind could be made by a departmental order in defiance of an Order in Council.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that possibly the hon. member is in error in stating that the restriction on the entry of the land and the presence of the half-breed is under an Order in Council. I rather think that is under a general regulation of the department which requires that there shall be no entry for land except in person or under certain special circumstances, but it is not a part of the Order in Council authorizing the issue of scrip.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister stated specifically that these regulations were approved by Order in Council.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to discuss the point, but I would like to have the matter as correct as possible. The Order in Council alluded to referred only to the issue of scrip and had nothing to do whatever with the location of the scrip or with the form of location.

Mr. HAGGART. I am aware of that.

Mr. OLIVER. The restriction as to personal presence and location was a general regulation of the department; a regulation that applied not only to scrip but to any dealing with land. That is as I understand it, although I may be in error. That was rescinded as shown in the papers by another departmental regulation.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood it differently. The other departmental regulation setting aside that has been approved by Order in Council, and I understood the minister to say that this is simply a departmental order.

Mr. OLIVER. I am trying to say that according to my understanding the restriction on the entry of the land is by departmental regulation, and the removal of that restriction was by departmental regulation also, and was not as I understand it, connected with the actual Order in Council regarding the issue of the scrip.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). It is entirely a question of fact. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) evidently understands, whether rightly or wrongly, from the statement of the minister, that the regulation obtained the force of an Order in Council by reason of the fact that it was approved by an Order in Council. And he understands that an attempt was made to rescind that by a mere departmental regulation without the intervention of the Governor in Council at all. I understand from the minister that his view of the situation is different. I hope it is as the minister thinks, because if any attempt were made by any minister of this government or any government to repeal by mere departmental regulation an Order in Council made in the public interest and for the public protection not only would the departmental regulation be void, but the minister would probably render himself criminally liable. There is not the slightest doubt of that in the mind of any person conversant with the criminal law, and the departmental regulation would have no more effect than if I or any gentleman on this side having no official status whatever, should attempt to repeal an Order in Council. The minister has spoken of the necessity of some formal charge or statement being made in connection with this matter before there should be any stay of proceedings. Let me say to the minister that when he speaks of fraud or overreaching we may understand that term in one or two ways: it may be possible under the law at present to accomplish what is in

effect fraud—and I would rather think that has been accomplished if the statement of my hon. friend from North Toronto made in this House yesterday is correct—you may have fraud accomplished under the most perfect forms of law, and you accomplish that fraud when you permit by this regulation, lands and money which were destined to be an aid to these half-breeds in the Northwest (when you permit nine-tenths or nineteen-twentieths of that) to go to the hands of certain predatory individuals who are hanging on the outskirts of allotments and appropriations of this kind, as there is good reason to believe certain gentlemen have been doing in the past. The Minister of the Interior is not ignorant of the fact that it is notorious in the Northwest—at least it was notorious in the Northwest when I was there two and a half years ago—that certain gentlemen, some of them in public life even, were busying themselves very much about the purchase of this half-breed scrip. There was no secret about it; every one was speaking of it and instances without number were given descriptive of the way in which that had been carried out. We are face to face with a certain situation at the present time. The word 'fraud' is mentioned. I say that any result such as that which has been described by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is fraud virtually and in effect, even although it may be accomplished under the most perfect forms of the law as it stands at present. That is my first proposition, and I say beyond that and apart from that altogether: there is good reason to think that the forms of law have been a little infringed upon in this case—what I might call the decencies of the administration of the law so far as it can be framed by the Department of the Interior. Otherwise, I do not understand why that regulation requiring the actual presence of the half-breed which had remained in force up to the month of August last, should so suddenly have been departed from, as it was departed from if I understand correctly the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). You may have what most people would regard as fraud either under the one aspect or the other: under the aspect of the most perfect adherence to every form that has been devised up to the present time for the protection of the half-breeds, while you may have certain subtle influences bearing their fruit and certain gentlemen who are considered friends of the Liberal party participating very much more in the benefit of this scrip than these poor half-breeds themselves. Then you may have a certain phase of administration such as that to which allusion has just been made. I would not think that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior would be quite doing justice to what has been his record in the past if he allowed considerations such as those presented this afternoon to deter him very much or very long from calling a halt, if he is satisfied in his mind that the benefit of this scrip, whether land or money, has gone or is now going to persons who would not care to be described as half-breeds. I trust the minister will take this matter into full consideraion, and of course we must have a further discussion of it after all the papers are brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is the memorandum:

It has always been the invariable rule of the department to refuse to recognize assignments or powers of attorney as authority for the delivery of half-breed land scrip, and the regulations already referred to of the 6th June, 1901, specifically provided that in cases in which the half-breed asks for land scrip, the commissioner has no authority to accept or act upon any assignment or power of attorney.

Then:

By departmental letter of the 10th of March last addressed to all agents of Dominion lands, the agents were advised that it had been decided to allow scrip granted to half-breed residents of the United States under the said Order in Council of August 13th, 1904, to be located in the name of the grantee thereof by the holder of such scrip without requiring the grantee to appear personally at the land agency to make his entry.

This order of June 6, 1901; what was it based upon? Was it based upon the report of Mr. McKenna, the last paragraph of which reads:

In order to remove doubt and dispose of the question which was raised, I would suggest the desirability of making it clear, that it is only in the case of money scrip that powers of attorney or assignments are to be acted upon or accepted, and that in cases where the half-breed asks for land scrip the commissioner has no authority to accept or act upon any assignment or power of attorney.

And that was approved by Order in Council of June 6, 1901. It would seem then, that this is a case of regulation approved by Order in Council and afterwards set aside by a departmental letter. What I said yesterday—what I was careful to say—was that, so far as the information contained in the papers was concerned, it seemed that a departmental order had overridden a regulation.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is a little in error yet. No assignments have been accepted on the letter authorizing agents to accept. Nor are they authorized, if I followed the papers correctly when they were in my possession, to accept entry in the name of any other than the half-breed to whom the scrip was issued. All the difference is that he is not required to be there in bodily presence, but there is no change of ownership as between the scrip and the land. It has always been the rule, as stated in the papers, and, as I believe is the fact, that the scrip is issued to the half-breed who is entitled to it. It is issued in his name, and entry is made in his

name, and, until the patent is issued for the land no transfer can be made and no assignment is recognized under any of the Orders in Council, departmental letters or system of administration.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I submit to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and to hon. gentlemen on the other side, that this discussion is altogether premature. It is impossible to discuss the matter intelligently in all its bearings until all the papers have been brought down. In proof of this I would call the attention of the hon. member for North Toronto to the statement he made a moment ago with regard to the provision in the Order in Council of August, 1904, which he says—and says truly—allowed assignments to be made. But I would say to my hon. friend that, if my memory serves me well, this provision of the Order in Council of August, 1904, was rescinded in the Order in Council of December 17, 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. No, that was a mere matter of priority of assignment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think not—that is the impression I have of it. If I am wrong it only goes to justify what I have already said, that it is not possible to discuss this question until all the papers have been brought down. There was one point spoken of by my hon. friend, and I am not prepared to say what is the condition of affairs with regard to it, and that is the dispensing with the order which made it obligatory upon the half-breed to go and locate his own scrip. As to that, I do not know the reason which has led the department to change the policy, and cannot, at the moment, discuss the matter. But I have no doubt that there is some good and valid reason for it, and that this will appear when the papers are brought before the House. I would make one observation on the main point—and the only point made by my hon. friend from North Toronto, if I understood him correctly, the only one he sought to make to-day. This was to persuade the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to stay his hand and stop at once the issue of these patents. Well, I think the reason given by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior for the position he takes is a very good one. He stated that if the object of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is to traverse the policy of the department, he has not shown that the suggestion should be adopted ; on the other hand if there is evidence or even allegation of fraud, that would be a very good reason why the issuing of patents should be stopped. But my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) would not take the responsibility of saying absolutely that there is evidence of fraud. He says there is a presumption of fraud. That may be. I have no doubt that if my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), on looking at the papers, finds presumptive evidence of fraud, he will act accordingly. I believe the hon. member for North Toronto is quite sure that if the minister finds any evidence or even presumption of fraud he will act accordingly. To my mind, from the evidence we have and from the information available, the only fact which gives evidence of fraud, or upon which even a presumption of fraud can be based, is that the scrip will not be very profitable to the half-breeds. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) stated a moment ago that probably not more than one-tenth of the scrip will avail to the half-breeds and that nine-tenths will be squandered. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will have this answer to the leader of the opposition—that ever since scrip was first issued to the half-breeds, that is since the year 1870 or thereabouts, there has not been a single issue of scrip to these people that has not been squandered by them. Whenever there was an issue of scrip there was always a following of sharks after these people to get their scrip from them for a mere song—the half-breed got nothing for it. But we had this satisfaction, that, even if the half-breeds did not profit by it, at least, when we had given them the scrip they had no grievance. But until the scrip was given them they had a grievance—and we know the consequence of that kind of thing. I remember very well that Archbishop Taché, and Father Lacombe, and Lord Strathcona when his assistance was sought on these matters, took the ground that the scrip should be non-transferable. Well, we acted upon this policy in 1899, when we made the last previous issue of scrip. We issued a commission, of which Mr. Laird was a member, as also were Father Lacombe and Mr. McKenna and one or two others. They were to negotiate a treaty in Athabaska with the Indians. They were to collect the Indians and half-breeds and give scrip to those who had not participated in the distribution of 1885. My hon. friend remembers the result, for he alluded to it yesterday. We gave special instructions to make this scrip—land scrip—non-transferable. And what took place? Why, the Indians would not participate in the treaty, and the half-breeds would not take their scrip, unless the scrip were made transferable. And we have the report—a report sent under emergency by the commissioners—that the half-breeds would use their influence with the Indians to prevent the signing of the treaty, and the half-breeds themselves would not take the scrip, unless it was made transferable. And the members of the commission who were there, Father Lacombe himself among them, then and there, to satisfy the half-breeds, asked that the scrip should be made transferable. Most of that scrip was squandered, no doubt. At the same time, by doing what we did, by adopting this policy which results in little benefit to

the half-breeds, we satisfied them as a class. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said that he did not think that there were any more half-breeds who had claims. He said that after the report had been made by the commission in 1899-1900, the half-breeds who had been in the United States could not participate in this scrip and that they had forgotten everything about it. Well, he was given an answer by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) who called the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that there are certain half-breeds in his own riding who claim that they did not receive the satisfaction to which they were entitled——

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand that they were half-breeds who had crossed to the United States and gone on reservations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know about that. I only am trying to show that when the hon. gentleman says the half-breeds had forgotten about this matter, he is mistaken. I am sure of one thing—though without having looked into the matter—that there is good reason to believe that the half-breeds in the United States were claiming their scrip. I know that there is a close connection between the half-breeds on one side of the line and the half-breeds on the other side, and we have found it good policy, and I think it is good policy when we pay the half-breeds, even though they will get but a mere pittance of what is given out of the public treasury, still we find it good policy to give this scrip so as to prevent them from having a grievance which they can proclaim and parade in the Territories. As I said a moment ago, the policy is all right, and I believe we will be able to vindicate it triumphantly when the discussion comes on. My hon. friend has made the point that the half-breeds allow other parties to locate land scrip for them. When the time comes we will give an explanation of that also, as of everything else.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Before we go into supply I desire to make an explanation. The other day I was explaining that in a discussion which had taken place the day before on a divorce question and in which I had taken part, I had in mind another case than the one before the House. I explained the next day that it was for that reason I had spoken in the way I did, and the 'Hansard' makes me say that if I voted as I did it was on account of another case. That is not correct. I said I would have voted in the same way I did vote, but I would not have said what I did say.

TENDERS FOR PUBLIC DOCK AT COLLINGWOOD.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). This morning I communicated with the Department of Public Works my intention to ask this afternoon a question relative to tenders for the government dock in the town of Collingwood. Lately so many matters are brought up in the House, which perhaps may be characterized as scandals, that one seems to get inundated with letters from different parts, particularly I speak of the province of Ontario, in reference to matters in which the general public apparently think there is not exactly fair dealing. Perhaps the minister who may be acting to-day for the Minister of Public Works in his absence, may be able to give a satisfactory explanation of the matter to which I wish to draw attention. In the Collingwood 'Bulletin' of Thursday, May 25, I find the following:

> Tendering too low for public works is evidently an unsatisfactory way of doing business, and judging by late developments Messrs. Conroy Brothers, whose tender here for the proposed wharf here was accepted by the Department of Public Works at Ottawa, have found this to be too true to their sorrow. Their tender is said to have been $25,000, but upon investigation they discovered that there would be no money in the contract at that figure, but what could be done? The department had accepted their figure, but above this it had the firm's marked cheque for $4,000 which would be forfeited were they to get out. They considered and hesitated, but evidently got from under, a letter from L. G. McCarthy to the chairman of harbour and frontages stating that they had declined to sign the necessary documents. Mr. McCarthy also stated that it was expected that the contract would go to the Battle Estate of Thorold, the next lowest tenderers, and that he hoped to see the matter definitely settled within a few days. This firm's tender is in the neighbourhood of $30,000.

May I ask the member of the cabinet who is acting on behalf of the Minister of Public Works, as to who Conroy Bros. are, where they reside, and if the statement I have read is true, and the suggestion thrown out here that owing to their being the lowest tenderers, their $4,000 cheque was returned. I may have some further remarks to make after the minister has answered these questions.

Mr. FIELDING. I would rather hear the hon. gentleman's remarks first.

Mr. BENNETT. Who are Conroy Bros.?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not tell my hon. friend who they are, I have no means of knowing.

Mr. BENNETT. Where do they reside?—Because I understand there are different firms. I do not wish to make any remarks that might confound one with another.

Mr. FIELDING. The name is right.

Mr. BENNETT. If it is the one I am informed it is, there may be a reason why he should be dropped.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no knowledge of any firm of Conroy Bros. in the matter. There is an individual named Conroy, I know nothing of any firm.

Mr. BENNETT. Where does he live ?

Mr. FIELDING. In Peterboro.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister if that $4,000 cheque has been returned to Mr. Conroy ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Then may I ask the further question,—has the contract been awarded to the Battle estate ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to wait and see what the minister has to say in regard to the whole transaction, but it does seem extraordinary that Conroy Bros., having tendered as they did and being the lowest tenderers as they were, have not received the contract.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken. They were awarded the contract, but the contract was not executed—the individual, not the firm. The contract was awarded to Mr. Conroy, but it has not been executed.

Mr. BENNETT. This paper is one that supports hon. gentlemen opposite, and I think that the facts stated in this article must have been communicated from some official source. The Mr. McCarthy referred to here is the member for the riding, and Mr. McCarthy has sent word to the people in the town of Collingwood who have the matter in charge, that this firm of Conroy Bros. as they are termed, are apparently to be released from their contract, and that on the other hand the contract is to go to the Battle estate. If, however, the minister will say to-day that the department propose to hold Mr. Conroy to his contract, and that they will not surrender to him his cheque or make a forfeiture of it, and that they do not propose to give the contract to Battle Bros. at an increased figure, that will be the end of the matter, and no one will have cause for complaint. But if, on the other hand, the department should hand over this contract to Battle Bros. at this increase, as stated in the paper, I shall have something to say about it. I want to call the minister's attention to the fact that these circumstances are communicated apparently from the department itself. I can understand that under certain circumstances a cheque may be returned. For instance, if the contractor made a mistake in his calculation, or rather in his additions, in such a case an Order in Council might be passed returning the cheque to him. I will wait now with some interest to hear the minister's statement of what is to be the action of the department in reference to this contract.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not propose to make any statement as to what will be the action of the department in any matter until the moment for that action shall arise. I understood my hon. friend to ask as to whether this contract had been awarded, and I answered that it had been awarded to Mr. Conroy. The contract has not been executed, because Mr. Conroy has failed to execute it. There the matter ends. That is the whole of it, nothing scandalous. The only thing scandalous I see in the matter is the two great proneness of the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) to suspect that things are wrong when there is nothing at all wrong in them. There is the transaction. Tenders were invited, and the contract was awarded.

Mr. BENNETT. What was the date of the award ?

Mr. FIELDING. There were two sets of tenders. The first tenders were invited in October last. Two were received. The lowest was considered in excess of the engineer's estimate, and the minister of the department refused to accept either of these tenders and sent back the cheques telling the parties that the tenders would not be accepted. Then he proceeded to ask for new tenders, and thereupon new tenders were received. The tender of Edward Conroy—the firm is not known in the record as Conroy Bros., though there may be other parties connected with it for aught I know—but a gentleman by the name of Edward Conroy tendered, and his tender was the lowest, and the contract was awarded to him.

Mr. BENNETT. The date, please ?

Mr. FIELDING. He was notified on the 7th of April that the contract was awarded to him. Mr. Conroy, as stated, communicated with the officials of the department claiming that he made a mistake, that his tender was too low, and that he could not afford to do the work. As a matter of fact his tender is below the engineer's estimate. He went to the engineer, the late Mr. Gray, who died a day or two ago in Toronto, and discussed the matter with him, and the engineer said that if he had made any mistake that it was his own fault, that he had no knowledge of the matter, and could give him no explanation. He tendered on the specification. He claims that his tender was too low, owing to a mistake. The department has taken no further action. No contract has been awarded to anybody and no cheque has been returned to any body except the cheques in the first instance where the parties were notified that neither tender would be

accepted. Since taking the second tenders and awarding the contract to Mr. Conroy nothing has been done, and the matter stands in that position at this moment. The next lowest tenderer's name has been mentioned by my hon. friend, but the contract has not been awarded to him or to anybody else.

Mr. BENNETT. Was Mr. Battle's cheque returned ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think nobody's cheque has been returned except the two cheques in the first instance. I have not had Mr. Battle's cheque particularly before me, therefore I would not be positive about that. Mr. Battle's name has not been in the matter so much as Mr. Conroy's. The contract has not been awarded to Mr. Battle. I do not think it is likely the cheque has been returned to him, although that may be possible. I will have to make further inquiries on that point.

Mr. BENNETT. I understand the hon. minister to say that the cheques other than that of Mr. Conroy were returned. Was the Battle cheque returned ?

Mr. FIELDING. Before being too positive I shall have to make further inquiry regarding the Battle cheque. As the contract has not been awarded to him his name has not been in the matter so prominently as that of Mr. Conroy. It was about the case of Mr. Conroy particularly that I made inquiries.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the file show any correspondence between the department and Mr. Battle relative to the return of his cheque?

Mr. FIELDING. The notice of the hon. gentleman, which, by the way, was addressed to Mr. Hyman, who, he must have known, was not in town, and who, in addition, is not even a member of this House at this moment, was only shown to me between twelve and one o'clock and I made a very hurried inquiry. I have not had time to go through the file and therefore cannot answer the hon. gentleman's question on that point.

Mr. BENNETT. The envelope was addressed to the Deputy Minister of Public Works, because I did not know that the hon. Minister of Finance was acting for the Minister of Public Works. It was addressed to Mr. Gobeil, for Mr. Hyman, Minister of Public Works. I do not know how I addressed it inside. However, that is immaterial. What we want is the information. There are certain things that are not shown by the documents at all and which are evidently known to my informant, and the certain things known to my informant are that Mr. Conroy and Mr. Battle are not unknown to each other by any means, that they would probably be quite able to recognize each other if they met on the street, that Mr. Conroy had a low tender in, that Mr. Battle had a higher tender in, and that if there was no intervening tender and it could be arranged for Mr. Conroy to drop out and for Mr. Battle to drop in it would be a very nice arrangement for these two gentlemen. As these two gentlemen are very strong political allies of hon. gentlemen opposite it was thought that such an arrangement might be worked out. These tenders were called for on the 7th April. The people of Collingwood are insisting upon this dock being built, yet, although the hon. Minister of Public Works has had their cheques for two months and has had the contract ready for two months—it will be two months on the 7th of next month—the contract has not yet been signed. It is not alleged on the part of these people that they made any mistake in their additions or anything of that kind at all, but they went to Major Gray, who was the engineer of the department and who is now deceased, and alleged that their tender was too low. Has it come to this that anybody can get out of his tender by going to the engineer of the department and saying: I will not make any money out of it ? Although two months have elapsed the department has not yet called for new tenders. Does the hon. minister think that is reasonable?

Mr. FIELDING. That did not happen to be the question.

Mr. BENNETT. It is a very serious question. The people want the dock. You have called for tenders and nearly two months have now elapsed.

Mr. BERGERON. They called for tenders last October.

Mr. BENNETT. No, the second tenders were called for last April. Here is another item in this same paper relative to this same dock which did yeoman service in the last election:

Mr. McCarthy's success in securing another grant for the improvement of the harbour cannot but be gratifying to the people of Collingwood. Without any fuss or feathers he has been steadily and persistently presenting our claims and always with good results. This time the grant is an even fifty thousand dollars, a sufficient sum to provide the new wharf and to continue the dredging which has been going on almost continuously for six or seven years. The people of Collingwood stood by McCarthy when the opportunity offered, and he is now returning the compliment.

That is more than the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) has done for the government. He had a chance to return the compliment the other day but he did not vote for them.

Mr. FIELDING. He had quite enough substitutes on the other side to make it good.

Mr. BENNETT. That may be, but if the hon. gentleman acted on principle——

Mr. FIELDING. I thought hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House acted on principle.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman acted from the motive of profit, and if it does not profit him he apparently does not support the government. This matter is not new in the department at all. It was pending before the elections last fall and two tenders were put in.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend think one of these tenders should have been accepted?

Mr. BENNETT. I know nothing about that.

Mr. FIELDING. Then why say so?

Mr. BENNETT. I do not know why it was not. I have not the figures before me, but it was expected, according to my information, that the dock was to be gone on with long ago, and that was the reason that tenders were called for. Tenders were received nearly two months ago and the department had these tenders in their hands until this Mr. Conroy came and asked to be relieved. I am going to tell the hon. minister something now that perhaps he will admit engenders a little suspicion. I had Bradstreet's hunted up to-day. It was intimated that Mr. Conroy might be a Peterborough man. This contractor who has had a $30,000 work offered to him does not figure in Bradstreet's as having any financial rating at all. That is an additional reason for returning him his cheque for $4,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Is the hon. gentleman referring to Mr. Conroy?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, he has no financial rating in Bradstreet's.

Mr. FIELDING. Why does my hon. friend repeatedly talk of returning his cheque. I have told him that Mr. Conroy's cheque has not been returned. Why repeat again and again about returning his cheque?

Mr. BENNETT. I am simply saying that Mr. Conroy is praying for the return of his cheque.

Mr. FIELDING. We cannot deny him the privilege of praying.

Mr. BENNETT. The department knew two months ago that he was the lowest tenderer and yet the department have not even notified him and the file will not bear it out to-day that his cheque will not be returned and that he will have to go on with this work.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no need of telling him that his cheque will not be returned.

Mr. BENNETT. No, but somebody in the department tells the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) that the contract with Mr. Conroy is to be at an end and that the contract is to be given to Battle Brothers for $30,000 or $5,000 higher than the figure of the other man. We will await and my informant will await with interest to see whether this work is given to Battle Brothers and there will be no excuse for not calling for tenders again if the department intend to take the work away from Mr. Conroy who is a political friend of theirs and give him back his cheque for $4,000. I understand that Mr. Battle cuts a very small figure. You cannot take up a little local paper published in any part of the province of Ontario with a circulation of 200 or 300 that does not contain an advertisement calling for tenders for something. This very paper has an advertisement calling for tenders for supplies for Kingston penitentiary, as if anybody in Collingwood would be supplying Kingston penitentiary.

Mr. FIELDING. They only send inmates.

Mr. BENNETT. That is rather hard on Collingwood. I am going to await with interest, and I think the people of Collingwood and my informant and others who think they smell a rat, will await with interest to see what is going to be done, whether Mr. Conroy is going to be held to his contract, his cheque retained and he obliged to go on with the work, or whether it is to be handed over to Battle Brothers, and whether they are to have a $30,000 contract without new tenders being called for. If they get that extra $5,000 it will be a handsome profit on a comparatively small work. Battle Brothers are not unknown to the department. I think that one of the brothers has been a candidate in one of these ridings in either a local or Dominion election—I do not at this moment remember which. But, they are very prominent Liberals in that district, and if Mr. Conroy is to have this cheque returned by the department instead of being obliged to forfeit his cheque, and if Mr. McCarthy sends word to the newspaper—for presumably it must be from him—that they are done with Mr. Conroy and are now going to deal with Mr. Battle at the advanced rate, I think we should keep our eye on this and see what the outcome will be.

Mr. FIELDING. We shall be glad to have my hon. friend keep his eye on the affair, but I think it is a pity that he did not wait until there was some substantial ground to bring the matter up. I am at a loss to find what his ground for complaint is. What is wrong ?

Mr. BENNETT. You were most anxious to show your good faith with the people of Collingwood eight months ago to show them

that you intended to build a dock there—that was during the election—and I think the government did intend to build the dock. Here to-day what are you doing? You have had the cheque of this gentleman for two months and you are not forcing him on with his contract, but are holding the cheque in abeyance and your representative Mr. McCarthy comes up there presumably and through the local Liberal paper makes the announcement that the man who put in the low tender is to be released from his contract. That means that his cheque will be returned and the other men who had the higher tender by $5,000 are given the contract and that they need not worry at all that the work is to go on at once. We will wait and see whether the work does go on, whether the Battles are given the contract at $5,000 advance without any tender or competition and whether a return is made of the $4,000 to Mr. Conroy.

Mr. FIELDING. I am still at a loss to find out what is my hon. friend's grievance; every part of this business is absolutely straight and businesslike.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. member for North Simcoe were here—

Mr. FIELDING. I am not dealing with the hon. member for North Simcoe.

Mr. BENNETT. Once before you were calling for tenders, and now you have accepted the lowest tender and held it for two months, you do not force the contract—or to go on or make him estreat his cheque. That is the complaint of the people of Collingwood to-day, that you are playing fast and loose with them and there is a suspicion there that you are going to let the lowest tenderer drop out.

Mr. FIELDING. Suspicion haunts the guilty mind; so says a famous philosopher.

Mr. FOSTER. Who says that? Give your authority.

Mr. FIELDING. I might make a mistake in my reference and I shall keep on the safe side by not giving the author. My hon. friend says the government undertook to build a dock there in 1904. Well, there is no particular reason why the progress of the country should stop in the year 1904. A great many things had to be done in that year even although we had the pleasant amusement of a general election, and so the contract was advertised in due course, two tenders were received, and there was a difference as usual and one was the lower. 'Why did you not accept that,' says the hon. gentleman. Suspicion at once, he smells a rat at once. 'You had two tenders, why did you not accept the lower?' Not the right man, the work is going into the wrong hands, there is something wrong.' There is to my hon. friend no explanation of a transaction of that kind. To his suspicious mind there must absolutely be some corruption somewhere. What is the fact? The lowest tender happened to be by thousands of dollars in excess of the engineer's estimate and therefore the minister says: I shall not accept that. Anything wrong about that? Anything corrupt about that? That suspicion is set at rest at once by that very simple explanation, of what my hon. friend would try to make out is some dreadfully bad part of the transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. It is the second set of tenders I referred to.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend dealt with the first. He said it was very strange that a contract was not awarded on the first and gives as a reason that the contract would not go to the right man. We pass from the first and come to the second.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the amount of the lowest tender in the first lot?

Mr. FIELDING. I think perhaps the leader of the opposition will agree with me that where the transaction is not yet completed and the contracts signed, it would not be prudent to quote the tenders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then my hon. friend should not make any reference to them.

Mr. FIELDING. I made a reference but I did not give the figures; I have not given the amount of any tender.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister must remember this that he is very extravagant often in his speech and what may be only a trifling sum may to him be thousands and thousands.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say 'thousands and thousands,' I said 'thousands.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is silence with regard to that more important than silence with regard to the one under consideration?

Mr. FIELDING. As respects both I do not think it wise to give the figures.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimate of the engineer?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I should give that. Here is a transaction which is not completed. We are having difficulty with the contractor, he wants to get out of the contract and be rid of it. I think under such circumstances it would not be wise to give all the figures of the contract, but when we are accused of not accepting the first tender, because there is some job and suspicion and corruption in it, I think I am justified in giving the reasons why the first tender was not acepted, because it was thousands of dollars in excess of the figures of the engineer.

Mr. BERGERON. Has my hon. friend seen the figures or is he repeating what he has been told?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not seen the figures, but I have no reason to believe that the officers of the department would put figures before me that are fraudulent.

Mr. BERGERON. It might be; it has been done before.

Mr. FIELDING. I am bound to say that from all the transactions I have had with the officers of the government of Canada, I do not think that a deputy minister or an engineer would put figures before me which were not correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These figures seem to have got into the columns of a journal friendly to the government in some way.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman can see here that this tender was for $25,000 and the other in the vicinity of $30,000.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend will agree that it is not wise that I should either confirm or deny the figures that are given. It sometimes happens that information of this kind is obtained by the newspapers in a partial and inaccurate form. I have given the reason in answer to the hon. member for Simcoe why the first tender was not accepted. The reason was that the value of the work according to the estimates of the engineers was materially below the tender price and after consultation with the engineer as to whether there was not a mistake and whether the estimates were carefully prepared the minister was advised that the engineer's estimates were quite reasonable and safe, that the tender price was too high and for that reason and for no other the minister declined to accept the tender.

Mr. BENNETT. Was the low tender on the first occasion the tender of Battle Bros., or was it in Conroy's name?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think I should answer my hon. friend's question. I am not so sure that I should answer that, but rather than have any doubt I shall say that it was not.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister state who it was?

Mr. FIELDING. I think I had better not at the present time. At the same time it did not make any difference.

Mr. BENNETT. There is a lot of suspicion in Collingwood about it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. member for Simcoe will accept this reasonable explanation, that after the tenders had been received the first tender was found to be materially in excess of the engineer's estimate. Thereupon the engineer was asked whether he had made any mistake, whether he had revised his estimates and was satisfied that this was a reasonable price. The engineer replied that the estimate was carefully made, that his price was reasonable and that the work should be done for that price. Thereupon the minister on that advice decided that he would not award the contract at a price which he believed to be excessive. I think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) will admit that that is a fair, businesslike transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not think the public service will suffer by stating who the lowest man is. That is the suspicious point in Collingwood.

Mr. FIELDING. It will not make any difference and by and by when the transaction is completed the papers will be brought down and it will be seen that the low tender was several thousand dollars in excess of the engineer's estimate. That I say, was a sufficient reason why the minister should refuse to accept it after he had consulted the engineer again to see if the estimate had been carefully prepared. That disposes of the first tender.

Mr. BENNETT. Not unless I know his name.

Mr. FIELDING. I assure my hon. friend if he knew the name it would make no difference.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps not.

Mr. FIELDING. Would it satisfy him if I gave the name

Mr. BENNETT. It might satisfy the people of Collingwood.

Mr. FIELDING. I have such faith in the people of Collingwood that I believe when they hear the explanation on that point they will be satisfied.

Mr. FOSTER. They will know the figures.

Mr. FIELDING. They will not from anything I said. Now as to the second tenders they were invited in the usual way, the contract was awarded to the contractor whose tender was lowest. His name was Edward Conroy. He was notified that the contract was awarded to him as he was requested to sign his contract. Mr. Conroy refused to sign it. He communicated with the officials of the department, stating that he had made a mistake, that his tender was too low, that he did not feel able to do the work, and that he desired the privilege of withdrawing his tender. There is where the matter stands at this moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long ago was that?

Mr. FIELDING. The notice was sent to Mr. Conroy on the 7th of April to execute the contract immediately, and giving him till the 15th of April to execute it. He did not execute it. On the 19th of April he communicated with the department, asking

that the matter be deferred, and he would come and see the minister with a view to presenting a statement showing why he could not go on. I presume he did see the minister. At all events, he saw the engineer in Toronto, the late Mr. Gray, and discussed the matter with him. Mr. Gray told him that he could not interfere, that if a man had made a mistake that was his own business. Mr. Conroy refused to sign the contract, and we have his cheque in our hands. Will any hon. gentleman say what is wrong in all that ?

Mr. STOCKTON. How long are you going to allow that to continue ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is opening another question. The hon. gentleman is not finding any corruption, or suspicion, or smelling a rat ; he is simply asking : When are you going to push the work on ? I can appreciate that. But that is not the line taken by the hon. member for East Simcoe ; it is the rat he is after. If any hon. gentleman says : You had better accept some tender and get the work done, that is another matter ; but, as the matter stands, we have not been able to get Mr. Conroy to sign the contract, and we have his cheque. The hon. gentleman says : Why don't you make him sign the contract ? How are you going to do that ?

Mr. BENNETT. Forfeit his cheque.

Mr. FIELDING. We have his cheque.

Mr. BENNETT. You have not cashed it.

Mr. FIELDING. But the hon. gentleman said he had authority for the statement that the cheque would be given back.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not. I said that Mr. McCarthy was authority for the fact, as stated in the paper, that Mr. Conroy would be dropped and the other man would be substituted at $5,000 advance, and I think he will be.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not dealing with the would-be's ; I am dealing with the facts as they exist up to the present time ; and when the transaction is completed and the papers are brought down, I think they will be found to be exactly as I have now placed them before the House.

Mr. FINLAY. For the satisfaction of the hon. member for East Simcoe, I may say that I was present when Mr. Conroy asked for his cheque to be returned to him, and I heard the minister refuse to give it. The hon. member for East Simcoe says that Mr. Conroy has no financial standing. I can say, of my own knowledge, that Mr. Conroy is worth $30,000.

Mr. BENNETT. I simply stated that he had no financial rating in Bradstreet.

Mr. FINLAY. There are many men worth $30,000 whose names are not mentioned in Bradstreet at all.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The matter is brought to the attention of the House by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) by reason of a statement made in a public journal, which I understand is a warm supporter of the administration. That journal states the amount of the tenders now under the consideration of the department—one $25,000 and the other $30,000 ; that the man who made the tender of $25,000 does not propose to carry it out ; and that the representative of the county has practically undertaken to have his cheque returned. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says there is no danger of his cheque being returned.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend suggested that ; he is more given to suggestion than to actual statement. We heard a great deal about a certain cheque that was put up by a firm in England which was going to establish a fast Atlantic service ; we heard a great deal about a guarantee of that firm, and we were assured by the Finance Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce and other ministers, that there was no doubt that we should have a fast Atlantic service within two or three years, because we had this cheque and this guarantee, and the coffers of this country would be enriched to that extent if those gentlemen did not carry out their engagement. The result of it all was that the guarantee was cancelled and the amount of the cheque was handed back, and handed back with interest four or five years afterwards. So that perhaps there is room for suspicion in the mind of my hon. friend from East Simcoe, when he states that there may be a good deal in what is suggested in the columns of this newspaper. What is mentioned by the Minister of Finance is not the only ground that there is for suspicion at the present time. It arises out of the very circumstance mentioned by my hon. friend from East Simcoe and my hon. friend from the city and county of St. John, namely, that the government was in a hurry to push this matter eight months ago, when there was a general election on hand, and that they are taking the situation very leisurely at the present time ? This man was ordered to sign his contract before the 15th of April, but we are now near the 1st of June, and no action has been taken either with regard to the forfeiture of his cheque or the assignment of the contract to any one else. Has there not been time to deal with the situation since that date ? I would think there has been ample time. It is true, you cannot compel this man to sign these documents except by a long procedure in the courts ; it is true, you cannot compel him to carry out the work ; but you can make up your mind within two or three days after he has refused to carry out his engage-

ment what you will do with him. If the situation was urgent enough to call for tenders in the midst of an election campaign last autumn, one would think it was urgent enough to justify the government in taking action within four or five weeks after this man had refused to sign the contract. You may deal with him in several ways. You may come to the conclusion that he was misled in some way, that therefore it would not be right to compel him to go on with the contract, and that his cheque should be given back to him ; or you may consider that it would be right for the government to exact from him the performance of the engagement that he has undertaken. If you adopt that conclusion, you have before you the necessity of considering whether you will accept the next tender or advertise for new tenders. But it should not take five or six weeks to come to some conclusion, and for that reason I think my hon. friend from East Simcoe is amply justified in bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. With regard to the cheque which was returned in connection with the proposed fast Atlantic service, that was returned by a vote of the House several years afterwards and after full consideration. There is no comparison between a matter in which the money was in our possession for years and a matter which is only a few weeks old. As my hon. friend thinks things of this kind can be done in such a hurry, perhaps he will find some day that there are reasons for delays, and that government business cannot be transacted as quickly as some hon. gentlemen think.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RATES.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. On the 17th of May the Minister of Railways and Canals occupied two or three hours of the valuable time of the House in trying to make the House and the country believe that I had made a statement in reference to the rates between Gananoque and Fredericton which was not correct. He stated on that occasion, on page 6335 of Unrevised 'Hansard' :

Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to make an explanation with respect to a question raised by my hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) in connection with the freight rates on the Intercolonial.

On the 27th of April my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) spoke of the alleged increase of these rates. I quote from the hon. gentleman's remarks as they appear at page 4997, revised 'Hansard.'

The minister then quoted what I stated, and in reply to the question raised by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) he said :

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will pardon me, I will point out that the change was with regard to Fredericton alone—there is no change in freight rates on the Canada Eastern or any other portion of the Intercolonial. The change is only with respect to Fredericton, and there it is because the Canadian Pacific Railway controlled this situation and had secured that rate. The result is that the Intercolonial does not get the traffic to Fredericton.

At page 6354 'Hansard,' the Minister of Railways said further :

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Cockshutt) allow me. The increase affects the city of Fredericton alone. Right opposite, at Gibson, or at Marysville, on the line of the Canada Eastern, there is no increase on the Intercolonial.

Mr. CROCKET. Does the hon. minister say that this applies only to the city of Fredericton and that there is no increase at Marysville ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no increase at Marysville or at any point on the Intercolonial, except at Fredericton, where there has been an increase by the two railways, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific which made this arrangement

The Minister of Railways had read circulars from the officers of his road, and he made statements himself trying to prove that my statement was not correct when I said : That we had been shipping to Fredericton at 58 cents under the old tariff and that since they acquired the Canada Eastern we were paying 66 cents. I now hold in my hand the tariff of the Canadian Pacific Railway and of the Grand Trunk Railway. Here is Canadian Pacific Railway tariff E. D. No. 28, issued 27th of June, 1902, and here is the new one issued 1st May, 1905, effective on the 6th of March, I quote :

Canada Eastern Railway, Chatham and Fredericton branches of the Intercolonial Railway, arbitraries on page 4 of tariff 'ED,' 28, will be cancelled and the following substituted : To make through rates to Fredericton, Marysville and Gibson, New Brunswick, add to the St. John, New Brunswick, rates the following cents per 100 pounds on first-class goods : 8 cents.

The rate to St. John was 58 cents, add 8 cents and you have 66 cents. The minister stated that this tariff only applied to Fredericton, but here the Canadian Pacific Railway tariff states that it applies to Fredericton, Marysville and Gibson, and yet the minister contradicted the hon. member from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) and said it only applied to Fredericton. The Grand Trunk Railway tariff proves it more effectively. I have in my hand the Grand Trunk Railway tariff GM 10, taking effect 14th December, 1903. The tariff is given in groups to all the different points : group E to Newcastle, group F to Chatham Junction, group G to St. John, group H to Halifax, group J to Mulgrave, group K to Point Tupper, group L to Sydney, and group M to West St. John. The tariff says that from stations in the following groups (No. 8 group takes in Mallorytown, Lansdowne, Thousand Island Junction and Rideau), the rate from any of these sta-

tions to St. John was 58 cents on first-class, and that covered Fredericton. The Grand Trunk Railway did not put on an arbitrary there, but they formed a new group and in their tariff of the 10th of November, 1904, effective 15th November, 1904, they issued a statement saying that the following stations will take group N. Group N was a new group that was formed. Up to this time group M was the last group they had, but they specially got up a group to cover Fredericton, Marysville and Gibson and it says :

The following stations will take group 'N,' Fredericton rates : Fredericton, Gibson and Marysville, New Brunswick. First-class rate 66 cents.

Here we have the Grand Trunk Railway tariff showing that the increased rate applies to Fredericton, Gibson and Marysville. And yet in the face of that, the minister occupied the time of the House for a couple of hours on the 17th of May stating emphatically out of the mouths of his officers, that there was no change in tariff to any point but Fredericton while in this very tariff which I will send over to the minister he will find that the rate to Fredericton, Gibson and Marysville is 66 cents as compared with 58 cents prior to the acquisition of the Canada Eastern. I want to put myself right before the House and the country for I never make a statement that I do not feel satisfied is correct. I was absolutely correct and the Minister of Railways was absolutely wrong, and he made a statement that he and his officers ought to have known was not correct when he made it.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I am afraid my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is somewhat extravagant in his remarks this afternoon. He started out with saying that I occupied the time of the House recently for three hours in trying to prove that he was wrong, but he qualified that statement later on by bringing it down to two hours.

Mr. TAYLOR. 'Hansard' will not show that I said three hours ; I said from two to three hours.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now that my hon. friend has got it down to two hours, perhaps he might throw a little off that.

Mr. TAYLOR. No ; I think the discussion lasted that long.

Mr. EMMERSON. Be that as it may, what are the facts ? During the course of a debate some weeks ago the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) made certain statements in connection with freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway, and after expressing some surprise at his statements I promised to give him the information later—not to prove that he was not correct but to give the explanation of the officials of the railroad. I communicated with the traffic manager and he wrote me in reply a letter which I asked the permission of the House to read. In that reply the traffic manager stated in effect, that all points between Fredericton and Chatham Junction were on the same basis as they had originally been ; that is, they were put in the Moncton zone of freight rates. On that authority I made the statement.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not Moncton but St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. Moncton and St. John are on a par ; and things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another.

Mr. HENDERSON. Correct.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I had remembered it correctly. The point I was making is :—and my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) proves it—that it was by the action of the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway—

Mr. TAYLOR. With the consent and approval—

Mr. EMMERSON. No, not with the consent, but as against the protest of the Intercolonal Railway traffic official, they had arbitrarily fixed the rate to Fredericton ; and they were enabled to do so by reason of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway reached Fredericton. I assume that the traffic manager, in writing to me, did not take into consideration the fact that Gibson is connected directly with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and therefore the Canadian Pacific can control the Gibson rates in the same way they can control the Fredericton rates. And Marysville—

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the minister why he was so emphatic in reply to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) and the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) saying that it did not apply to Marysville and Gibson ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I made that statement because of the statement in the letter of the traffic manager to the effect that the points between Fredericton and Chatham Junction were not affected.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it because the Canadian Pacific Railway directly touches Fredericton and Gibson that they are able to control Intercolonial rates at these points ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is because the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as I understand it, have entered into an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway as to freight originating west of Montreal. Marysville is not directly on the Canadian Pacific Railway, but is distant a mile or thereabouts—it is within cartage distance.

Mr. CROCKET. It is three miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not from where their station is ?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes, it is certainly three miles to Fredericton.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not as familiar with it as my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), but it is within cartage distance. In Fredericton there are factories to which freight would have to be carted almost the same distance as to Gibson or Marysville. But it is because of this position that the freight rates are made the same as for Fredericton—that the Canadian Pacific Railway controls the situation and they can by arrangement with the Grand Trunk Railway change these rates. But from the points which the Canadian Pacific Railway cannot touch, that is points on the Intercolonial Railway which are not affected by compact with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the rates are precisely the same. Take Bolestown for instance or Cross Creek, or Stanley——

Mr. TAYLOR. The tariff gives all these.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes. All these points which are not controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway and cannot in any sense be the subject of contract between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, have the same rates as before. Therefore, substantially what I stated is proved by the explanation of my hon. friend.

Mr. TAYLOR. And so is the statement I made. But what I want to ask is whether the Railway Commission approved of these two new tariffs issued by these companies, that of the Canadian Pacific Railway on November 16, taking effect next day and one of the Grand Trunk Railway on March 17 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not aware whether they were approved by the Railway Commission or even considered by them. I know that the railways have the right to file with the Railway Commission joint tariffs ; and until that commission takes action, either amending or revising that tariff, it would be effective. Whether they did file these tariffs, as provided by the law, or not, I am not personally informed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will he ascertain whether they have been filed and approved and how long the government is going to allow them to run until they are approved of ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The government has no right to affect that.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government can control the Railway Commission.

Mr. EMMERSON. The government does not control the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission is an independent body ; it stands independent of the government, the railways and the patrons of these railways. Any shipper on the line of any of these roads has the right to ask the commission to revise the tariffs. It is true that the Minister of Railways can ask the Railway Commission to take action and decide matters to which his attention is called. But the government has no control of the decisions of the commission, nor does it decide the time when such matters should be taken up. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) has not in any way maintained his original position. He undertook to say that the freight rates from Trenton and Sydney to Brockville and Gananoque were greater than they were from Gananoque or Brockville to Pittsburg.

Mr. TAYLOR. At 37 cents.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not take umbarge at my hon. friend making such a statement. Of course I should have been surprised to find the hon. gentleman's information correct. I made inquiry and found that the distance between Trenton and Brockville was very much greater than the distance between Pittsburg and Brockville.

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not complain of that ; what I complained of was the 37 cents to Gananoque—25 cents and 12 cents.

Mr. EMMERSON. But he undertook to cast reproach in some way upon the Intercolonial by reason of that.

Mr. TAYLOR. Upon the combine. Because, I consider you are all in an arrangement.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the facts show that my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is not looking at it in the right spirit.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am one of the sufferers.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend knows that this carload to which he refers was billed from Trenton to Brockville. The car reached Brockville, and the Intercolonial had nothing to do with it.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) cannot expect the rate to Gananoque to be the same as the rates to Brockville. An important point like Brockville of course, must have a different rate from a place like Gananoque.

Mr. EMMERSON. After the car had reached Brockville the consignee, I understand, desired to have it sent on to Brockville. It was subject to local rates over the Grand Trunk Railway from Brockville to Gananoque. No reproach can be cast on the Intercolonial for discrimination on the part of the Intercolonial in such a case.

Mr. TAYLOR. I brought it up in order that the Railway Commission might consider the grievance—a rate of 25 cents from Trenton to Brockville and 12 cents for the thirty miles to Gananoque.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) knows that there is a great distinction between the through rate and the local rate. He must have known indeed that if these statements were not true he was doing a great injustice to the management of the Intercolonial in bringing the name of that railway into question at all. The way he

placed the matter before the House would lead one to conclude that the Intercolonial was at fault, that the officers of the Intercolonial were discriminating unfairly in the application of freight rates. I so understood him, and I asked for an explanation, because it is my desire, so far as I am responsible for the administration of that railway, that the rates shall not be discriminatory, that they shall be fair and equitable to all sections of country so far as it is possible to make them so. I am glad my hon. friend has made this explanation, he has clearly proved that the Intercolonial is not at fault, that the Intercolonial is not responsible for increased rates to and from Fredericton, or to and from points that are included within the Fredericton zone, and which are controlled by the Canadian Pacific Railway. I thank him for bringing it to the attention of the House, and for emphasizing the fact that the Intercolonial is in no sense responsible for that increased rate on traffic originating west of Montreal.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.). During the discussion of this matter the other day I asked the Minister of Railways if the increase applied only to Fredericton, and he informed me then that it did, and that there was no increase to Marysville or to Gibson. Now the statement of the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) indicates that the minister was mistaken in the answer he gave to my question. I may say in connection with this matter, that the council of the Fredericton Board of Trade had a meeting on Wednesday night, and I have here a copy of the Fredericton 'Gleaner' of last night, containing an account of that meeting. It was stated in the course of the discussion here that the merchants of Fredericton had agreed to this increase in the Fredericton rates. At the time I was at a loss to know why they should have done so, because the letter which the minister read from the general traffic manager of the Intercolonial stated that the Intercolonial authorities themselves considered that the discrimination against Fredericton was most unfair. In the report of the meeting to which I refer, I find this :

> Mr. Hodge stated that Messrs. Randolph, Sterling, himself and other men had complained at the differential of three cents per hundred weight over the rate on all freight from Montreal and points west of Montreal to St John, Moncton and other places with which they had always enjoyed the same rate. They later met the Canadian Pacific Railway officials, and after a conference decided to accept the differential on all other classes of goods providing that they got the same rate on grain produce that St. John, Moncton and other places enjoyed.
>
> Mr. Randolph explained that the Canadian Pacific Railway had claimed that they had changed their rates from Fredericton north and that that justified them in raising the rate on freight coming in. The merchants claimed that this was not fair and the changes did not bring it down as far as a mileage basis. When the Canadian Pacific Railway officials offered to put the rates on grain back the merchants felt that it was better to take that offer than nothing at all. A month or so later Mr. Randolph's firm wrote complaining of the arrangement to the general freight agent of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Mr. Randolph pointed out that for a long haul to Sydney the rate was the same as to Fredericton.

So it seems that the wholesale grocers of Fredericton did assent to the rate being maintained, to the increase being maintained, on other classes of goods than on grain products, because they could do no better. But the board of trade, at a meeting, on Wednesday, passed a strong resolution protesting against this discrimination. I may say that the people of Fredericton feel that the discrimination is most unfair and unjust. It is not only the merchants of the city of Fredericton who are interested in this matter, but it is the people who purchase the goods ; the farmers, the mechanics and the labourers of the city of Fredericton and the county of York are paying this increase, and the whole community is very much opposed to this discrimination, and very much disappointed that it has resulted from the acquisition by the government of the Canada Eastern Railway. The great argument, I may say, that was made in the county of York with reference to the acquisition of the Canada Eastern Railway by the government was that if the government did not acquire it the Canadian Pacific Railway would, and that we would be entirely in the hands of the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to freight rates. It is rather disappointing then to say the least, to hear the admission made upon the floor of this House by the Minister of Railways that the Canadian Pacific Railway now controls the freight rates of the Intercolonial to Fredericton—that is the admission which I understand the minister to make that at Fredericton and all points that are touched directly by the Canadian Pacific Railway, that road determines the rate. That is a matter of great disappointment to the people of Fredericton. Now the correspondence which the minister referred to the other day shows that, as I said before, the Intercolonial authorities themselves recognize the injustice of the discrimination, and I do hope that the Minister of Railways will exert his influence to have that discrimination removed as speedily as possibly.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Debates—amount required to cover expenditure for session of 1904 paid during present financial year, $31,503.74.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the main vote ?

Mr. SPEAKER. This is largely owing to the fact that the session of 1904 was so long. The session was estimated at 130 days, but it exceeded that by 41 days. These 41 days had to be taken into con-

sideration this year. The items are as follows: Amanuenses for 'Debates' reporters during the extra period, $1,291.50; printing and binding, printing paper, $29,066.01. This represents the accounts of the Printing Bureau for work done after the first of July, 1904, to the end of the session. Seven hundred dollars is for the preparation of the analytical index. The Debates Committee ordered this index to be prepared last year.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the index of the 'Hansard?'

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it being carried out this year as I think it was last year, namely, that the whole index is not in each volume of the 'Hansard.'? I want to call the attention of the speaker and the committee to this, because it seems to me to be a very inconvenient way. I send for the 'Hansard,' quickly or not in order to look for a certain thing. I do not know how many volumes of the 'Hansard' I may be obliged to get before I get the particular volume that I want. It used to be always so that no matter what volume of the 'Hansard' you got you had the complete index of all the volumes.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is still so.

Mr. FOSTER. No, as I understand it now, you do not have a complete index in every volume of the 'Hansard.' You have an index for each volume, and consequently you may have to send for and look up all the volumes before you get the one you want. That is very inconvenient and I do not think the little amount of expense that would cover the paper, because that would be about what it would be, is a sufficient reason why we should not have a complete index in every volume.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. member is in error about that, although I speak with some hesitation about it, but my recollection, being then a member of the Debates Committee, was that the intention was that each volume, consisting of approximately 2,000 columns and being of a uniform size, should have an index of the contents of that volume, the complete index of all the volumes to be in the last volume.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I mean; you only get the complete index in the last volume.

Mr. SPEAKER. Oh, yes, I see. You want the index in all?

Mr. FOSTER. I want it in all. It is now very inconvenient.

Mr. SPEAKER. The idea of the committee at that time, as I well recollect, was that it would be a very convenient thing to have the bound volumes of the 'Hansard' put into the hands of the members at the earliest possible date. If that is done it is manifestly impossible to have a complete index in each because the complete index cannot be ready until all the volumes are out. The idea of the committee was that, instead of having these loose volumes prepared by the pages, a volume of 2,000 columns should be printed and bound and placed in the hands of members, rather than, as has been the custom, that they receive these volumes two or three months after the session was over. That was what the committee had in view and the change was made for that reason. If it is not considered wise to take that course it would be a proper thing to refer the matter back to the Debates Committee to consider it further. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), who is a member of the committee, will probably remember the reasons which actuated the committee in making the change.

Mr. TAYLOR. We have our hands full of trouble on the Debates Committee every session. Last session a change was made. The government appeared to have had a gentleman that they had to find a job for in the person of Mr. McGillicuddy, and it was suggested to change the system of indexing the 'Hansard.' It was proposed that we should get up an analytical index, he was engaged to do it and the whole system was changed. But, the members found it was so inconvenient that at the first meeting of the Debates Committee this year we changed the system and went back to the old system, and in every volume of 'Hansard' for this year and future sessions, until the government have another gentleman that they want to find a job for, there will be found a complete index. The Debates Committee recommended and the House has approved of it, that we should revert to the old system of having a complete index in every volume of 'Hansard.' That will go into operation this session.

Committees—additional amount required, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is in connection with reporting and the payment of witness fees for the Telephone Committee and the Agriculture and Colonization Committee.

Stationery—additional amount required, $10,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the main vote for stationery?

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not that at hand. The reason that this additional vote is asked is owing to the length of the last two sessions. The stock was very much reduced, and then the Toronto fire prevented the stationer from securing from local people the necessary supply with the result that quite a lot had to be imported

from Massachusetts and heavy express charges had to be paid upon it. But, the principal reason why this additional vote was required, was because of the length of the last two sessions, one of five months and the other of seven. The main estimate I find now was $15,300.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would call the attention of the committee to the quality of some of the note paper which is supplied to members of the House. I have made application for paper over and over again and I have been supplied with paper of a very poor quality. I have been supplied with paper which was not worth more than two or three cents or at the most five cents a quire. On one occasion when I sent for note paper I was told that all the note paper was in our boxes. I think there is a great deal of favouritism and partiality shown in the stationery office.

Mr. SPEAKER. I will call the attention of the stationer to the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Sessional clerks, $11,700.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the original vote for that ?

Mr. SPEAKER. $13,810.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the cause of that ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The same remark I made a little while ago in connection with another item, that is the extra length of the session of 41 days to be provided for this year, applies to this.

Mr. FOSTER. How many sessional clerks have we ?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are 30.

Mr. FOSTER. Now will the Speaker tell us what is the duty of those clerks, whom do they serve and at whose wishes do they do their work ? I would like to know and I do not know what the position is, whether the members are to get any use of them or have they special duties or how is it ?

Mr. SPEAKER. These clerks are strictly under the direction of the clerk of the House and their first duty is to serve requests from the House, to prepare papers, copy papers, or do any departmental work of that character.

Mr. FOSTER. That is from the clerk of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. From the clerk of the House, which is called for by reason of the action of the House. Then if they have any extra time, as they frequently have, it has been the custom, as far as I can gather, for them to serve members. Any statements or copies in connection with departmental documents that are asked of it is their duty if they have the leisure time to prepare at the request of the members. They are liable of course to be called upon to attend on the select committees and to prepare statements, documents, or serve them in any way. These are in a general way the duties of the sessional clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. These sessional clerks are all clerks. They do not do the work of messengers or anything like that ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the legal number provided for ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I am informed by the clerk that there are 30 sessional clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. And you have now ?

Mr. SPEAKER. We have a full list of 30.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the statement was made that the sessional clerks were 52.

Mr. SPEAKER. The messengers alone are 52.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not speaking of the messengers. We are on the vote for sessional clerks and I asked how many sessional clerks there were and the answer I got was 52.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is wrong, there are 30. 28 permanent sessional clerks and 2 extra sessional clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. How many sessional clerks are being paid out of this vote ?

Mr. SPEAKER. These 30.

Mr. FOSTER. And are there not more than 30 ?

Mr. SPEAKER. No. There are no more sessional clerks than these.

Mr. FOSTER. This vote that is now being taken is simply to pay for the 30 sessional clerks and for no other service ?

Mr. SPEAKER. For no other service for the extra 41 days.

Mr. FOSTER. For the extra 41 days and for the 41 days you want a vote of $11,700 for clerk hire ? And for an ordinary session you take a vote of $13,810. That does not seem to quite fit in. Forty-one days as compared with the ordinary session ought not to give an increase of $11,700. That would give for 30 clerks a large amount of money.

Mr. BELCOURT. As I make it the total vote of the main estimates with the vote now asked of $11,700 will make a total of about $24,000. The session lasted about 180 days and the sessional clerks are paid $4 a day. That would make $120 a day and if you multiply 120 by 180 you have a total of the two estimates about $21,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What I was getting at was that if it requires $11,700 for 41 days,

if the original vote contemplating the usual session, called for $13,810 it ought not to take $11,700 to cover the extra 41 days.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman will see at once that $13,000 would not cover a session to which would be added 41 days. In other words the original estimate of $13,000 was not sufficient for the session lasting as the one we had last year lasted.

Mr. FOSTER. Who made the estimate for last year ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I forgot ; the Speaker or probably the clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Why does the Speaker bring before the House an estimate which he knows is not sufficient for the ordinary session ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Because the estimate has always been based for years and years on a session of a certain number of months. The session last year not only was 41 days longer than usual, but more than twice 41 days, so that the original estimate was found to be far out, owing to the extra time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume the intention of the government was to have a very short session when they brought that in. They did not intend to inflict that iniquity on the Northwest. Now they realize that the snow is likely to fly before they get away.

Mr. BELCOURT. This is last year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It will take possibly until next Christmas to explain to the people of the country——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is very clear.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is very clear that a great iniquity is being perpetrated on the Northwest.

Mr. BERGERON. Better make the estimate for a year now to be sure for the future. Where are these sessional clerks to be found ; have they a room in the building here ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they for the use of members for anything connected with the House ? If we have any translation to make or anything of the sort can we get that work done by them instead of paying out of our own pockets to have it done ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I explained a few moments ago in the absence of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) that the first duty of these clerks is to serve the House and to serve any committee of the House in the preparation of information or documents and if they have time, as they frequently have, beyond that it is their duty to attend upon requests of members of the House, prepare documents or statements for them or anything of the kind they can do.

Mr. BERGERON. Those for the committees as far as I can remember are old permanent clerks who are clerks of the Committees. They are to be found in the committee rooms where they act as secretaries.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they sessional clerks?

Mr. BERGERON. No, I would call them permanent employees, the clerk of the Agricultural, Railway, Standing Order or other committee would be a permanent employee. I am talking more especially of the sessional clerks. I may say I do not know where they are and I very seldom see them. I am asking this because very often we have some translation to do. To-day I have some translation to do and I have either to pay for it or do it myself if I have time. I ask that as a matter of information.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think they could be called on to do that. It depends altogether on how much of their time is taken up in the direct service of the House for which they are procured.

Mr. FOSTER. What I would like to know is, what is this direct service which requires the employment of thirty-two sessional clerks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. If papers are called for by the House, they make copies of these.

Mr. FOSTER. Not returns from the departments ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, copies of these. The department makes one copy, and further copies are made by the sessional writers ; perhaps half a dozen copies are called for. A great deal of their time is taken up in that way. I do not think that they could be called on to do any work that members might wish them to do ; but if they have leisure, they might accede to the request of members who want them to prepare matters of that kind. They occupy a room near the entrance to the gallery, where they are provided with desks and typewriters.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had these thirty-two men employed for a long time, and the House has never yet had any return showing the services they have rendered. Could we not be informed just how many copies of reports they have turned off in the course of a session ? For instance, we ask for a return ; the minister lays it on the table of the House, and the clerk may ask me if I would like a copy of it. If I said I would, that is the work of a sessional clerk. When a return is brought down to the House, it is either printed or not printed. If it is not printed, I undertake to say that very few copies are required by the members during a session. I do not know that in the years that I have sat in the House I have ever asked for a copy of any of these papers to be made for me by the sessional clerks, and

I think that is true of most of the members. The conclusion I have come to—it may be wrong—is that for thirty-two clerks the amount of work taken out of them in preparing duplicates for the use of members is comparatively very little, and I would like to have a return of the work that is really turned out by them. We should not have thirty clerks and not keep any tab over them so as to know what they are doing. When you take away that work, what other work is there for these men to do ? In the twenty years that I have been in the House I have never had any sessional clerk do any work for me. If other members are in the same position, what are these clerks doing ? But if some members have work done by them, and know how it is done, could we not have a director of sessional clerks to whom any member could apply when he wanted the services of a clerk ? For instance, if I want a piece of work done, I do not want to go to the rooms and hunt up a clerk for that purpose. If there were a director of the clerks, I could go to him. As it is, if we pay clerks we ought not to have to waste our own brain and nerve energy in preparing statements, so long as they have leisure to do it. Is there any method, and if so, what is the method that is adopted in that respect ?

Mr. SPEAKER. As I said a little while ago, they are, in the first instance, under the Clerk of the House, to whom application can be made by members at any time for copies of documents ; and I am told by the clerk that application is frequently made to him and also direct to members of the staff of sessional clerks. There is a chief of that staff, Mr. Stewart, and applications can be made to him at any time in the same way. I should have said also that eight members of this staff are assigned to the post office in the House, and are there practically all the time sorting. I think there is a great deal in what the hon. member has said, that the House ought perhaps be better apprised as to what the duties of the sessional clerks are, and what reports and documents they have prepared, and I will ask the clerk to procure a statement to that effect and lay it before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Is care taken to see that the sessional clerks are really men who are capable and can be trusted to prepare, for instance, a statement which I might want for use in the debate on the budget ?

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as I can learn, they are all pretty reliable men. It may be that in the future more attention should be paid to their being stenographers or typewriters ; but, so far as I can learn, they are good, reliable, trustworthy men, capable of doing any reasonable work which a member might ask to have done by them. Of course, they are answerable for their conduct to their chief, and particularly to the Clerk of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. How can we know when they are at leisure ? There is no way of finding that out unless we ask every day.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the only way would be to apply to the chief.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe that they are available mostly to members on the government side. We do not have much benefit from them. With such a number of clerks, we should have our share of them whenever it is necessary in the public service. I am told that in the Ontario legislature there are thirty clerks who are, I imagine, like these, paid by the House, and who are at the service of the members. If I am well informed, each of these clerks is at the disposal of three members. They are very good clerks, and the members utilize them. I would also call Mr. Speaker's attention to the fact that we are at a great disadvantage so far as accommodation is concerned. As to the messengers, I must say that they are really very attentive, but we have a good many round the House who seem to be assigned to some kind of special work. I have remarked during this session that the doors of the House are very badly kept. I have seen strangers on the floor of the House, and it seems to me that should not occur when we have so many doorkeepers. I have seen men coming through those doors behind the Speaker's chair, and I have even seen a man sketching the House through the open doors. Indeed I have seen men at the back of the chamber, and on one occasion a man was smoking there. It seems to me that we have enough messengers to take care that the precincts of the chamber are kept sacred, and I would ask the Speaker to look into the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The attention of the sergeant-at-arms has been called to the matter and I do not think my hon. friend will have cause to complain in future. It is proper that the chamber should be kept for the members, and that the corners should not be a loafing place for officials of the House or any one else. There is no doubt that the accommodation for the sessional clerks is most miserable at present. These twenty-two men are crowded into a room where they cannot live in comfort and health. I believe that question is receiving the consideration of the Department of Public Works together with the general question of better accommodation for the members of the House. As the business of the House has increased and the staff has been enlarged, there is a manifest lack of accommodation for the members, who have not at their disposal the facilities they should have for their comfort and convenience in the discharge of their duties. That whole question is at present engaging the attention of the Internal Economy Committee, and particularly the Minister of Public Works. I am in hopes that at some early day he will be able to make a statement to

the House which will be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen.

Mr. INGRAM. The sessional clerks have never refused to typewrite and give a copy of the returns laid on the table of the House, but as I understand it the hon. member for North Toronto was asking the Speaker whether the sessional clerks are competent to secure data for the budget speech for instance, or for a reply to the budget speech. Do I understand Mr. Speaker to say they would be competent, and prepared to do that class of work ? Suppose a member wanted to make a search in the Library for some particular information, do we understand that it would be part of the duties of a sessional clerk to procure that information ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I would not think that all of them would be competent to do that work, although I am perfectly satisfied that some of them are quite competent. It has come to my notice in previous years that they have done work of that class, but I cannot say at this moment how many of them would be capable of doing it.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it part of their duties to do that ; and if it is a circular should be issued to every member of this House informing him of that fact, so that each member of the House should know exactly where he stands in regard to it.

Mr. SPEAKER. Their first duty is to the House, and one could only know definitely whether they could do that work by applying to the chief. If any members of the staff were at leisure at the particular time a member applied, I think their duty would be to serve that member and I think they would be willing to do so. If, however, it is to be a generally recognized rule that members may apply to these officials to do such work, the present staff would not be at all adequate and it would have to be largely increased.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not think these men should be allowed to do that sort of work for an instant. Last session, I do not know what it is this session, we had the respected Admiral from Goderich who was utilized by some members of this House to pick up data for them. It is all right for the First Minister to have Mr. Farrer to prepare his speeches and get data and that sort of thing, but I do not think this House should pay members of the Library staff or members of the sessional staff to procure information which may be used in speeches.

Mr. BELCOURT. The gentleman you refer to was not a sessional clerk.

Mr. BERGERON. He was employed to do work he did not do ; he was employed by the Debates Committee and he did not do anything last year.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have in my hands a note sent into the chamber last session drawing 'Dear Sir William's' attention to a certain column in the 'Globe' where he would find an item with which he could 'slug Sam.'

Mr. BERGERON. Who wrote that ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. McGillicuddy.

Mr. FIELDING. How did you get the note ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The note was brought to me.

Mr. FIELDING. Did he send it to you by mistake ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. You may be sure that he did not intend it to be sent to me, at all events the note is in my possession and I want the Minister of Finance to understand that.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume you sent it to the proper person ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That would cut no ice.

Mr. FIELDING. Did he send it to you by another man's note.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I want these gentlemen to understand that they are not here to do work for members on the government side of the House, and I object to these sessional clerks being employed for any such purpose as hunting up data for the speeches of gentlemen opposite. If one member has a right to have that done, every member of the House has a similar right.

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement I made was that every member in the House should have the same right in the matter.

Mr. BELCOURT. In justice to the gentleman referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) I should say that he was not on the staff of the sessional clerks, and he is not now.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was he doing in the name of goodness ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Last session the Debates Committtee recommended that he should be employed for the purpose of preparing an index of all sessional papers from the year 1894 to the present time. The last index of that kind was brought up to 1894 and on the recommendation of the Debates Committee this gentleman was employed to continue it. The index is prepared and is being printed now.

Mr. FOSTER. What is he doing now ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know. I am told he is employed by the Debates Committee.

Mr. BERGERON. That is not the information I have. I understand that this gentleman, together with a French gentleman, was employed last year to make an analytical index of 'Hansard,' which was a new idea. I may say that we have altered that a

little and gone back to the old system of having the index attached to each volume of 'Hansard,' as the members desired and as I think is the better way. The French gentleman has done his work thoroughly, but the English gentleman of whom I spoke had not done anything. The Debates Committee received a letter from that gentleman explaining that the reason why he had not done anything was that he had been sick, and we accepted that explanation. I have been told that during the time that he was supposed to be sick he was doing something else. I imagine that is what my hon. friend refers to.

Mr. BELCOURT. The work he was required to do was undertaken because of a report in favour of it by the Debates Committee last session. The gentleman was here a part of the session and he was not receiving any salary or indemnity from the House or the government. Towards the close of the session the report of the committee was made to the House, and adopted in favour of having this index prepared. I was mistaken when I said a moment ago that it covered ten years. It covered fourteen years—from 1890 to 1904. The work has been completed and is being printed.

Mr. BERGERON. What is it ?

Mr. BELCOURT. An idex of the sessional papers from 1890 to 1904—really an index of the journals of the House including the sessional papers and the Votes and Proceedings.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there no index of that ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Up to 1890, yes ; but the last fourteen years had not been indexed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Returning to the question of the sessional clerks, I would like to ask the Speaker if all these 32 men are employed in the sessional clerks' room ? I have gone in there frequently, but had no idea there were such a large number on the staff. Are any of them employed by the members in the different rooms ? Or, of course, they may work in relays, some in the early part of the day and some later, which would account for one not seeing so many in the room at once.

Mr. SPEAKER. A couple of these men are employed by the whips, one on either side. One of them is employed partly in attendance upon the deputy speaker's room and there are eight in the post office. Allowing for such cases, the number working in the sessional clerks' room would be about from eighteen to tweny-two.

Mr. HENDERSON. I must say that I have always had a good deal of delicacy in asking any help of the sessional clerks, not knowing exactly what I had a right to expect. But it is only due to Mr. Stewart the chief of that staff, to say that I have always received the utmost courtesy and have never been refused anything I asked. At the same time I have avoided asking for the copying of documents in a good many cases not knowing what was my strict right. But, if we as members of the House are entitled to more privileges than I have hitherto claimed, I would be glad to be informed, for I would avail myself of them, being one of those who believe in taking all they can get. I have often wondered if the sessional clerks were available to assist in the private correspondence of members. We are called upon to write a great many letters, yet not in such fashion that we have continuous employment for a typewriter. To have the assistance of a clerk for one or two days in the week would be a great help.

Mr. SPEAKER. If, on application to Mr. Stewart, the chief of the staff, it were found that members of that staff were available, I do not know why they should not be used for that class of work.

Mr. INGRAM. So far as the whips secretaries are concerned, they are overworked now. Owing to their position they are called upon to work long hours, and a lot of work is imposed upon them. I think a great deal of this is due to the fact that members do not think they have a right to ask the ordinary sessional clerks to typewrite documents, and so the whips' secretaries are called upon to do the work. If it were better understood that sessional clerks generally could be called upon for that class of work, it would relieve these other officers of much of the work they are now called upon to do.

Mr. SPEAKER. While I indicated that it is probably the right of members to avail themselves of the services of these officers, it must be apparent that with perhaps twenty clerks available, if 215 members exercise that right to any great extent, it would be impossible for these men to do much else than serve the members of the House. Of course, such work could only be expected of them when they have time to do it, and that can be ascertained by application to the chief of the staff. But where these clerks have the time, I do not see why their services should not be availed of in that way. The chief of the staff will see to it, I suppose, that they are not required to work too many hours in the discharge of their duties.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that Mr. Speaker went a long way when he authorized the use of sessional clerks to assist in the private correspondence of members. I do not know where we should end if we began that. It seems to me that either we have too many clerks, or we have not enough, or we have not the right kind. The work of a working member of this House is very arduous. He has a large private correspondence that he is bound to take care

of. Then he has a large correspondence of a public nature that he has to take care of. Then, there is the work of the House. My own experience is that, as compared with what it was fifteen or twenty years ago, the work of this House is very much increased. The multiplicity of things that claim our attention, the rapid succession in which new questions are forced upon us, make it arduous drudgery for even the best man to keep even with the work of the House. One almost feels like giving it up in despair and deciding to run the chance of making what show he can in the House with as small a modicum of work as possible. In some legislative assemblies they give every member a clerk or amanuensis. That seems extravagant at first blush, and it is certainly expensive. But to give each member a clerk or secretary may not in some respects be any more than the public man who gives his work to the House and country is entitled to. But we have not yet come to that, and it must be a good while before we will come to it.

But I think it is possible that if we had a staff of sessional clerks, the right men, competent, varied in their ability to work, stenographers, quick at summaries, calculating definitely and well, and doing their work so that it can be thoroughly relied on—I think there is a class of work that a moderately large number of clerks of the right kind could do for members, under the direction even of the clerk of the House, or of a director of the staff, divided so that it will be perfectly fair and even for both sides of the House, and all members of the House, a class of work that they might do with advantage to public business. Now something like this for instance : There was laid on my desk to-day six different returns with reference to certain subjects. Now, when I saw them my heart sank; I said to myself : How ever am I going to get through with that, analyse it and bring it here in the course of ten days or so, ready for the discussion which we have invited upon it ? For instance, it is relating to a matter which we were discussing to-day and yesterday. Now it would not be a partisan thing, I think, and it would be a public benefit, and would do a great deal to help the working members of the House, if, when a return like that comes down, they knowing what kind of information they want to get from it, a tabulation, were just to write a little memorandum of the tabulation they wanted in that return, and hand it over to a competent sessional clerk and have him make that tabulation. It would not be a partisan piece of work, you are not directing him as to what he shall say against the government or for the government, you are after a certain tabulation out of all these returns. I do not know whether I will ever get that done myself, if I have to do it. But there is a species of work which I should think a competent staff of sessional clerks could do, and do fairly well, and could alleviate the members of this House, for the public good and the public service. But if you come to say that we will have clerks here who will take up the private correspondence of members, I am afraid that we will go so far in that direction that it will simply become an impossibility, and will end in a worse state of affairs than we have to-day. But I would like, Mr. Speaker, and the clerk of the House to think it over, and see whether we can have, say, 25 or 30, or more if necessary, thoroughly good, first-class men, typewriters, stenographers, summarists, men who know just how to take hold of papers and give you a summary that you require out of them, and have them under competent direction and distribution to do work of that kind for the working members of the House. That is a thing which I think we might improve upon, because otherwise it comes to this, that even the best workers of the House, appalled by the tremendous amount of labour they have put upon them in order to get through the work, will fall behind hand in their work, and the public interests will suffer in that respect.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will be apparent that the class of men the hon. gentleman refers to would have to be a superior class of men, and probably we would require to pay them a little more than we pay the present staff. Any one can see at once with what great utility they would serve various members of the House. The clerk of the House and myself will take the matter up and see if we can make some suggestion, at all events, to the House to be dealt with at some future day.

Leather trunks, 240 at $25 each, $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How is that thing carried out ?

Mr. SPEAKER. According to a report of the Joint Committee on printing.

Mr. FOSTER. Who makes the trunks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The contract is on tender, I understand, given out by the Printing Committee.

Mr. FOSTER. Is value got for these trunks ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They seem to be very good.

Mr. BERGERON. Tenders were invited, and two houses tendered. They brought in some samples which were examined by a special committee of the Printing Committee and were found satisfactory. The contracts were given to two houses, and the members were invited to go and choose for themselves which house they should get their trunks from.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FESSENDEN WIRELESS TELEGRAPH COMPANY OF CANADA.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 144) to incorporate the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada.—Mr. Geoffrion.

On sections 11 and 12,

Mr. BERGERON. When we last had this Bill under discussion clauses 11 and 12 were allowed to stand because there was a proposal made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to add a word. I did not take upon myself at that time to accept the suggestion, because I was only acting for the promoter of the Bill, but since then I have been authorized by the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Geoffrion), who is in charge of this Bill, to accept the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Finance. Section 11 reads like this: The company may enter into any agreements with any government, and if I remember well the proposal of the Minister of Finance was to add the word 'Canadian' so that it would have nothing to do with any foreign government. I therefore beg to move:

That the word 'Canadian' be inserted before the word 'government' in the second line of section 11.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Is that word going to qualify 'corporation' and 'person?'

Mr. BERGERON. The difficulty the other day was that in not mentioning which government was intended it might mean a foreign government, although I understand it means either this government or a provincial government, and the hon. Minister of Finance proposed, so that there should be no doubt about it, to put in the word 'Canadian' before the word 'government.' I move to insert the same word in section 12.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Would it not be better to say 'any government in Canada?'

Mr. BERGERON. It is only a matter of phraseology; that is the meaning of it. By putting in the word 'Canadian government' it serves also the purpose of qualifying the word 'corporation' or 'person.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it is intended to give the company power to enter into agreements with the governments of any of the provinces, I think the expression 'Canadian government' is not very appropriate.

Mr. BERGERON. How would it do to say 'with any Canadian government?'

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I would think that you might say, 'any government in Canada, or any provincial government.' Provincial governments are Canadian governments in a certain sense but they are not Canadian governments in the ordinary sense.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, put it in good English.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the intention to restrict the words 'corporation' or 'person' in the same way?

Mr. BERGERON. Not persons, but corporations.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Would you make it read 'any government or corpoation in Canada?'

Mr. BERGERON. All right. I will therefore move that sections 11 and 12 be amended by inserting in the second line of each after the word 'corporation' the words 'in Canada.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How will it read then?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading):

The company may enter into agreements with any government or corporation in Canada or person, &c.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I do not think that is a very good way of wording it. The words 'in Canada' might be held to apply to the verb enter into' and not to 'government.' Why not say that they may enter into agreements with the government of the Dominion, or with any province or with any corporation or person?

Mr. BERGERON. The clause as it stands is the very same clause that was in the Marconi Act. The other evening when it was suggested that these words be added I did not take it upon myself to accept them, but since I have been authorized to do so. It is the same clause that they have in the Marconi Bill. The Minister of Finance will remember that the other day when discussing the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company we left two clauses aside in order to consider the insertion of the word 'Canadian' before 'government,' to be sure that the company would not be dealing with a foreign government and we are moving to add these words now.

Mr. FIELDING. The member who has charge of the Bill and who, in his absence, has handed it over to my hon. friend, mentioned this to me to-day. I think that from any point of view we need not object on behalf of the government. Whether the amendment carries out as fully the intention of my hon. friend as he desires I do not know, but I do not see any objection to the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to insert the word 'Canadian' before 'government.'

Mr. BARKER. I would have preferred to have seen the whole power subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and then the powers could be made as wide as you like.

Mr. FIELDING. The Bill already contains a clause with respect to the erecting of stations, and in the practical working out of the scheme they have to come to the Governor in Council, but this particular clause relates to agreements, and I do not think this is especially subject to the Governor in Council.

Mr. BARKER. If the agreement clause is made subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, I see no objection to making it as wide as you please.

Mr. BERGERON. Clause 19, which has been added, makes the whole Bill subject to the Governor in Council. You might put it this way :

The government of Canada or of any province in Canada or with any corporation or any persons, &c.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker suggests to me that it might read :

The company may enter into agreements with any government, corporation or person in Canada or any province thereof.

'In Canada' might cover it without any reference to the provinces. The expression 'in Canada' would apply not only to 'government,' but to the persons and corporations as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think the intention would be very well carried out by putting in the word 'Canada' before 'government.' You do not want to restrict the corporations or persons.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the company are content to have it in the form my hon. friend suggests.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The section will then read :

The company may enter into agreements with any government in Canada or with any corporation or person for the purpose, &c.

The same amendment will be made in section 12.

Sections, as amended, agreed to.

Bill, as amended, reported and read the third time, and passed.

FARMERS' BANK OF CANADA.

On the motion that the amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 124) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada—Mr. Martin (Wellington)—be concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING. The amendment I find consists in the striking out of a clause in the Bill. This, I may say, is a Bill to extend the time for the organization of a bank. During the interim certain proceedings have taken place, and a clause was inserted in the Bill as passed by this House validating anything that may have been done in the way of organization in the meantime. The Senate has moved to strike that clause out, and the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill is satisfied, I believe, to have the Bill go in its amended form.

Motion agreed to, and amendment read the second time, and agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Mantoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 116) respecting the Algoma Central & Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Sergeant-at-arms—House of Commons—Sessional messengers, $13,200.

Mr. BARKER. In regard to these items under the heading 'sergeant-at-arms,' I desire to ask Mr. Speaker what the present position of the sergeant-at-arms is in regard to purchases for the House of Commons. It will be recollected that last year a discussion occurred upon this subject, and as I understand, the position taken then was that up to a very recent period the sergeant-at-arms had been accustomed to make purchases, but that a year or two ago the Committee on Internal Economy had changed the position of the sergeant-at-arms in that respect, and while they left to him the care and custody of all property in the House, they made some change with regard to purchasing ; but there was some difference of opinion as to what the change really meant. It was said that the purchases in the future would have to be made under the direction of the committee and either the Speaker or the clerk, I am not sure which. But it was assumed by the then Speaker that that did not at all alter the duty or right or privilege of the sergeant-at-arms to make the purchases. That is, as I understood it, the sergeant-at-arms might still be considered to be the proper person to make the purchases, though he might only make them under the immediate direction of the committee or Mr. Speaker or the clerk of the House. I would like to know exactly what the present position is, and what the intention for the future is in regard to such purchases ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think there is no very radical change in the matter. A resolution was passed to the effect, I believe, that before any purchases are made there must be a requisition from the sergeant-at-arms, who in the first place has to pass upon the propriety or impropriety of the

purchase ; and before he can purchase outright, this requisition must be passed upon by the Speaker or the Internal Economy Committee. As far as the act of purchasing is concerned, that is now as it has been always, done by the sergeant-at-arms, with this one qualification which was made a short time ago : There have been requisitions made to the department of the sergeant-at-arms for furniture by various members in connection with their rooms, and from time to time it appears that applications which either were or were not refused by the sergeant-at-arms branch were made to the Public Works Department in an indirect way—at all events not through the sergeant-at-arms—and were granted in some cases where they had not been granted by the sergeant-at-arms branch. This manifestly led to difficulty in keeping books and to the inconvenience of having applications made to one department after refusal by another. On consideration the Internal Economy Committee came to the conclusion that in the case of furniture, the requisition should first come from the sergeant-at-arms and be passed by the Speaker to the Department of Public Works. The purchase of furniture is now made entirely by the department of Public Works, but a written requisition must first be made by the sergeant-at-arms branch. All other supplies that have heretofore been purchased are still purchased by this branch and on the initiation of the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that everything except furniture for rooms in the House of Commons is purchased by the sergeant-at-arms ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is true.

Mr. BARKER. Upon the requisition being approved the sergeant has absolute power to make the purchase and is the only person authorized.

Mr. SPEAKER. The requisition is made by him in the first instance and is passed upon by the Speaker, or, in case of a considerable amount, by the Internal Economy Committee. But in all cases except furniture the purchase is still made by the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. FOSTER. What does Mr. Speaker mean by furniture for the House of Commons ? Does it include furniture for the members rooms and the furniture necessary for the work rooms of the offices and servants ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think it includes all wooden furniture.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it take in furniture for the Speaker's rooms?

Mr. SPEAKER. It would take in what would come in under the term furniture.

Mr. FOSTER. Just wooden furniture ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, I think that is as far as the resolution goes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has Mr. Speaker a copy of the resolution ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think I can get it in a few moments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is desirable that these regulations and orders made by the Internal Economy Committee should be laid before the House. I have been in the House nine years and I do not know anything about this committee, what it does or what its functions are, or what it is supposed to do. I never before heard of it doing anything, and I am much surprised to learn now that it has actually made an order about something. That fact might be regarded as so unusual anl almost unconstitutional, that a copy of anything this commission has done for the last nine years should be laid on the table at the earliest possible moment. I do not even know whom I should call upon to undertake that, but in case there is any one within the sound of my voice who has anything to do with it—apart from the Speaker who I presume may be ex-officio a member—I would ask him to have a copy of the regulations laid on the table. We want to know how we are governed ; that is true as regards the whole country and it should be true also of the House of Commons.

Mr. SPEAKER. Last year a report of that sort was, I think, laid before the House.

Mr. FOSTER. How many sessional messengers are there ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Thirteen permanent and fifty-two temporary. At the beginning of the session there were fifty-five temporary but some have been dropped from the list for one reason or other so that there are three less now.

Mr. FOSTER. How are these messengers distributed ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Some of these permanent messengers are in the galleries, at the doors, and in the rooms. The temporary messengers are pretty well distributed all over the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the messengers that we see on the different landings and near the telephones included in this ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. By what system do you know whether fifty or fifty-five messengers are necessary ?

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the actual authorized number is fifty but it has grown a little beyond that. I do not know how it came to be fixed at fifty, but an effort will be made to get it down to that number.

Mr. FOSTER. There appear to be 'servants' as well as 'messengers'?

Mr. SPEAKER. There are twenty-five charwomen and eight servants.

Mr. FOSTER. Where are the servants located ?

Mr. SPEAKER. They are employed in different parts of the building looking after the coal and ice and telephones.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the legal number of these ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Five.

Mr. FOSTER. These exceed the legal number as in the other case.

Mr. SPEAKER. The authorized number of charwomen is twenty.

Mr. FOSTER. And you have how many ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Twenty-five, including two attendants in the ladies' cloak room, established this year for the wives of members.

Mr. FOSTER. The Speaker seems to have a large number beyond the authorized number. Whose province is it to make sure that the duties call for that many servants ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The sergeant-at-arms, of course, is the head of this department. There is at present a little excess. We are looking into that, and have been for some time, to see if we cannot reduce the staff to the exact limits.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the excess come over from last year ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes. There has been no increase this year except the two attendants in the ladies' cloak room.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that last year the excess amounted to sixteen above the authorized number. Mr. Speaker tells us that this has been reduced by three and that he purposes to reduce the number to that authorized.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, just as soon as we can without undue hardship to any servant.

Legislation—House of Commons—Sergeant at Arms—pages, $3,645.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the number of pages ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Nineteen.

Mr. FOSTER. And the authorized number ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Sixteen.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any probability of the number being reduced ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, we will see what we can do about it.

Legislation—House of Commons—Sergeant-at-Arms—one additional messenger, 10⅔ months at $500 per annum, $444.44.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this an additional employee ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is for a messenger put on permanently, and the sum voted is to pay the balance of the year since the date of appointment. He was previously employed, but is now made permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an addition to the permanent list ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, that is the condition I found.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Speaker the resolution from the Internal Economy Commission ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, this was a resolution passed on March 24th, 1905.

That owing to the fact that confusion is likely to arise from the practice that has been growing up of a portion of the furniture procured for the House of Commons being purchased by the Department of Public Works and a portion by the sergeant-at-arms, in future all such furniture as may be necessary, be purchased by and through the Public Works Department on requisition signed by the Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not put it entirely in the hands of the Public Works Department ?

Mr. SPEAKER. So far as the purchase is concerned. But they make purchases on requisition from the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution does not say that it is on requisition of the sergeant-at-arms.

Mr. SPEAKER. In practice that is how it is done. The sergeant-at-arms inquires into the advisability of the purchase. If he decides in favour of it he makes a written requisition. These requisitions are numbered. The requisition is submitted to the Speaker, who initials it and it is then forwarded to the Public Works Department, who attend to the purchase.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand this to be the course : Where furniture is considered necessary for the House of Commons, the requisition originates with the sergeant-at-arms. He makes his inspection and decides what is necessary. He makes up his list, which is in the form of a requisition. There is a conference with the Speaker, who, if he approves, initials the requisition. Then the matter is entirely out of the hands of the sergeant-at-arms and of the Speaker ; the Public Works Department purchase as it pleases and delivers the purchase. Then that is paid for by the Public Works Department ?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no appropriation in the House voted for that furniture. The requisition originates here, but the money vote is with the Public Works Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will have to be.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether that is the best form in which to have it or not. Certainly, the sergeant-at-arms is responsible for the custody and care of all this furniture. It seems to me that it ought to be clear beyond doubt that he has to requisition for it and has to be the judge of what is necessary. Of course, I do not wish to cut the Speaker out from his proper place, which is to supervise and, in the end I suppose, to say what he thinks is necessary. But one thing I wanted to make sure about is that it is not the Public Works Department that is to judge what furniture is necessary for the House of Commons. The Minister of Public Works is a political head. The sergeant-at-arms, as is well known, has no politics, he is not a political head, but an officer of the House. If the initiative were left to the Minister of Public Works there would be everlasting pressure upon him to order things not really necessary. I understand that it is clear that the initiative does not rest there but with the sergeant-at-arms, who has the responsibility for the care of the furniture.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not the intention. In the past purchases were made through these two channels, and there seemed danger of abuse arising. It may be a debatable question whether it should be left with the sergeant-at-arms or with the Public Works Department. So far as the actual purchase is concerned, it would seem that, purchasing so many things as they do, including large quantities of furniture for all the departments, the department of Public Works would have facilities for the purchase of goods of this kind. In any event the intention was to make it plain that the initiative should be with the sergeant-at-arms' branch, the purchasing only being left with the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, with reference to prices, which would depend on the quality of the furniture. I might think that if I had the courtesy of a room in company with others and wanted some furniture, I should have very excellent furniture, and I might pitch my demand pretty high. I should think that in such case it would be the sergeant-at-arms who would be the judge of the kind of furniture that should be used, both as to quality and price.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that is the intention, that the sergeant shall pass upon the articles, and state about what kind and what price they shall be, as a certain desk, for example, or something of that character.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask Mr. Speaker what is the precise position as to all other purchases. I understand now that with regard to wood furniture for the House of Commons, the sergeant-at-arms has the initiative to recommend what is required, and the purchases are made through the Public Works Department. There are at least one or two other branches who make purchases. But where is the initiative of those purchases ? By whom are they made and certified ?

Mr. SPEAKER. When I took office I found that certain things were being purchased without apparently any requisition to start with, though I did not find this to any great extent, and I am not going to make any complaint about it. But I decided that in each case there should be a written requisition to start with, something which could be placed on file. That written requisition will now be made by the sergeant-at-arms, after investigating the need of the purchase ; in every case that will be the duty of the sergeant. I do not exactly know what the hon. member meant as to the other branches. He may refer to certain purchases made by the clerk ; for example, books for the use of the clerk in his library, or certain publications of utility which may be distributed among the leading officials to assist them in their work. Matters of that character will be dealt with in the same way by the clerk ; he will make a requisition, and the purchase will be carried out in the same way.

Mr. BARKER. Where the sergeant-at-arms makes a requisition, and I presume it has to be approved by the Speaker, which seems to be reasonable, who makes the purchase then ?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is passed at once to the Speaker, and after he looks it over and initials it, he sends it back to the sergeant. After that nobody has anything to do with it but the sergeant-at-arms, he makes the purchase himself, he certifies the account, then the account comes regularly back to the Internal Economy Committee at its next meeting. This committee consists of four members of the government and the Speaker, and they pass upon all accounts before they are paid.

Mr. BARKER. In explanation of these accounts, I may say that last year, although the then Speaker seemed to have a very clear notion, practically the same as the Speaker now has, that the sergeant-at-arms made all the purchases, that was not the fact. On page 8991 of the 'Hansard' of 1904, the then Speaker said :

He——

That is the sergeant-at-arms.

—is responsible for the purchase and custody of the goods purchased not only in connection with the Speaker's department, but the whole House.

Now, that was not the interpretation of this order that had been made in May, 1902, by the Internal Economy Committee :

The question of the puchase of supplies by the sergeant at arm's branch having come up for

consideration, the commissioners record their opinion that in future all such expenditures shall be made under the direction of the Speaker and the Internal Economy Committee.

Now, the interpretation of that by the then Speaker was that while the Speaker and the committee directed the sergeant-at-arms, still the sergeant-at-arms made the purchases, and presumably certified them. But, as a fact, that was not the procedure, because we found in the Auditor General's Reports that accounts were passed and paid without the certificate of the sergeant-at-arms. Now, I think I clearly understand what Mr. Speaker tells us, and what he says is perfectly satisfactory, so far as I am concerned, it appears to be a perfectly proper arrangement. But although that was the understanding of the late Speaker, it was not the practice, having regard to what appeared in the Auditor General's Report ; and I think it was not the practice as understood by the Clerk of the House, because in a letter of his, dated October 7, 1903, reported at page 9001 of 'Hansard' of last year, he answered the Auditor General to the effect that the account had been passed by the Board of Internal Economy, and that he, the Clerk, had certified it. So that under that order of 1902, which was interpreted by the then Speaker and the committee to mean that the Sergeant had control, the Clerk of the House had a different view of it, and accounts were being sent in to the Auditor General without any certificate from the sergeant-at-arms. I simply mention this as a reason for making these inquiries in rather a particular manner. I can only add that I am perfectly satisfied with the arrangement as it is now stated.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask a question with reference to the audit. If I understood the discussion which took place last year, in reading it over, it seemed to be the contention of the late Speaker—whether it was the opinion of the Internal Economy Committee I do not know—that the House of Commons expenditure should not be audited, and it was not necessary that it should be audited by the Auditor General, that it was exempt from the Audit Act. But the fact remains that a large payment was made not to the satisfaction of the Auditor General, and, so far as I know, it has never been certified according to the demands of the Auditor General. Now, the present Speaker, if he has looked into it, knows quite well that the Auditor General was asked to audit the House of Commons expenditure, and that there was a resolution of the House, I think in 1880, which affirmed that, and I should hope there would be no more of the contention that it was not necessary and proper, and a wise thing, to have this expenditure audited by the Audit Department. I do not think that even the House of Commons wishes to take itself out from under the most stringent audit of the Auditor General's Department.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot say at the moment what the position is, but I will look into it.

Mr. FOSTER. Are inventories taken yearly or at stated periods, and how is track kept in reference to our purchases and what becomes of them in the general run of things ? Looking at some of these expenditures one would think that there must be stacks of this stuff somewhere. It seems almost impossible to have worn out with fair usage all these things which have been got within the last few years. Take the Speaker's apartments. The past Speaker does not seem to have shown himself to be a master of economy ; either that or there must have been a tremendous falling out of supplies, furniture and that kind of thing in the Speaker's apartments in preceding years. I find that the expenses made by the past Speaker in the two or three years of his official life came up to a large amount. In two years they went up to about $8,000. I never had the idea that the Speaker's apartments were so poorly furnished and so badly depleted that it would require all that amount of money to refit them, and I think there was a little bit of a reign of extravagance during the regime of my hon. friend the late Speaker, which was not emulated by his predecessors and I hope will not be emulated by his successor. In fact, I think, taking into account the enormous purchases that were made, the present Speaker must find that there is an embarrassment of riches rather than anything else and that he will need very little for the next two or three years.

Mr. SPEAKER. I quite agree on the question of the utility of having these inventories ; in fact, I have already written expressly asking that there shall be inventories at stated periods so as to check purchases and compare them with previous purchases. I think that will be attended to with fair strictness.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I came in perhaps a little late to hear all this discussion, but I would like to know from Mr. Speaker, or whoever is in charge, how a member has to proceed to get what I may regard as a share of the furniture that is provided for members of parliament. This is the seventeenth session I have attended this House. I never had a desk such as is furnished to many members, I think I can fairly say, except a desk in the House of Commons and even that is at times tampered with. I have had from my seat trinkets that I placed here thinking they were safe, stolen during the present session. I do not know any reason why I should not have these advantages as well as others. Perhaps I have been too modest in not asking for them, but I never became acquainted

with the procedure of how to get anything of that kind. I go about a great many rooms, I see beautiful desks and ample provision made for locking up anything of a private character, papers as well as other matters and I wonder how these are obtained, whether it is through favouritism, or whether I am not supplied simply because I have been too modest to ask for anything of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the reason.

Mr. HENDERSON. It may be the reason but I never became acquainted with the mode of procedure, and I do not know whether I should get on the right side of the Speaker or the right side of the sergeant-at-arms or make friends with the Minister of Public Works. Or, is it because I am on the left side of the Speaker that something of that kind is not held out to me ? There are a great many rooms in this House well furnished with every provision of that kind. I think I may safely say that there are anywhere from 100 to 200 desks provided for members. If one member is to get a desk another member should have the same thing without asking for it. It should be presented to him for use during the session. I do not think he should be humiliated by having to get down on his knees to any officials of the government and beg for such a thing. It seems to me that if these conveniences are for general distribution, which they seem to be, they ought to be provided without any requisition. I may say this, however, that a desk for myself would be very little use because I have practically no place to put it consequently that may be the reason why I have not made a requisition. I find that others have abundance of room in which to place these desks. How that is obtained I do not know. Why I should not have obtained the same privileges I assume is just owing to my modesty in not asking for them and in not troubling the officials of the House. I think the time has come, when, if these privileges are accorded to one man, they should be accorded to another and that without his asking for them. It is a known fact, it is known to the sergeant-at-arms that there is a necessity for having some place where a member can lock up his private effects because the sergeant-at-arms is quite well aware that the House of Commons is not the safest place in this world to leave a penknife or anything else that is of the value of five cents; in fact it is very dangerous to do it. Here we are making laws, we have enacted the Criminal Code and I believe there is no place where the Criminal Code is more frequently violated than in the House of Commons. I am not accusing the members of being the guilty parties.

Mr. BERGERON. Not even the ministers.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not the ministers certainly. I am not accusing the Speaker, or the sergeant-at-arms ; I am not accusing even the pages, but somebody does it. That is a well known fact. To my mind some steps should be taken to protect the House of Commons. I think this country is big enough and rich enough to afford a salary to two policemen to stay in this chamber all hours of the night, every hour while the House is not in session to keep their eyes constantly on every desk or on every part of this chamber and see that no one is permitted to come into the House to remove anything that does not belong to him. I have been told that this was attempted, but that the very men who were employed were the men who did the work. All we can say is that we will get two more to watch these two. It seems that something will have to be done. I think it is necessary even to set a good example to the country. I draw the attention of Mr. Speaker to this matter and I hope and trust that steps will be taken to sacredly guard everything that is left in the House by members and that it will not be possible to say that the Criminal Code of which we are the authors is more frequently violated in the House of Commons than in any other place in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER. There appear to be two reasons why the hon. member (Mr. Henderson) has not a desk. One is undoubtedly his modesty and the other is that he has no place to put it. I can assure my hon. friend that if he will apply to some of the new members he will very quickly get on to the way of getting a desk. The new members are very much more assertive in that direction than old members ; at least, they have been the last three or four years.

Mr. FOSTER. How was it with yourself ?

Mr. SPEAKER. The usual way in which members are in the habit of getting desks is by applying for them, and if my hon. friend is not too modest there may be hope for him in that direction. I can assure him there will be no discrimination, there has been no discrimination. The desks are allotted as they are applied for and as we can get them for the members on either side of the House. I quite agree with something that the hon. member said just at the end. My attention has been called repeatedly to petty thefts around the House and some that are not very petty, and I believe that there is an absolute necessity for us to secure efficient police or detective service around this House. I believe a couple of detectives could earn their salaries well in the saving of the theft of articles that are stolen from time to time around this House. That is another matter that has recently been engaging the attention of the sergeant-at-arms and myself.

Legislation—Senate—further amount required for contingencies, $15,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is that? Who can answer for the Senate ?

Mr. FIELDING. Nobody. I really think we will have to take these items as being self-explanatory for I am not able to give any explanation that is not set forth there. The further amount required for contingencies arises from the length of the session no doubt. The leather trunks are due to the fact that it is the privilege of senators to have trunks as well as members of this House.

Mr. W. JACKSON. What about the extra $25 for leather trunks ? The amount of this vote would provide for more trunks than are required.

Mr. FIELDING. There is enough for 90 trunks ? Then we will have to reduce it by $25 and pass the item.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend cannot give any explanation of the $15,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is doubtless owing to the length of the session. My hon. friend is doubtless aware that these items are sent to us by the officers of the Senate and we can hardly do anything more than accept them. The Senate is rather sensitive about our inquiring about what it does with its leather trunks.

Mr. BERGERON. It is the amount required for contingencies. Considering that the Senate has sat about 15 days they should hardly want about $15,000 more.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps if they sat more frequently they would not want so much for contingencies.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required for the last session because parliament sat into this fiscal year.

Mr. BERGERON. Did the Senate sit much more last year than this ?

Mr. FIELDING. The session was longer; whether the Senate sat or not is another question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was the original amount ?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount voted for salaries and contingencies which, I presume, corresponds to the same item, was $75,576 in the main estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must say that I do not see any particular reason why they should not come any nearer to it than $15,000. The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue suggests that it may be due to the circumstances that the session of parliament extended into August but I do not see how that would affect this.

Mr. BRODEUR. Because I suppose last year the amount which was voted for the current year was $75,000. Of this amount they must have spent a certain sum for the two months or nearly two months in which we were in session during the present fiscal year and so of the sum appropriate for this fiscal year a certain amount has been taken for the payment of expenses incurred during the months of July and August 1904. I do not know whether it is because of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In that case we would expect that the appropriation for the previous year would be very much cut down, that would be the logical result of that argument, but I have not heard of that. But they do not allow any appeal from this I suppose.

Mr. FIELDING. I believe there is no appeal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Next year they may ask $150,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Such is our system. I have not the full particulars of the items for voters' lists with me.

Mr. BERGERON. I see here there is some new edition of an electoral atlas.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall state in general terms the object of this vote and then if any hon. members desire any further information the item may stand. Generally speaking the increased cost of the franchise lists is due to the large amount of work that had to be done and the King's Printer reports that the amount is not sufficient under the previous appropriation. The electoral atlas is a book published from time to time containing maps of every constitutency in Canada. As there has been some readjustment of the constituencies, a new edition is necessary, and this vote is for that purpose.

Mr. BERGERON. It will be distributed to members ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, as usual.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that issued yet ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. It is in course of preparation. The other item is a general one owing to the larger amount of work caused by the printing of the voters' lists for the general election. I would like hon. gentlemen to intimate the points on which information is wanted, and I will have it when the item comes again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The only point on which I would like information in connection with this is as to the preparation of the voters' list for the recent election in Edmonton. I made some inquiry with regard to this list from the King's Printer. I received an answer, the exact purport of which I forgot, but I could not very well understand what it meant. He said they were not strictly speaking voters' lists, but lists of electors, prepared, I think, for the information of the enumerators. I want to ask some

questions with reference to that when the matters comes up again.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that information and explanation on that point are prepared.

Further amount required for hydrographic surveys for the River St. Lawrence below Quebec and Pacific coast, $30,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was the amount originally voted, how was it expended, and why do you want this amount more ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There was no vote for this service, because it is a new service undertaken by the department because of the British government having withdrawn their service from both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. These surveys used to be made by the British government, with their own officers and steamers, and they notified us last year that they had ceased that service. Therefore we are obliged to undertake it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much did you have voted for it last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Last year $40,000 was voted for hydrographic surveys, but not for these. What was provided for was the lakes and part of the St. Lawrence. The upper part of the St. Lawrence is almost finished. Two months' work will complete the surveys between Montreal and Quebec, and Lake St. Louis will be finished this season. The surveys on Lake Superior and the other upper lakes will take two or three seasons. On the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast nothing has been done yet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to understand this. The hon. gentleman says the British government has abandoned the work which it was doing. What work was it doing, through whom was it doing it, and why does it abandon it ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The work that has been done by the British government went to a certain point of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, I think only as far as Belle Isle. So we have all the Atlantic coast to survey and to prepare charts for navigation. The present charts are quite unreliable in many respects. For instance, the chart of the River St. Lawrence was so unreliable that it was reported to the department for a couple of years that steamers had touched in the centre of the channel opposite Murray bay. Surveys were made, and for one season we could not discover anything, because the surveys were made not continuously but only occasionally. But towards the end of last season, after a thorough search we discovered a shoal about three-quarters of a mile long where there was only twenty feet of water at low tide. Fortunately the channel is about a mile wide at that point so that it was only once in a while that steamers would touch. Nobody knew anything about it ; it was not marked on the charts. This shows the importance of the service and the importance of having these charts prepared with great care. The British government have abandoned doing this work, as they have abandoned doing many things for Canada, because, they said, we have gone far enough, and this work belongs to Canada. The service falls on our shoulders, and we are obliged to take it up. This $30,000 will provide for the organization of the service until the 1st of July, including boats, provisions, and so on. Every member of the commission will appreciate the importance of having these surveys made with all possible diligence. There are two or three important lines on the Atlantic, especially the Canadian Pacific Railway line, and the navigation is developing very fast. In a couple of years there will probably be large steamers plying between Vancouver and Port Simpson, carrying provisions, materials, &c. There is such a deficiency of charts for the Pacific coast that when the boat which carried the expedition which visited Port Simpson and the North Pacific coast last fall ran on a rock which was never suspected. Fortunately, the captain of the government boat was very careful, and the boat not going very fast at the moment, there was no loss of life and no serious damage to the boat. These surveys are very important in the interest of navigation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How did the British government carry on their surveys ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On the Pacific coast they rented a boat, an old one, but a very good one ; and they had engineers and all the necessary organization to take the soundings, and make a general survey of the bottom of the sea, showing the gulfs, bays, &c., around the coast. They did very good work, which will help us in carrying on our work ; but it will serve only as an indication. The work they have done on the Atlantic coast dates back forty or sixty years. That coast will all have to be resurveyed, and for that purpose we are going to use a boat which we used to have for the tidal service. This year we were short of a boat and we suspended the tidal surveys on the Atlantic coast. We will use the 'Gulnare' which will save the renting of another steamer, and we will try to execute that work regularly and properly. I took over the work last from the Department of Railways and the Department of Public Works. The survey between Montreal and Quebec is almost completed and the work is very nicely done. The charts are being engraved and will be distributed to mariners as is done in every other country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What portions of the coast are these charts for ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The charts which are being engraved are from Montreal to Quebec, except a small portion near Que-

bec which will be completed in about two months. Between Montreal and Kingston will be completed this summer. The work on the Great Lakes commenced two years ago is now well advanced, but it will take at least one year more before we can publish the charts.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom is this work done ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is done under the supervision of Mr. Stewart a highly qualified engineer who has been at the head of the department for the last ten or twelve years.

Mr. BERGERON. Is he an officer of the government ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. He is a graduate of Kingston, and is aided by certain permanent officers as well as by temporary engineers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has he charge of the work on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. Unfortunately one of our best young officers, Mr. Tyrwhitt, died a few days ago, and we must get some one to replace him. It is very peculiar and important work requiring engineers of high qualification.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you propose to re-survey and re-chart the whole of the Atlantic coast ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. So much as concerns the navigation of the St. Lawrence. We do not propose to go further than Belle Isle ; we will take up what has not been done by the British government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand from the minister that the work done by the imperial government fifty years ago along the Atlantic coast required to be resurveyed. Do you include the southern coast of Nova Scotia, the Bay of Fundy, the entrace to St. John Harbour ; do you propose to resurvey and re-chart that ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, everything.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the Marconi station at the entrance to the Gulf in operation ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There are at present six stations in operation and they are rendering the most valuable service. The Glace Bay station was the first established in 1902, in order to test the system and now it is running perfectly. Six stations have been established since I came to the department at an average cost of $8,000 a station, and there are six more to be established.

Mr. BERGERON. Then a vessel coming up the gulf will be reported from station to station.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There will be a complete chain of stations until they get to the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the distance between each station ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The average distance is 200 miles and they communicate between themselves and the steamers.

Mr. BERGERON. Where will the other six stations be built ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Fame Point, Cape Race, Cape Ray, Heath Point, Point Amour, Cape Rich, Whittle Rocks. Of course the stations are not in a straight line because they are situated both on the Belle Isle route and on the Newfoundland route. When the other stations are erected both of the routes to the St. Lawrence will be fully equipped. I can say without boasting that when this station shall have been established, we will have a most perfect Marconi system.

Mr. BERGERON. Then these stations are not all in line ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; there is a map showing where they are established.

Mr. BERGERON. That might be laid on the table.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I will bring it down with pleasure.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend please let us know how he is satisfied with last winter's experiments with the 'Montcalm' ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I can only give that information generally, and from memory. We are perfectly satisfied with the boat's work. It is acknowledged by every one connected with navigation that, with the severe winter, had it not been for the 'Montcalm' breaking the ice at Cape Rouge from early winter, the ice would not had left the channel until the 15th of May, on account of the vast accumulation. It will be remembered that the ice in the gulf delayed steamers for five or six days. The ice was so thick and solid that, had it not been for the work of the 'Montcalm,' the route would not have been cleared until the 10th of May. The 'Montcalm' kept the river clear of ice from Cape Rouge for two or three miles to the piers of the Quebec bridge. It did not prevent the ice from forming at certain points where the river is very narrow, but the keeping of the channel clear alone helped the departure of the ice so much that the 'Montcalm' herself was nearly caught in the spring movement. No accident took place, because the ice-shove was ahead of the steamer and she was following it. The

boat has proved very solid and very effective in every way. I went myself with some of my officers and some people connected with navigation at different times to be present at the work while the steamer was breaking her way through the ice. The last time I was there there were several members of parliament from the west in the party, and they were really astonished at the work done. The boat broke a channel in ice that was twenty-five or thirty feet thick—ice that was stuck to the bottom in some places. I would not say that if I had not witnesses, members of parliament, who saw it as I did. The boat would break as much as 600 feet in a day over a width of 200 feet. Of course, this work was done at a time when the ebb-tide would carry down the ice. The effectiveness of the boat was interfered with by one thing that could not have well been foreseen. She was brought out from Scotland late in the season, arriving in Quebec about the beginning of December. She had two sets of blades. That is, she had two propellers, and she had six extra blades for her propellers. These blades were broken at different times, and, although we ordered a new set, only one set arrived in time to enable her to continue effective work. The day when the members of parliament were aboard she had only one complete propeller, the other one having only one blade. But even with this disadvantage she did the work I have mentioned. After she had got through this work she was ordered to go down and meet the steamers that were supposed to be kept back by the ice. She went down almost to Newfoundland, and there came face to face with an immense field of ice about ten miles long. The 'Montcalm' is fitted with the Marconi system. But, unfortunately, the boats that first arrived were not fitted wih the system, so she could not communicate with and could not give the help they expected from her. Therefore, she returned to Quebec. We wished also to send her down to Seven Islands, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, to make an experiment in maintaing navigation during the winter, but, owing to the circumstances I have explained, this could not be done. The other ice-breaker, the 'Champlain,' though a very much smaller boat, kept navigation open on the ferry route between Murray bay and St. Denis wharf throughout the winter, except for a few hours during particularly stormy days. Altogether our experiments show that navigation throughout the winter is perfectly feasible, even under the most unfavourable circumstances, because last winter was, as everybody knows, a season of extreme severity.

Mr. BERGERON. The 'Montcalm' was in service all winter ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, except for a few days when her propellers were being fitted with new blades.

Mr. PREFONTAINE.

Mr. BERGERON. How many has she in her crew, and what is the expense per day ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The crew numbers forty, and the expense is $150 a day.

Mr. BERGERON. What is done with the steamer in the summer ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. She is on the lighthouse service in the gulf.

Mr. BERGERON. And the minister intends to continue this steamer in this ice-breaking service next winter ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Steamboat inspection—to pay the widow of Douglas Stevens, late inspector of Dominion steamers and fog alarms, a gratuity equal to two months' salary, $250.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I must ask that this item be dropped, to be renewed in the supplementary estimates for 1905-6. There has been a mistake in a calculation, the amount necessary to cover two months' salary of this late officer being $283. The item will be struck out in the meantime.

Marine hospitals—further grant to St. John, New Brunswick, Fernhill cemetery, to provide for the putting in order and for the perpetual care of the seamen's lots, $1,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this something new ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Parliament voted $1,000 for a lot to be known as the 'Seamen's lot' in Fernhill cemetery. It is used for the interment of seamen dying in the marine hospital. The grant was insufficient, and the cemetery is in bad condition. We have made an arrangement with the authorities of the cemetery that this $1,000 will be paid, and they will for ever maintain the cemetery in good condition.

Post Office—compassionate allowance for the family of the late Mr. Patrick Callery, letter-carrier at Montreal, who was accidentally killed whilst on duty, January 25, 1905, the amount to be applied for the benefit of his widow and children in such manner as may be determined by the Treasury Board, $1,000.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General). Patrick Callery, letter-carrier at Montreal, was knocked down and run over by a horse and sleigh while returning home after work. The injuries he received resulted in his death about half an hour after the accident. Mr. Callery was appointed letter-carrier on the 19th of May, 1873. At the time of his death he was in his 61st year, and had been in the service 31 years and 7 months. During that time he was a contributor to the Civil Service Superannuation Fund. He left a widow and two children.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that case well, and I think the government never asked

for a more commendable vote. He was an old servant and a very faithful one.

To complete payments for mail service for year ending June 30, 1905, $100,000.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. About $85,000 of this amount is for the ordinary land service, the increase being due to the general expansion of the service, the increased prices asked for nearly all contracts put up for tender. During the last calendar year 409 new post offices were opened, forty per cent of them in Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and British Columbia. Nearly all those new post offices necessitated new services. Of this amount $15,000 is required for railway mail service, the increase being due to the establishment of new services and greater frequency, placing postal cars on trains where baggage cars had been in use.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount of money voted in the main estimates last year ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. $2,561,700. We require about $100,000 more to complete the payments for the current year. It is entirely the same service, but we are expanding every day now.

To provide for the salary of A. W. Cairns, post office inspector, moved from Winnipeg to the Northwest Territories, at the rate of $2,000 a year from April 1, 1905, $500.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Mr. Cairns, who was assistant post office inspector at Winnipeg, has been appointed post office inspector in the Northwest Territories from the 1st of April last, at a salary of $2,000. That is the minimum salary of the appointment, and the amount of $500 is asked to provide for his salary for the balance of the current year. He has been in the service since March, 1882, and has been assistant post office inspector since the 1st of July, 1885.

Mr. BERGERON. When he was deputy inspector his salary was $1,500, I suppose ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No matter what his salary was in some other office, if he is taken from that and put into another office, the vote made for the first office ceases. This is a vote to the office, not to the man. In his new appointment he is given $2,000 a year.

I wanted to lay upon the table some papers I promised to the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce). I told him I would do so, and I will do so now. But I am afraid I cannot do so, according to the rules of the House, until Mr. Speaker takes the chair.

Mr. BERGERON. They might be laid on the table by any member of the government when the House rises.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I will do it then.

Fisheries protection service—further amount required to provide new boilers and repairs to the hull of fishery protection cruiser 'Petrel,' $17,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The 'Petrel' was taken away from the service of the lakes and was replaced by the 'Vigilant.' The 'Petrel' was too slow a boat, because the American poachers got away from her, and she could not do the service that was necessary. We have sent her to New Brunswick where there was need of a boat for the service of the department. Before sending her down we had her inspected, and it was discovered that her hull was in bad condition, and that new boilers were required.

Mr. BERGERON. Where were these repairs made ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. At Polson's in Toronto, after tenders were asked. She has gone to New Brunswick now.

To pay honorarium to R. N. Venning, chief clerk of the fisheries, for special services in connection with the Russian seizures, as per Order in Council, December 28, 1904, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is this ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Mr. Venning is an old employee of the department, who has been sent out as a special officer in connection with investigations of this character. He was in Paris when the Behring Sea investigation took place and when these commissions have taken place during the last twenty years Mr. Venning has been sent out from the department. He is a very competent officer and we generaly allow him a certain amount.

Further amount required for salaries and disbursements of fishery inspectors, overseers and guardians, $20,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if the government have given a license to any party or parties to fish in Moose Lake, or if any application has been received by the department for the exclusive privilege.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I think there has been an application received for fishing rights in Moose Lake but it has not been entertained.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In other words the department do not mean to grant the application ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The reason I ask that is that I am informed that an application has been made and that the parties have stated that they are going to receive the exclusive privilege. I am glad to hear such a license is not to be granted. I might ask the hon. minister if he is in receipt of any protest from parties in regard to the closing of Lake Manitoba ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, I have received quite a number of protests against the closing of Lake Manitoba but after going into the question thoroughly I have considered that I acted rightly and in accordance with the wishes of the people in deciding that this lake should be closed to summer fishing for a few seasons.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What they complain of particularly is that there was no notice given to the smaller fishermen in advance. And that they have therefore suffered a hardship.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think they could plead ignorance. The matter was before the department for quite a while. As far back as last fall there was an agitation to close the lake for summer fishing. There were petitions in favour of it and counter petitions. Of course, we did not know what position we would take, and it was not until January that I had an opportunity of taking up the question of considering it and deciding it on its merits. At that time, of course, we all supposed that the people round there would know about it. The only serious complaint we received was from a gentleman named Macauley, I think. I do not remember the name now. He complained that he had filled his ice house and was prepared to go on with fishing in the spring. We looked into that case, but we did not consider that the gentleman was justified in doing what he had done. He only had a one-year's license, because these licenses were issued every year, and a man with only a license for one year is scarcely justified in going to a large expense without inquiring whether the lake is going to be kept open or closed.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand that there were some protests received from citizens of Portage la Prairie. When I visited the province of Manitoba two or three weeks ago I heard that citizens of Portage la Prairie had sent in strong protests to the minister against the closing of the lake. It appears that there is a short line of railway from Portage la Prairie to this lake which is largely used for excursion purposes and as a resort for the people of Portage la Prairie; they intend deepening the harbour there, and I think the government were about to grant, if it is not already granted, a sum for dredging to be done for that purpose. They claim that if fishing is done away with it will practically render the harbour useless to them and will result very detrimentally to the citizens there as well as to this railway. That is the principal reason advanced, but besides that a great many people take issue with those who claim that it is necessary for the protection of the fish to have a close season. As to that point I am not in a position to judge. But many people who live in Portage la Prairie claim that there is no likelihood of the lake being depleted of fish by keeping it open at the present time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I went thoroughly into the question. I do not say that I am an expert, but from the officials I gather that there was only one salvation for the lake and it was to close it to summer fishing for two or three years. The lake is being depleted very fast. If these gentlemen that my hon. friend mentions have gone into an enterprise which depends on this class of fishing in that lake during the summer we could not render them a better service than by closing it for two or three summers so as to put the lake in the condition it was in former years. It is in a very bad condition at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is it necessary to have this additional sum placed in the supplementary estimates? Why was it not placed in the original estimates?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is found that $85,000 for salaries is not adequate to meet the expenditure. In 1896 and 1897 the appropriation was reduced from $100,000 to $85,000. At the time negotiations were between the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the Dominion government as to certain jurisdiction an amount was placed in the estimates without being in a position to determine as to the amount required. Last year a similar amount of $20,000 was placed in the supplementary estimates, bringing the total up to $105,000. Since 1896 it has been the practice to vote in the main estimates only $85,000 leaving always a further sum to be voted in the supplementary estimates. I think that is bad policy. We should ask for what is necessary and my intention in future is to ask for exactly the amount that is necessary and not leave any back account. We will place the right amount in the main estimates in the next financial year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should like to make an observation as to the work done by many of these overseers, although as I am informed, a great many of them do no work at all. These men are supposed to prevent poaching, but in a great many cases, as men who are familiar with the facts inform me, they really do nothing. They do not pretend to do anything. It is a mere sinecure from which they enjoy a small salary and travelling expenses. One of these overseers, for instance, simply takes his own horse and wagon, drives around and charges up his alleged travelling expenses. That is the explanation which was given to me in this House about three years ago. That is not desirable. There is work that these men ought to be doing throughout the country. The laws regarding the observance of the fishery regulations are not observed. Public opinion is against their observance in some localities.

The men who ought to be protecting the fisheries and enforcing the observance of the law are looking on, practically conniving and paying no attention to their duties, taking good care never to be on hand when the laws are being broken. Representations have been made to me from various parts of the maritime provinces in regard to this, and I think the minister should take the matter up and see that men are appointed who will, whether it be popular or not, enforce the law. One man in my late constituency of Halifax, a most excellent officer, who went about on all occasions in the performance of his duty and did his duty fearlessly and well was dismissed and after his dismissal offered to continue in office without any salary, travelling expenses or indemnity whatever, simply because he took an interest in the preservation of the fish. I am sure he was supported in the position he took by every one who knew him in the country and who had any interest whatever in the preservation of the law. However, he happened to be in the habit of voting for the Conservative candidate, and it was thought better to put him to one side, although he was an excellent and fearless officer and to appoint some one who simply shut his eyes and winked at violations of the law. In some localities in the maritime provinces, the law is being violated by the friends and neighbours of the officers, they know it is being violated and take no steps to prevent it. Public money paid out under these circumstances for this purpose is worse than absolutely wasted and I would like to know from the minister whether or not he has heard anything of these circumstances, whether he is cognizant of them. There is no doubt about the accuracy of the information. The whole administration of this law seems to be a farce. Men are paid a small salary and very considerable sums for supposed travelling expenses which simply means remuneration to them for the employment of their own horse and carriage. Then they wink at the violation of the law. I have not time for sport of this kind myself and I do not know these things personally, but I am told by men who take an interest in the matter that the law is openly violated. We should not proceed in that way, but either give up any appearance of attempting to enforce the law or put men in these positions at a reasonable salary who will see that the law is carried out. One or the other course ought to be adopted. I am sure the minister will agree.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I agree as to the breach of the law and regulation but we have such a vast territory that with all the good will in the world it is almost impossible under the present circumstances to have these regulations and laws followed up to the letter. I have had complaints and have tried as much as possible to remedy the complaints in every case. As regards the special case mentioned by the hon. gentleman I may tell him he may rest assured that I would never discharge a good officer for such a reason as he has mentioned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope not; this was long before the hon. gentleman's time.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Good officers are too difficult to secure and maintain in office. When they do their duty I certainly would not countenance any complaint made against officers who would follow the letter of the law and be rather severe. If the hon. gentleman were in my place he would find it very difficult to have the regulations followed as they should be followed. People will try to evade the regulations. We have the lobster regulations which provide that lobsters of a certain size must not be taken. Well, unless we had an overseer or inspector on every fishing boat it is almost impossible to detect frauds or the offences that are committed. In order to avoid the taking of seed lobsters what had we to do last year? We made an experiment which has proved very satisfactory. We offered to establish ponds where the seed lobsters would be deposited and we would purchase them. We succeeded in that way last year in saving over 500,000 seed lobsters. Probably out of this 500,000, 250,000, a quarter of a million, would have been sacrificed. This goes to show how difficult it is to have these laws followed, but I am sure that the service is not worse, than it was before and I should think that it was better. We have tried to organize it on the best footing possible and I am not going to give up the work until I am satisfied that proper protection is given to such a great industry as our fisheries. If any suggestions are made as regards improvements in inspecting and better protecting the fisheries I am ready to accept them from whatever side they come; it makes no difference to me, I am ready to do what is in the public interest in this matter because I think there is no politics whatever, it is purely and simply a question of public interest that is at stake.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One association in the maritime provinces, I think, has made a suggestion to the minister that if he would accept their recommendation with respect to the appointment of an overseer they would undertake to assist in every way in the enforcement of the law, and they believe the law can be enforced. The difficulty is that men are appointed in that particular locality who do not pretend to attempt to enforce the law but simply regard the appointment as a mere sinecure bringing them $25, $50 or $100 a year and who make no effort whatever, as every one knows, to enforce the law. These people who are interested in the presenvation of the fish say that if the minister will accept their recommendation they will endeavour to secure and recommend a

fearless man who could be expected to carry out what he undertakes and if such a man is selected all the members of this association interested as they are in the preservation of the fisheries will join and give their support to that man and in that way certainly enforce the law very much better than it is enforced at present.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not know of the organization to which the hon. gentleman alludes, but I know of an organization in New Brunswick from whom I have accepted all suggestions of that kind willingly and with the greatest pleasure and I have acted upon them. There is a great complaint of some people who do not want these rules to be applied as they should be applied, and if such an association puts itself into communication with the department I am quite sure they will accept the suggestion. I think they have already done so. If not, I shall be glad to give the name of the president or some of the officers to the hon. gentleman or some of his officials.

Further amount required for the building and maintenance of fish-breeding establishments, $10,000.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I believe the hon. minister informed the House some time ago that it was his intention to establish more fish hatcheries on lake Winnipeg. The hon. gentleman, I believe, was in receipt of a board of trade resolution or a series of resolutions from the town of Selkirk some time in the early part of this year, in which they complained of the manner in which the hatchery at the town of Selkirk was being operated, and also made some suggestions in regard to increasing the hatcheries on that lake. One of the clauses of the resolution reads :

The said hatchery has never hitherto been made use of to more than a small fraction of its capacity, due chiefly to the imperfect means used for procuring the whitefish ova, past experience having shown that attempts to procure ova for this hatchery by means of gill nets have been almost if not absolutely failures, and it is desirable to make use of some better and more certain method of procuring the said ova.

They go on to make further suggestions : First, that the hatchery at Selkirk be operated to its full capacity, secondly, that additional hatcheries be established at Berin's river or Big Black river or at some other convenient location on the east shore of Lake Winnipeg ; and, third, that a full equipment of pound-nets be provided to procure an ample quantity of whitefish was to supply the hatcheries to their fullest capacity. I would ask the hon. minister if he has responded to this resolution by establishing additional hatcheries, improving the method of securing the ova, and making arrangements to operate the hatchery at Selkirk at its fullest capacity ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may say that I sent out Mr. Cunningham, the inspector, to Manitoba and British Columbia during the last few months. He returned about a month ago, and has made certain recommendations in the sense which the hon. gentleman has mentioned. He has recommended the establishment of another hatchery in the lakes of Manitoba, besides the enlargement of the one at Selkirk. I think all these matters will be settled in time. Of course, I cannot go faster than the money is voted. I have exceeded the vote of last year by $10,000 owing to some pressing work in British Columbia, which was done so quickly that the money is due before the 1st of July, and it gives my officer a chance of going elsewhere. I am perfectly alive to the situation in the west as regards improvements in hatcheries, and if I had the money available, I would give speedy satisfaction to the people there.

Further amount required to pay persons employed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries for services in connection with the distribution of the fishing bounty, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $600.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the meaning of this ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Every year there is a certain amount voted to pay those who make out the cheques for the distribution of the fishing bounty. It is never certain whether the expenditure will exceed the amount voted. This year it exceeded the amount by $600. There are about thirty girls employed doing this work in the winter.

Lighthouse and coast service—further amount required for maintenance and repairs to lighthouses, $75,000.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I need not say that it is the desire of the department to efficiently maintain these aids to navigation. The appropriations which have been granted in the past have not been entirely sufficient, owing to the fact of the rapid increase in the number of aids to navigation, and the further fact that many of the lighthouses were without the required repairs. An additional amount is asked to place the system in an efficient state of repair, and when granted the ordinary vote should be sufficient to maintain it in proper shape. The department has never been able to catch up with the repairs which have been required, and it is deemed in the interests of the service to take steps at once to carry these out and to bring the different lighthouses up to a state of efficiency. In order to avoid as much as possible the heavy repairs which have been necessitated in the past, the department is more and more building permanent piers of steel and concrete rather than structures of wood as formerly. The first cost of

these is of course larger, but money is saved in the greater length of life. It is desired to minimize as much as possible the maintenance vote, and, as intimated above, the department is taking every possible step to carry this out. The introduction of steel skeleton towers has been a feature in recent construction by the department and the substitution of concrete piers for aids formerly built of timber. The total number of light stations, lightships, and fog alarms in the Dominion on June 30, 1904, was 796 and lights shown 9,996; the number of steam whistles, fog horns, bells and guns, 99; the number of lighthouses, 783. The increase in the number of aids to navigation in recent years rendered it desirable to increase the facilities for their proper inspection and operation. The large increase in the tonnage and size of the vessels on the great lakes necessitates a closer supervision and more frequent inspection than has obtained heretofore. Also the extended coast line of Canada, rivers, harbours and other navigable waters, require a large number of buoys. Annually the number of buoys have been increased, but in the past year the increase has been larger than in any previous year, causing a correspondingly larger expenditure. The cost of the buoy service alone last year, which was charged to maintenance, was $125,000. I beg to refer you to the report of the department, page 3, which gives an interesting report of the lighthouse service. A large number of lighthouses were built soon after confederation and extensive repairs are now required in order to put them in good condition. A number are in such shape that practically new towers will require to be built, and, as it is important that the lighthouses should be kept up to the highest standard, this cannot be accomplished without the expenditure of money. I am personnally aware of the representations that were made in years gone by as regards this service. I remember that when I belonged to the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, delegations came year after year asking for improvements in this respect. At that time the steamers navigating the St. Lawrence were not at all what they are now; the aids to navigation which were sufficient ten years ago have now become obsolete; and not only have they to be replaced as rapidly as possible but more quickly than we can do it, because the steamers are increasing in size in greater proportion than our improvements. Under these circumstances, I think this is money well spent in the interests of the country, and it will yield its return in proper time. I think everybody is convinced of the necessity of these improvements.

Mr. BARKER. The minister has been addressing himself, I think, to several of the sub-items. As regards the vote for the maintenance and repairs of lighthouses, will he tell us what the previous amount was that was voted for that purpose for the year 1904-5.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $500,000.

Mr. BARKER. It would be convenient if the amount voted in the main estimates for a particular service were put in a separate column alongside each supplementary item. It is most extraordinary that in a well managed department there should be $75,000 out in the estimate of money required for a year's repairs. This is not a question of building additional lighthouses; it is simply to repair existing structures.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is impossible to say in advance how much it will cost to keep these aids to navigation in proper condition for you never can know what damage will be done by ice and so on. If we were to allow three months of fine weather to elapse without doing necessary repairs the steamship companies would complain bitterly and with reason that the country was not doing its duty in this respect. We have decided to maintain these aids to navigation in the best possible condition in order to satisfy the shipping federation. It might be interesting to give the committee information as regards the beneficial effect of these improvements on the commerce and navigation of the St. Lawrence route. I have information here which it is just as well should not be made public with reference to that matter, but people generally do not know that the St. Lawrence route is a more expensive route than the route to the Atlantic ports of the United States. I have a letter from Sir George E. Drummond, who imports large cargoes of raw sugar every year. Every one admits the patriotism of Sir George Drummond, and we know that he would rather take his trade to the St. Lawrence than elsewhere, but sometimes as a matter of business and under certain circumstances he is obliged to import via Boston and Portland where the cost is from 25 to 30 per cent lower than via the St. Lawrence. I do not wish to dwell on this or to go into exact details which might be detrimental to the St. Lawrence route, but it is well known to all business men that the insurance rates to the St. Lawrence are from 25 to 50 per cent higher than to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Newport News, Norfolk and other United States ports. Even with the comparatively small work we have done in the last few years, I am glad to say that last year the insurance rates were reduced by 20 per cent on first-class risks and that reduction is of great advantage to Canadian trade. Mr. R. Wilson-Smith, of Montreal, who publishes a

financial journal estimates that the total amount of marine insurance on the St. Lawrence route per year is $400,000,000, hull and cargo included, and the premium paid on that is $3,500,000 no difference being made between Montreal and Quebec. The rates on the St. Lawrence are from 35 to 50 per cent higher according to the season than the rates to United States Atlantic ports. The Allan Line, Dominion Line, Reford steamers, and Canadan Pacific Railway line are all rated as first class; the Manchester and Furness lines, second class, and tramp and outside steamers are included in the third class. The reduction of 20 per cent in the rate made in 1904 is quite a gain to the trade of the country as you will see by estimating it on the total premium paid. If we had the St. Lawrence route in such condition that it would compare with any of these United States ports I have mentioned in the rarity of accidents, and if the rates were reduced 30 per cent of 50 per cent in all—the 50 per cent excess rate only applies to tramp boats and steamers of the third class—the fifty per cent reduction would mean for one season of navigation $1,500,000 according to these figures given to me by this expert, and thus the saving effected in five years after the improved system had been completed would represent a very enormous sum of money indeed.

The boards of trade of Quebec, Montreal, Halifax and St. John have all been making representations to the department, and not only have they been making representations, but they have approved of what we have done. I will not repeat here the resolutions of congratulation to the department and the government that have been passed by these bodies. This is certainly the most important question that comes before parliament. If we spend a great deal of money in establishing these Marconi stations, in putting in sub-marine bells and fog alarm systems, in trebling or quadrupling the capacity of the lights and adding to their number—if we do all we can to make accidents impossible, unless pilots or masters will run their boats ashore for the fun of it or through gross negligence, it stands to reason that the whole country will benefit. This is not a question of politics or of government policy, as between one party or another, for everybody agrees on this subject. The conditions must be met, and met as rapidly as possible. And even with our greatest progress, we shall not be able to keep up with the increased size of the steamers on the route. We have already two immense steamers, the 'Virginian' and the 'Victorian.' The Canadian Pacific Railway has given a contract for two others of even larger size. The tendency is constantly to increase the size of vessels. Let us give the greatest protection to them that we can. Money spent in that way will receive the approbation of every one, even of those who are not interested in navigation. This is not a new idea by any means. Before I had the honour of occupying my present position I was connected with navigation in an indirect way as harbour commissioner of Montreal for four years. I took a great interest in those matters and mixed with people connected with navigation, and I knew that whatever was wisely done to improve the navigation on this route would receive the approval of business men, whether they are directly connected with navigation or not.

Mr. BARKER. I did not raise any question as to additional aids to navigation. I was not discussing that, nor did I expect the minister to explain it. The item concerning which I asked an explanation was the first item—maintenance and repairs of existing lighthouses. The hon. gentleman received last year a grant of $500,000 for the year's repairs. Apparently he has expended $575,000. That was money required to repair existing structures. With any proper care on the part of the officers he ought to have been able to judge more closely than he seems able to do what he needed for repairs, for $575,000 is a considerable sum to expend in one year for repairs beyond what he called for originally.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. This is for maintenance also.

Mr. BARKER. Maintenance is a part of repairs. This is for maintaining existing buildings, I take it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No; maintenance includes supplies for the different services.

Mr. BARKER. Supplies in the way of oil, and so on?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Then that seems to be rather worse. I suppose the department ought to know very closely how much will be required for supplies for existing lighthouses for the year. There seems less excuse for being $75,000 out than if repairs were the only item. I simply point out that there must be a great deal of looseness in the estimates, when the hon. minister is $75,000 out in an item of this kind. I think it requires some explanation of how the error was made. There would have been no objection, I take it, last year to grant the hon. gentleman $575,000 or $600,000 if he had said he needed it. But he told us he only wanted $500,000, and that was given. Now, he has spent $75,000 more than the House authorized.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. There is an item which the hon. gentleman loses sight of. I made allusion to it in the beginning of my remarks, but I suppose that I did not make myself clear. Take, for instance, the buoys. Some of these cost a good deal of money, and they are sometimes broken, destroyed,

or even carried away by the ice. Sometimes we are obliged to abandon some of these aids to navigation, because it is too late to take them away. There is a tendency, as hon. gentlemen are well aware, to keep navigation open as late as possible in the fall, and so it often happens that it is too late to recover the property.

Mr. BARKER. Is not that sort of thing covered in the third item ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No ; that was for a special locality, as I will explain in a moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I cannot understand is why it is that, within a month of the close of the fiscal year, the hon. minister should be asking for $581,810 for the construction of lighthouses and aids to navigation. Is it possible to expend all that sum within five weeks ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I may say that the progamme of improvements laid out by the department for the present fiscal year has been carried out much more quickly than we had reason to anticipate when the vote for 1904-5 was passed last session, and the department was then under the necessity of suspending urgent improvements required for the great national waterway or carrying out the same and obtaining the necessary allowance in these supplementary estimates. I have here a number of resolutions from the Shipping Federation of Montreal and the Montreal Board of Trade, in which the efforts which the department has made are approved, and stress is laid on the necessity of continuing the same. I may say that the programme is as follows :

1st. To improve our existing fog-alarms, and bring them up to as high a standard as any in the world.

2nd. To improve the coast lights in the Gulf and River St. Lawrence and on the Atlantic sea-board by the substitution of modern dioptric quick-flashing apparatus for the inferior apparatus installed.

3rd. To improve our buoyage system by the substitution of lighted for non-lighted buoys, on the principle that if a buoy is required for day navigation, a lighted buoy is required for service at night. On the sea coast it is our endeavour to light ' outside the danger,' which is the proper scientific principle.

4th. To improve the pilotage system of the Dominion.

5th. To install Marconi and submarine signal systems, at the same time that we are carrying out and bringing up our existing aids to navigation to a high standard second to none in the world, we are endeavouring to meet the needs of the growing trade of the country by building new lighthouses, new fog alarms, and placing more buoys.

This amount, $581,500, is in the way of being spent by 1st July and will complete the work that has been undertaken. It is impossible in advance to say what the reconstruction of a lighthouse will cost. Some of them are in very remote places, and we have taken in hand those that are most remote, those in the gulf first. Some of them which were estimated to cost $5,000 have cost as much as $11,000, when done by days work, and under great difficulty. I have here a list of those improvements which are being executed, and which will be finished by the 1st of July, at various points in Quebec, Nova Scotia and Ontario, amounting to $65,000, things that have to be completed. It is no use to bring back our men and leave this work half finished. All these things have to be done in order to satisfy the shipping people. Although all these expenditures were not authorized, they were all contemplated, so there is no misrepresentation. The work has been done, it is there and it renders it possible for navigation to open a little earlier than would have been the case if we had suspended the work.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand that this $581,500 has been an over expenditure ; and that is additional to the amount we voted last year.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It was contemplated that this amount would have been voted sooner. When we brought in the main estimates we did not suppose that we should go so far in the season with the expenditure, or that we should have to ask for supplementaries now. As I have explained, expenditure has gone on faster than we anticipated, and we did not want to lose time in making these improvements. They had to be made, these works undertaken had to be completed. I think we have followed a good policy in executing these works as we have done. I must say that we have been asked to do a great deal more than we have done, and we are asked to do a great deal more in future, but that which has been done will remain of permanent advantage, and will be of great benefit to the marine interest.

Mr. LENNOX. What is the amount that was voted last year ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. $852,000.

Mr. LENNOX. And we have to expend in addition $581,500.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Now the minister has a very charming manner, and it is very hard to complain when he fails to answer exactly the questions that are put to him. He has been asked twice at least whether we are to expend this $581,000, or whether it has already been expended ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been partly expended, about fifty per cent has been expended.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what we wanted to know. Last year we voted $852,000, and now we are asked to vote an additional $581,000. Already, without asking the leave

of parliament, one-half of that amount at least has been expended. Now we are not inquiring whether there has been a wise expenditure; but surely if we are to have parliamentary government at all, if we are to adhere to the system of voting moneys before they are expended, we must come a little closer to that condition of things than we are in the minister's estimates. I do not see how the minister can justify taking first $800,000, and then expending an additional $581,000 in advance within the current year. He should know, he should anticipate the requirements, and know how much the country can afford to expend upon this matter much more closely than he has done. I venture to say it is not a good system of parliamentary government for the minister to allow this condition of things to arise, it is not a thing that ought to be tolerated without very severe comment by an opposition. It is an extraordinary request to ask parliament to sanction an expenditure of public money if we are to have a great deal more than one-half the original amount, probably seventy-five per cent, added to the previous vote. I think the minister will see himself, the necessity of adopting a different system in the future. Let him take parliament into his confidence, let us understand what is contemplated, because it is very difficult to believe that the minister could not have foreseen a great deal of this expenditure a year ago. We want the hon. minister to promise to do better in future.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They shoved me into this a little against my will. I understand that under ordinary circumstances this is not the policy that should be followed, but I do not know how in this case it would have been possible to have done otherwise. If we had not gone on with this expenditure of $581,000 it might have been increased to $700,000 or $800,000 next summer on account of suspending the work and beginning it over again.

To provide for repairs to lighthouse, steamer 'Scout' and for expenses on buoy service, $21,000.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would kindly give us some information in regard to what the government propose to do in improving the communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I understand that a delegation has waited on the government within the last few days and another delegation was here about a month previously. I would like to know if it is proposed to add a third steamer in order to test if it is possible to fulfil the terms of confederation by building a new and more powerful steamer than they have provided at the present time and also if surveys are to be made this summer in regard to a tunnel.

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I understand that at the present moment there is a delegation here making representations to the government on this question. The question as presented to these gentlemen involves an expenditure of about $10,000,000 if the scheme of the tunnel were to be accepted. As regards a temporary scheme or the addition of another boat it will be considered at the same time as the other question. I am not in a position as one of the members of the cabinet to make any declaration today on this matter. There is no doubt, if anything can be done to improve the service, the disposition of the government is to do it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In 1900 the sum of $30,000 a year was granted in perpetuity in the province for the non-fulfilment of the terms of confederation. Perhaps the hon. minister can tell us whether any claim has been made by this delegation for the period between 1900 and the present time and what the government propose to do in regard to it.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The matter is under consideration and I am not in a position to make a declaration now.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Finance. I asked for the papers in regard to this matter some time ago and it was promised that they would be brought down. The hon. Minister of Finance made a certain statement in this House. That statement is contradicted by members of the local government who are in sympathy with the minister and with the government which is here at the present time. I asked for the correspondence which has not been brought down and I would like to know if I will get it in the near future.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember if my hon. friend's motion for the papers was passed or not. But if the papers are brought down I think they will prove the accuracy of what I said. As far as the claims made by the local government are concerned I must do these gentlemen the justice of saying that they are claiming everything in sight. There has been no lack of claim on their part. If everything is not arranged as they wish it will not be from any want of claiming on their part.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Perhaps the hon. minister has raised their expectations a little too high previous to some election or something of that kind, and I suppose that if he has done that he will be responsible for it, but at any rate the province is only claiming what every one admits is fair and equitable. But the papers, I think, will settle the matter, and it is very important while these delegates are here that we should have these papers. I asked for them over a month ago. The statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance is completely contradicted by mem-

bers of the local government and by the premier of the province. If the hon. minister is correct then the leading member of the delegation that waited on the government a few days ago is incorrect in the statement which he made in the legislature.

Mr. FIELDING. My statement I do not think is contradicted because it was made on the basis of an Act of this parliament and the Act speaks for itself. That cannot be contradicted, the document is there and I do not think it is open to debate. Did the hon. gentleman's motion for papers pass the House?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. If the motion has passed and the papers have not been brought down I will make it my business to inquire because if they have not been brought down they ought to be brought down.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Would it be possible for the hon. Minister of Finance to say whether a third boat is to be provided for this year and placed on the route? Of course it is all very nice now, but another winter is coming and in view of our experience last year and many others, I hope the government will not leave it to the last minute but will provide the necessary amount without delay.

Mr. FIELDING. That is one of the matters which the delegation has pressed upon the government and it is now under the consideration of council. If it is to be dealt with it will have to be in the supplementary estimates for the coming year which have not yet been laid before the House.

To pay expenses incurred in extending navigation till December 15, 1904, maintaining all necessary lights and fog alarms in operation, keeping the harbours at Fort William and Port Arthur open, removing keepers after the above date, $15,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was this attempt successful?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Very successful. The quantity of wheat which was in store at Port Arthur and Fort William was larger by many millions of bushels than at the close of navigation in the previous year and by keeping navigation open in that way the grain people interested in the transportation of grain caught up to the previous year.

Mr. LENNOX. When was this first thought of? Is it a matter that can be anticipated, or has it to be provided for by a supplementary vote every year?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It depends on the season. In some seasons navigation closes earlier than in others, but last year it closed earlier than in the former season.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a certain time at which navigation closes and this was carried on after the ordinary time?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes, on account of the shortness of storage at Fort William.

Mr. LENNOX. Therefore, it is a thing that has to be thought of from time to time as necessity arises?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

THESSALON, ONT., POSTMASTER.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM MULOCK (Postmaster General) moved for leave to lay on the table of the House certain papers connected with the affairs of the Thessalon post office. He said: In connection with this motion, I would crave the privilege of the House to make a few very brief observations. When this matter was before the House some days ago I had not the papers before me, and was not aware they would be referred to by the hon. gentleman who made the motion. I could, therefore, speak only in general terms. Since then I have perused these papers, and would state precisely my connection with the matter and the circumstances under which I acted. In May, 1904, in the ordinary course of my duties, I found upon my table the report of the inspector for that month reporting irregularities at the Thessalon post office. I considered the statements sufficient to warrant an order for the dismissal of the postmaster, and so directed; and, in the ordinary course, the report, with my authority or direction upon it, went out to the department to be treated in the ordinary way. One or two communications came to the office during that interval. One is a letter from the postmaster himself, wherein he explains that the shortage was not caused by himself, but by his assistant. Another communication was a private communication from the daughter of the postmaster, wherein she herself states that she is responsible for the trouble that had been brought upon her father. While the matter remained in that position, the postmaster having resigned and the present member for Algoma having been called upon to make a recommendation of a successor, he did not do so, having his reasons for it, doubtless, one of them being, as he says in one letter to me, that he did not wish to have to fill the vacancy on the eve of a general election. That seems to be his idea, but he had no acquiescence or authority from the department to do more than make his nomination. The matter did not come before me in any way until in the following month of February of this year. Then, on the opening of this parliament, the member for East Algoma stated to me that I had reached an unjust decision in dismissing the postmaster, and asked me to review the circumstances. I called upon the department to lay before me all the papers, and they then laid before me some papers, and then, for the first time, I had before me the report of the month of April from the same inspector. The report

upon which I acted was the report of May, 1904. In that report the inspector threw the responsibility upon the postmaster, but in the report for April, which then, for the first time, was laid before me, the inspector did not throw responsibility upon the postmaster. In the report of April the inspector found a shortage of some $500, and that forms part of the shortage no doubt that he again referred to in May. But in dealing with the shortage in April the inspector, referring to the postmaster, said :

He admitted that heretofore he had entrusted the verifying of the stamps and the postal notes wholly to his daughter and accepted the figures she gave him as correct. His supervision of the accounts being chiefly in seeing that the debit and credit accounts were correctly made up and the remittances sent to the bank as required by the regulations.

Further on, he again says, speaking of the whole matter :

I observed when in Thessalon that several members of the postmaster's family are allowed access to the office and there is not the care taken of the office that I considered necessary at an office like Thessalon. I am satisfied the postmaster's statement is absolutely correct, and that he has never used any post office funds and there is no reason to believe the daughter has done so either.

I say this report of the month of April, dealing with part of the shortage, inasmuch as it did not throw any moral blame on the officers, was put on the files in the ordinary way ; I suppose the authorities of the department not considering it important, and it was not called to my attention. Whatever be the reason, that report was not before me until I called for all the papers connected with the history of this affair, and in February last this report came to me, and when I found that the inspector, the same officer, in the month of April, in dealing with part of this shortage, had stated :

I am satisfied that the postmaster's statement is absolutely correct and that he never used any post office funds and there is no reason to believe the daughter has done so either.

I felt I could not accept his judgment in a case of this kind, and accordingly I gave the postmaster the benefit of whatever doubt there was and directed his re-instatement. In the next report of May, 1904, he added that the daughter was in feeble health and suffering from some internal malady that was likely to involve some serious operation. All those circumstances weighed with me, and when I reviewed the case in February of this year I felt no good purpose would be served, and I did not think public opinion would call upon me to give further publicity to the affair, and I felt a desire to throw a veil of charity over what I supposed to be some shortage or infirmity on the part of the officer really responsible, and for that reason I did not desire to give publicity to the circumstances, inasmuch as the postmaster himself had made good the shortage, and, so far as I knew, had borne an unblemished character, was a man in good standing, and had been for over twenty years in the service of the government, and there never had been a charge of anything against him during his long period as a trustee of public funds. Whether I was justified or not in fact, I had ample precedent for it. If I were to enumerate to this House the many instances that I find on record wherein my predecessors—not one minister alone, but going back for years, many ministers, have taken a charitable view of cases presenting features which, on the surface, would call for apparently the severest treatment—I say if I were to recite to this House instances of this kind, it would be found that I was not the first Postmaster General that had exercised a discretion of this nature in favour of the persons in office.

I would be perfectly willing, if any one desired, to discuss the record of previous ministers. If it was considered just to postmasters to have been forgiven by previous ministers, I think I would have more than justification for what I have done in this particular case. I would not consider it a justification. Each case must be considered on its merits, and no person can sit in judgment satisfactorily upon another who in cases of this kind exercises a discretion which may at the time seem to him right, but which may perhaps not stand the absolute criticism of those who demand nothing but hard and harsh justice. Accordingly I recommended the reinstatement of this postmaster. He told me first of all in a letter marked confidential that the fault lay with his daughter, and the daughter said that the fault lay with herself. It may have been true ; I do not know whether it was or not. The inspector who in one month declared the postmaster guilty, had said in the previous month that he had not touched those funds. The hon. leader of the opposition thought there should be an inquiry. Perhaps he was right. I am not prepared to challenge the correctness of that view. I would not have laid these papers on the table but that the discussions which took place practically defeated the object I had when I reinstated the postmaster and did not direct any further inquiry. I thought that the trouble was in that family, and that there was no good purpose to be served after the public funds were restored, by my taking proceedings to find out whether or not the daughter was really the guilty party. Accordingly the matter rested as it did, and but for the publicity apparently given to the action of either the daughter or the father, I would not even now have taken the course which I have taken. But since my object was defeated by the discussion in this House, I decided that I would then do what the leader of the opposition said ought to have been done at an earlier date, and I directed that the matter be inquired into by the chief super-

intendent of the Post Office Department, Mr. Ross, and some other inspector along with him. Mr. Ross is at present in Winnipeg, and on his way back from Winnipeg he will with some other inspector make an investigation, and see where the fault lay.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE. Mr. Speaker, I was desirous of further discussing this matter with the hon. gentleman before the House, and this morning gave him notice of my intention to mention the matter in the House this afternoon. But it stood over, and I had not any idea that the hon. gentleman would bring the matter up at this late hour of the night. I would ask whether it would be possible to leave the matter open for discussion at some subsequent time ? I cannot reconcile, so far as I have heard them, the remarks which the hon. gentleman has made and the explanations which he has tendered, with the facts as they exist to my knowledge out of the reports on file and in the reports on file; and the hon. gentleman's former statements and some of the statements he has made to-night are absolutely irreconcilable. If what remarks I have to offer to the House have to be made now, it will be at some considerable inconvenience ; and I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that an arrangement be made so that this matter, which I am anxious indeed to lay before the House, can be fully discussed later on upon the papers which are brought down. While on my feet, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that he has not brought down all the papers on the file. I have looked over the papers which he has brought down, and there are a number of very important letters which are not among them. There are memoranda having a very important bearing upon the financial transactions involved, which are on the file and in respect of which no privilege can be claimed, but which the hon. gentleman has not brought down ; and there are specific documents which I asked for in the House, and of which I gave the Prime Minister a memorandum, none of which are included in the return. I refer to the very important documents called salary warrants, which must show, and I think do show, that no excuse can be made such as is offered now, that the postmaster thought he was dealing with funds due to him out of salary warrants. The statement also, for which I asked, and of which I gave a memorandum to the Prime Minister, as to the amount paid to the postmaster for six months preceding the 19th of May, 1904, is not brought down. Then I would ask that an opportunity be afforded me of further mentioning this matter when all the papers are down and when the hon. the Postmaster General is in his place ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman will have every opportunity to discuss any question affecting the public service on any day that a motion is made to go into Committee of Supply. He cannot be deprived of that right. As to the hon. gentleman's statement that I have made some statements which vary from the papers produced, if he will be good enough to state what he refers to, I might address myself to that point.

Mr. BOYCE. I was hoping that the hon. gentleman would have brought down all the papers, so that the discussion could have been directed to the subject with all the papers before the House. It will be futile for me to continue the discussion now, with only probably one-half the papers before the House. I am quite ready to discuss the matter with the papers that have been brought down. I think possibly I can point out to the hon. gentleman some defects or inconsistencies in the statements which he has made now as contrasted with those which he made when the matter was first mentioned in the House. But I should like to have an opportunity of mentioning the matter later on when the hon. gentleman is in his place in the House.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The hon. gentleman knows quite well that there will not possibly be an opportunity of discussing the matter again for some time when I shall be here.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman not be here on Tuesday ?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. No, I am leaving town to-morrow night. I may be in town again next week, but I am not sure of my movements after to-day. I am not aware of any papers on file which have not been brought down. I did not arrange or review the papers. The instructions were to produce the papers, and I am surprised if any of the papers on file are not produced. I do not claim any privilege ; on the contrary, I am most pleased to furnish any papers connected with the matter, and therefore I am surprised to hear that any papers having any bearing on the subject are not brought down. The other day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) stated that some payments were made to the postmaster after his dismissal. On that point he had superior knowledge, because he had been examining the papers with a view to discussing them and I had not seen them for many months. I said in a general way that I thought it impossible that moneys had been paid to the postmaster after he ceased to render service. I asked the secretary of the department to make an explanation and I found that salary warrants had been issued until some day in August. The explanation of the secretary is among the papers, and I thought it was very fair.

Mr. BOYCE. That is the explanation of three days ago.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. Yes, I asked for the explanation after the discussion. The transaction passed out of my hands when I directed the dismissal, and the subsequent proceedings whether regular or not were departmental, and the departmental explanation has been placed on the file. Whether it is satisfactory to the hon. gentleman or not it is the explanation, and it is no doubt true as well. If there are any papers on file that should be brought down and are not brought down I shall call the attention of my deputy to it to-morrow. As to future discussion the House can have an opportunity every day that the House is moved into Committee of Supply. The hon. gentleman did mention he would bring the question up to-day and I remained here until five minutes to four, but as the hon. gentleman is aware we had a very important witness from England before the Telephone Committee, and I crossed the floor and told the hon. gentleman that I desired to be present as chairman. The hon. gentleman was quite agreeable to that. I would prefer going on with the matter in Committee of Supply, but it did not occur to me at the time that I could not move to lay the papers on the table when the House was in committee, and therefore I mentioned in committee that I would wait till the speaker was in the chair; I did not observe my hon. friend in the House at the time.

Mr. BOYCE. Did the hon. gentleman not get a memorandum from the Prime Minister as to further documents?

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. The Prime Minister handed me a memorandum and I gave it to my secretary who I am sorry to say is very seriously ill; he has not been in the department for the last few days, and I am afraid he will be absent for many days, which perhaps may account for any slip that may have occurred. I did not look at the memorandum what was in it.

Mr. BOYCE. It was a memo. asking that there be added to the papers to be brought down, the salary warrants for six months preceding the 19th of May and a statement of the amounts paid to the postmaster for the six months preceding that date, and up to the time he ceased to be paid by the government.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. There can be no possible objection to the production of such papers. I am afraid to charge my memory with what the hon. gentleman has said, but if he will give me a memorandum I will be responsible to see that these papers are added.

Mr. BOYCE. With regard to the other papers, if the hon. gentleman reads the report of the last discussion in 'Hansard,' he will see that the papers now brought down must be defective because papers were referred to by their date on that occasion which are entirely omitted.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman should go over the file carefully and send to the department a list of the papers which he thinks or knows to be in existence, or which may be on file, and we will try to meet his wishes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that will be quite satisfactory, and as the Postmaster General says, the matter can be brought up on any day when the House is moved into Committee of Supply? It is a pity the Postmaster General did not have an investigation made before the appointment as he now proposes. It would strike me that I would hardly be prepared to correct the report of May by the report of April; I would rather be inclined to correct the report of April by the subsequent and fuller report of May.

Sir WILLIAM MULOCK. It is very easy to be wise afterwards.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Further than that, so far as putting the blame on the daughter is concerned, if there is any one consideration in the whole affair that would incline me not to reappoint the father it is the very fact that he endeavours to cast the blame of this upon his own daughter, or upon some one who stands in the relation of daughter to him. That appeals to the Postmaster General in a different way. It would be the last reason in the world why I should reappoint that man, and I do not think I will change my mind after reading the papers. However, we may look at these things from different standpoints.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What government business will be taken up on Monday?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed in supply and I would like if possible to dispose of the supplementary estimates. The largest of the items are in the Public Works Department, and I hope with the assistance of the deputy minister to be able to give the House all the information necessary so that we may get a supply Bill through as early as possible.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, May 29, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

Mr. MORIN asked :

Who recommended a post office to be opened at St. Abdon, in the county of Dorchester, Quebec ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Postmaster General). The post office at St. Abdon was opened by the Postmaster General on recommendations which he considered sufficient to induce him to do so.

DISMISSAL OF POLICEMAN CASTONGUAY.

Mr. BOYER—by Mr. O. E. Talbot—asked :

1. On what date was Alexander B. Castonguay dismissed from the federal police ?
2. For what cause ?
3. On whose report ?
4. Did this report incriminate other policeman ?
5. Have these also been dismissed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Justice) :

1. December 13th, 1904.
2. For gross misconduct at Government House on the night of the 16th November, 1904.
3. On the report of the Commissioner of Police.
4. Two other policemen were incriminated in the same report.
5. One of these latter was dismissed and the other suspended for sixteen days.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some time ago I asked a question as to whether this man had been employed in the Marine and Fisheries Department. The answer of the minister was that he was not so employed. I have data to the effect that he had been employed up to the date on which my question was placed on the paper, and his services were then dispensed with. If such was the case, the answer of the minister was equivocal and misleading. I desire the First Minister to look into that.

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Have any payments been made to the Collingwood Dry Dock Company, by way of bounty or assistance, by the federal government ?
2. If so, what are the amounts and dates of payments ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

BRACEBRIDGE DRY DOCK.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT—by Mr. Bennett—asked :

1. Who is the local superintendent of the government dock recently constructed, or being constructed, at Bracebridge, Ontario, and where does he reside ?
2. How much per diem was he paid ?
3. How much was he paid for such services to date, and will he be paid any further amount for such work ?
4. Upon whose recommendation was he appointed ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) :

1. P. L. Clairmont. The address known to the department is Bracebridge, Ontario. We have no other address.
2. $3 per day.
3. (a) $448.68 ; (b) The services of a clerk of works will be required until the contract is completed.
4. Mr. Clairmont was appointed by Mr. Henry A. Gray, resident engineer, after consulting with well informed people in the vicinity.

COLLINGWOOD GOVERNMENT DOCK.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If the House will permit me, I will answer a question which was put to me the other day during the discussion with respect to the construction of a dock at Collingwood. I was asked about the return of the cheque of Mr. Battle, and I stated that while I was positive in regard to Mr. Conroy's cheque, I desired to make further inquiry. I find that after the tender of Mr. Conroy was accepted and the contract awarded to him, all the other cheques were returned. The cheque of Mr. Conroy is still held in the department.

JAPANESE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CANADIAN GOODS.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to call the attention of the government to a letter which appears in the Yarmouth 'Telegram' of Friday last. It may have been already brought to the attention of the proper department, but it seems to me to be a matter of very great importance, and therefore I now call attention to it. It is copied from 'Industrial Canada' :

Mr. C. T. Grantham, manager of the Imperial Cotton Company, Hamilton, sends us the following letter from their New York selling agents, which may be found of interest as illustrating the difficulties which Canadian manufacturers are meeting with in endeavouring to market their goods in Japan :

New York, April 22, 1905.

Dear Sir,—I regret having to report that in spite of continued efforts, we have found it im-

possible to sell any of the Canadian goods for export to Japan. During the past six or eight months we have sold very large blocks of goods manufactured in the United States for export to that market, but, in spite of our best efforts, and of offers, of price concessions, we have not been able to ship a yard of your goods to Japan.

Knowing that your goods were equal in every respect to the American made duck, we were forced to look for some other reasons for the discrimination against the Canadian goods. We found, in the first place, that there was a preferential of five per cent, in favour of the duty on American duck. In order to offset that, we offered the Canadian goods at five per cent less than the American goods, so that they might go in through the customs on the same basis. Even at this price concession, we were unable to effect any sales, in spite of the fact that the Japanese were most desirous of obtaining goods promptly, and were thoroughly scouring the American markets for goods which could be delivered at an early date. We then found out that the reason we could not effect sales was not so much on account of the prices of goods as because there was a sentimental prejudice in Japanese official circles against Canadian-made goods. It seems that the Japanese feel that they were discriminated against by the Canadian government, and that the Canadian government was not willing, at some time in the past, to make the same arrangements with Japan as with the United States and England.

I believe that it is more on account of this prejudice than for any other reason, that we cannot effect the sale of your goods in this market, and if it is in any way possible for you to bring about more friendly relations between your government and the Japanese officials, we believe that it will materially help the trade of the Dominion.

Yours very truly,
J. SPENCER TURNER COMPANY.
H. H. Lehman, secretary and treasurer.

This is a very important matter for the consideration of the government if it has not already been dealt with. I shall send the letter over to the hon. minister.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). The point to which my hon. friend refers has already been brought to the notice of the government. It arises out of this condition: The imperial government made a treaty with Japan some years ago under which certain privileges were granted and we had the opportunity of joining in that treaty. All things considered it was felt that if we should adhere to that treaty Canada's freedom of action in other matters would be embarrassed, and it was not deemed wise in the interest of Canada to assent to that treaty so that it might be applied to Canada. The consequence is that Canadian products do not get the preference which British products would under that treaty and which are granted to the products of some other countries. In order to get the advantage to which my hon. friend refers we would have been obliged to give up some degree of that freedom which Canada has desired to have in regard to its own legislative action. I am speaking from recollection of what occurred some years ago but that is substantially the condition. We declined to join in this British treaty and therefore we lost some advantages which might have been derived if we had accepted that treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend recollect what was the chief factor in causing this action of the government, what possibilities they would have let themselves in for had they accepted the treaty and at about what time this occurred?

Mr. FIELDING. Some years ago. It relates to the operation of the favoured nation clause, and also my recollection is that it affected our freedom of action on the labour question.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see it is rather important to know if it debars us from participating in the great increase in the commerce of Japan. Perhaps the minister may bring down a little more information, the terms of the treaty or an abstract of it, showing in what way we would have been affected.

SUPPLY—PURCHASE OF MILITIA CAMP AT KENTVILLE, N.S.

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

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Some four or five weeks ago I notified the Minister of Militia that I purposed bringing up during the course of the session the purchase of a site for a militia camp at Kentville, N.S., and he then explained that he was familiar with all the details of the case and that it could be explained. In justice to the Minister of Militia the House and the country I think it is proper that we should have an explanation, the best possible he can give. The statement as furnished to me contains the following data: It shows that the government expropriated about 640 acres of land for the purposes of a camp ground, I believe, at or near the village of Kentville, N.S. That land was previously owned by a number of people, but before the expropriation proceedings it was purchased by Messrs. H. P. Dodge, and H. H. Wickwire, members of the local legislature of the province of Nova Scotia, staunch Liberals and members of King's county. I have here a statement which shows how a number of these lands were purchased, contained in a newspaper published in the locality, and I may as well show the manner in which these lands were acquired. For instance one was purchased from John Redden, et al trustees, &c., by Williard H. Fulton, barrister, Halifax, Race Track, Kentville 26 acres, May 30, 1902, for $1,250. Then there was a transference of the same property from W. H. Fulton and his wife to H. H. Wickwire, barrister,

Kentville, August 1st for the same consideration. He was content with a small fee.

Mr. FOSTER. He did not get any profit.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then Stephen Belcher, sheriff King's county to Branton H. Dodge, Kentville, merchant; land in pine woods, 60 acres, July 21, 1902, $110. That is a little over $2 an acre. Then the Robinson heirs sold to the same purchaser 208 acres for $218.40, a little over $1 an acre. James Fanning and wife, same purchaser, land in Cornwallis, 31 acres $400, some $131 an acre. Then the rector and wardens, Parish St. John, same purchaser Glebe lands, pine woods, 25 acres $100, $4 an acre.

Mr. BLACK. What authority is it that the hon. gentleman is quoting from?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman will preserve his soul in patience I will give the statements. It is for him to prove that they are wrong. These are from records of the courts, and if the hon. gentleman will preserve his soul in patience——

Mr. BLACK. What is the authority?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am assuming the authority for these statements here and it is for the hon. gentleman to show that they are incorrect.

Mr. BLACK. I think I am within my rights in asking what the authority is.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Samuel Chipman and wife——

Mr. BLACK. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—Boston, same purchaser, land and pine woods one acre, $20.

Mr. BLACK. I am rising to a point of order. I demand the authority from which the hon. gentleman is reading. I want to know the name of the paper?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They were not purchased from Doukhobors.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think the hon. member is within his rights in insisting on the authority.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I may say that they were not purchased from Doukhobors or Galicians. The St. John's church I presume is an English church and consequently the land would be worth only one-twentieth as much as if purchased from some other concern, from a Doukhobor. Walter B. Reid, farmer, same purchaser, lot 3 acres, the price is left blank here. The heirs of Hanley Chipman, same purchaser lot in pine woods, 10 acres, $20, $2 an acre. Geo. Carter, farmer, same purchaser, lot in pine woods, 1 acre, $120. Wilson Young and wife, same purchaser, lot in pine woods, 12 acres, $120. H. H. Wickwire, same purchaser, race track Kentville, 26 acres, August 26, 1903, $3,000. That is the same track that was sold previously for $1,250. That is the difference in the price. These 377 acres were purchased for $2,358.40, $6.26 an acre, including the value of the buildings. All this was transferred to Messrs. Wickwire and Dodge, M.P.Ps., staunch supporters of the Liberal government of Nova Scotia, and I presume of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia in the province of Nova Scotia. The later conveyance I have no report upon, but I presume the Minister of Militia will be able to furnish that. The statement I have is that this propery is largely an expanse of sand covered with a few pine trees and scrub and that it has always been considered of little value. Let me say that this would not in any way detract from its value as a drill ground. On the contrary I should say that the fact that it is a sandy soil would be a great advantage from the view point of drill purposes, although not from the view point of agricultural land. After Messrs. Dodge and Wickwire had acquired this, Mr. Crawley, of Wolfville, a Liberal, was appointed arbitrator and Mr. McIlreith, of Halifax, another Liberal, acted for the government and W. E. Roscoe, of Kentville, for the local members. I am informed that Mr. Roscoe is a gentleman with a record in the Liberal party. He is the confidential representative of some of the leading Liberal ministers and others in the province of Nova Scotia, and I am informed he has of necessity to be called in in very many of these delicate technical matters requiring adjudication in this section of the country. The value which these witnesses put on the property ranged between $50 and $70 per acre which you will see is a very great price considering what Messrs. Dodge and Wickwire paid for the same property a short time previously, namely $6.20 per acre including a number of buildings. The final decision as to how much the government shall pay for this camp ground is in the hands of Judge Burbidge, and it is understood that it will not be had for some time to come.

Mr. BENNETT. Who appealed to Judge Burbidge?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I do not know. The hon. minister will be able to tell us. I am merely bringing this up in order to have from him a full explanation. According to the Auditor General's Report, nearly $25,000 have been expended on the rifle ranges on this camp ground.

An hon. MEMBER. What was paid for the land?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The arbitrators allowed $38,400 for the land and a large area had been purchased for a comparatively trifling sum by Wickwire & Dodge. The arbitrators allowed $38,400 for 641 acres.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the total amount paid by Dodge & Wickwire?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have the total only for the 377 acres and for that they paid $2,358. This amount of $25,000 expended on the rifle ranges is from $6,000 to $7,000 above the contract price. I find also that the stop-block was constructed of hemlock timber instead of cedar which the contract called for. Perhaps the minister will make a note of that point. I have here a short extract from the speech of the hon. minister delivered in the House. In that speech he said :

With regard to the rural districts and the smaller towns, where there is only, say, one unit, my idea is that we should construct a substantial building which can be headquarters, armoury and storehouse, and with a room sufficiently large for a lecture room, where the officers who take an interest in military matters can bring their men in the evening, and, by means of blackboards and so on, illustrate military affairs and give necessary instructions. My plan will include every village of any importance in the Dominion of Canada.

That is almost on a par with the promise of the right hon. the First Minister, after he got into the little Dundonald trouble with the Minister of Agriculture last year, when he proposed to arm every one, old and young, with one of the new Ross breech loading rifles. I should like to see a few scattered throughout the province of Ontario. The minister continued :

We have reverted to the old system of keeping arms at company headquarters. I may be permitted to remark that in my own county we have a regiment of infantry of eight companies, and two squadrons of cavalry, yet we have only an old wooden drill hall in the town of Kentville, which was built some years ago. There has not been $1,000 expended on a building to house the militia in my county during the nine years I have been a minister. I tell my people that they must be patient. The time will come, I hope, when they will all be housed, and I will ask some of my hon. friends to emulate my example and be patient.

That does not agree with the Auditor General's Report. In the Auditor General's Report of 1901, I find the following :

J. C. Reeves, fitting up armoury, per contract	$1,325
Less drawback	132
	1,193

I presume that drawback was the 10 per cent. As a rule, I understand, the rake off is 20 per cent.

Rockwell, C. F., superintending work at armoury to June 29th, 1901, 50 days at $2.50, $125.

In the Auditor General's Report for 1904, Vol. 2, Q—115, I find the following :

Rifle ranges, lands for military purposes, Kentville, Nova Scotia, $24,709.73.

C. L. Dodge, inspector, 131 days at $2.50	$327 50
Wm. Rand, surveys and expenses	448 13
A. B. Ward, construction of field stages	785 00
R. T. McIlreith, legal services	591 88
Account witness fees, King vs. Dodge	$ 200 00
Paid for labour	865 69
John J. Lyons and James Whyte, rifle butts, ranges and sheds	20,463 55
Sundry expenses	1,027 98
Total	24,709 73

I wonder is this the gentleman who was connected with the purchase of these lands, or was he one of the gentlemen who sold some land ? I think we had his name before in connection with the matter.

Then in 1904 I find by the Auditor General's Report, Q—33, there was paid :

C. L. Dodge, supplies to Aldershot camp drill, $2,892.92.

That of course, would be legitimate expenditure, but it looks as though these contracts were kept within the hands of these professional gentlemen in connection with the Liberal party in that province for political purposes. If the hon. minister has any satisfactory explanation to give, I am sure he will be glad of an opportunity to make it. If he has none, it is the duty of this House to have the facts probed to the very bottom. This system is one which seems to have taken hold, not only of the other departments, but even the Militia Department. It is trifling with the proper method of awarding contracts, and the making of these deals should be stopped and the people be given full value for their money. I do not know what explanation the minister can give for paying $50 to $60 an acre for land, the average price of which was only $6.20 per acre.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). It is quite true that the hon. gentleman informed me some time ago that he intended to bring this matter up. I suggested that it would be more convenient to bring it up on the militia estimates ; and as I heard nothing from him for some time, I rather assumed he proposed to follow that course. Had I known he was going to bring the matter up to-day—I only got his note ten minutes ago—I might perhaps have been able to bring some information of a more detailed character than I can give at this moment. However, let me inform the House at once of a fact, of which I informed the hon. gentleman, namely, that this matter is to-day sub judice. It is to-day in the hands of the Exchequer Court as a result of the Militia Department having taken possession—as it had a right to do—for the Crown of this property. As the land is situated in my county, I thought it much preferable that the property should be expropriated and that the court constituted to deal with questions of this character should declare what the property is worth. It seems to me that the statement which my hon. friend made here should have been made before the court. Some hon. gentle-

man wanted to know who Judge Burbidge was.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, no.

Mr. BENNETT. I asked who appealed to Judge Burbidge.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have just given the answer. The land was expropriated. By that fact it became the duty of Judge Burbidge to ascertain, from the best information available, the value of the land and the price the Crown should pay.

Mr. BENNETT. I heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) make the statement that three gentlemen had acted as arbitrators——

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Crawley acted as arbitrator, I understand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not say that.

Mr. BENNETT. I heard the statement made to which I refer, and so I asked who had appealed to Judge Burbidge?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, that is not the position. Judge Burbidge, as is the custom of the court in certain cases—the general custom if I understand aright—named a proper officer to take evidence on the point. In this particular case Judge Burbidge named Mr. Crawley, a very respectable barrister of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know what took place in the present instance. But, as I understand the practice, sometimes the judge takes the evidence himself. Sometimes he refers the question of value to a referee who has authority not only to take evidence, but to make a finding, while in other cases he entrusts the case to a referee merely for the purpose of taking evidence, the finding being reserved for the judge himself. I do not know in which category this was.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was in the last category.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have seen references to the matter in the newspapers, and my recollection is that the matter was referred to Mr. Crawley for the purpose of taking the evidence and reporting a value to the court. I understand also that he had reported the value and that the Crown had appealed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not familiar with these technical points. But I know this—that it remains for the judge to give his final adjudication as to the value of the land.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister have any objection to say what connection Messrs. Crawley, of Wolfeville, Mr. McIlreith, of Halifax, and Mr. Moscoe, of Kentville, had with this matter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I understand it, Mr. McIlreith is the agent of the Department of Justice in Nova Scotia; Mr. Crawley was appointed the referee——

Mr. FOSTER. By the judge?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, directly by the court—and Mr. Roscoe, I have heard, although I have had nothing to do with him in this particular matter, was the lawyer employed by the owners of the land.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister state what were the first steps taken in order to get hold of this land and when they were taken?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The first steps as I remember were taken about two or three years ago by the Militia Department expropriating this property for a camp ground for the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. STOCKTON. Will the minister allow me to ask a question? If the government expropriated, did the department at once take proceedings under the Exchequer Court Act to ascertain the amount to be paid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Immediately.

Mr. STOCKTON. When was that done?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know the exact date, but I think it was between one and two years ago. I think it was during the camp a year ago last summer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister stated that one of these gentlemen represented the owners. I presume he referred to Messrs. Dodge and Wickwire, the Liberal members of provincial parliament for the county.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) insists very much upon mixing up these Liberal members of provincial parliament with the matter. I do not see much in that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Who were the owners—that is all I want to know?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I stated that I did not know who the owners were and I cannot make it any more emphatic than I have made it already. This property was owned by somebody—I do not know who the owners were; I have nothing to do with the owners. Acting as a member of the government, acting for the Crown and in the interest of the public, I ordered the expropriation of that property, and saw to it that the matter was referred to the proper court in order

to have the value of the property ascertained. The proceedings are still going on. And I doubt very much, myself—and I suggested that to the hon. gentleman—I doubt very much the propriety of bringing a matter of this kind here while it is still sub judice. Now, I do not know that there is very much more to say. This matter was one of the stock campaign arguments during the time of the last general election. I fought it on the platform in my county. All sorts of veiled charges were made against me. It was suggested that some impropriety had been committed. But, when I stated to the people of my county the facts, as I have stated them here to-day, my statement was accepted as satisfactory, the result being that I received a majority of 1,200 in my county, in that election.

Mr. FOSTER. There were a good many arguments to back that up in your county were there not?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) understands as well as any of us, I think, what kind of arguments are used in an election.

Mr. FOSTER. I think I understand.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe there was a minimum of that kind of thing in my county—it was unnecessary.

Mr. FOSTER. If that was the minimum, the maximum must have been awful.

Mr. EMMERSON. Was there a ballot-box missing in that instance?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was nothing of that kind. In fact, this is a case of much ado about nothing—the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has discovered a mare's nest. I do not know that I have anything more to say, except this: There was an evident intention or desire in some way to show, by quoting an extract from a speech I made in this House some time ago, that I had mis-stated the facts in that case; that while I had stated in the House that not $1,000 had been spent on militia buildings for the militia of my county since I have been minister, enormous sums had been spent—amounting to $20,000 or $25,000—in constructing rifle ranges. And the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) even showed that some $1,200 or $1,300 had been spent in improving an old drill hall in that county. Now, I am prepared to admit that, to the extent of the difference between $1,000 and $1,200 or $1,300, I was in error in saying that only $1,000 had been spent in militia buildings in my county for the use of the corps immediately concerned, the corps having their headquarters in my county. The evident intention—the unfair intention—on the part of the hon. gentleman was to show that my statement was not true and that thousands and tens of thousands had been spent in my county for the militia of my county, when the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well, quite as well as he will after I have told him again, that all this expenditure, except the paltry $1,200 I have referred to, was expended for the whole militia of Nova Scotia. This expenditure was for the establishment of a rifle range, one of sixteen targets and one of the best rifle ranges in Canada, and securing a camp ground of 640 acres—a mile square—for the use of the militia not only of the whole province of Nova Scotia, but of part of that of Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick as well. I have the satisfaction of knowing, from the highest military authorities in this Dominion, that the camp ground at Kentville is one of the best if not the best in the Dominion of Canada to-day.

But the hon. gentleman tries in some round-about way to cast suspicion of wrong doing upon this transaction. Where is the wrong doing? It was not for me to say and I am not saying whether the land was worth one dollar, or ten dollars, or twenty dollars, that is none of my business. The value of the land has been submitted to the proper court to ascertain and it will be ascertained. It is the duty of the judge to get the best evidence with respect to the value of the land. I may say, however, Mr. Speaker, that this camp is situated within a mile of the shire town of my county, the important town of Kentville. This 640 acres of land are well situated, surrounded by orchards on every side, with a railway passing along the whole of one side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have just made an inquiry by telephone to the officers of the Exchequer Court as to the position, which was not very clear. I found that the claim was referred to Mr. Crawley for inquiry and report. Mr. Crawley took evidence and reported in favour of the claimants, fixing the value of the land at $38,400. The Crown appealed, and the judge sent back the case to Mr. Crawley for further inquiry and report. That is the situation of the matter at present.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I said, it is sub judice, it is open to change. It is the duty of the judge to make up his opinion as to the value of the land, and I do not think it can be in safer hands than in the hands of Mr. Justice Burbidge, where I am sure the interest of the public as well as the interest of the owner of the land will receive every due and fair consideration. Now what more is there to be said? That is the whole story, it seems to me. The value is to be fixed, the land has been expropriated, everything is above board. The records are there to show. I have not familiarized myself particularly with what has been done, I only know that the greatest care was taken to assure that the inter-

est of the people of this country might be served.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister did not seem to deal with that part of the statement that $35,000 had been spent on the rifle range, and that the contract had been exceeded by $6,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is not a word of truth in that statement. I am glad my hon. friend has called my attention to it, because I agree with him that it requires an answer. The intention to construct the rifle range on these grounds was published in the newspapers in Halifax, and I think in the newspapers in this city, so that it was open to all the people of Canada to tender, and the lowest tenderer got the work, an Ottawa firm. There were several tenders, but the people who got the work are men who have done a great deal of work of this kind, are experts in the matter. They constructed the rifle range in Ottawa, they constructed the rifle range in Montreal and at Three Rivers, they have constructed many rifle ranges throughout Canada, and in every case they have received the contract only after open competition, and after due advertising in the public press. That is the way they got the tender at Kentville. I do not know whether one kind of wood was substituted for another or not, but I do know that the engineers in my department are exceedingly careful in all such matters, that the most careful inspection is insisted upon; and if any change or substitution took place, it only took place under the authority of the chief engineer of the Militia Department.

Mr. FOSTER. As to the appropriation.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is an annual vote of $75,000 for the construction of rifle ranges, and as I understand it the $19,000—I think this range cost $19,600, possibly $20,000—was taken out of that vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The contract price has been adhered to?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Absolutely. When the estimates come down there will be a further opportunity to discuss this matter, and if any additional information is required I will be glad to give it.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, before these estimates come down and are taken up again, the minister might, in justice to the House, lay on the table whatever papers in connection with the matter are in his possession.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not like to say anything more about it until I see these papers. I will say this much, however, that I would like to get $38,400 for 640 acres of land in that part of Nova Scotia.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know whether $38,400 will be paid for it or not. But I can tell my hon. friend that he will find in that part of Nova Scotia, which I think he has visited, lots of land, farming, lands and orchard lands, which he could not buy for $600 an acre.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) read from the local papers some comments with reference to this land. The minister says, and no doubt it is quite true, that this subject attracted a great deal of attention during the last election in his riding. I do not wonder that it did. Why, two local members of parliament, by inspiration I presume, had gone around the country and bought land at $2 an acre, and in a very short time afterwards found they could sell it for $60. This must have been pretty exceptional land, with all due deference to the county, and the minister does not contradict it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I did not think it was necessary for me to go into that. I have no idea what they paid. All I know as to the value of the land is this, that some thirty years ago about twenty-five acres of land which was made a hunting park, which is a part of this range, was purchased in the native condition, you might say, for $25 and acre. I ascertained that fact, and that is all I know about it. But I feel quite confident that a fair valuation for that land would be anywhere between $20 and $30.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, it seems that that part of it which is the race track they sold at a fairly good price. But whatever prompted the two local members to go and buy 60 acres of land at $2 an acre, must have been a question that suggested itself to the electors of that riding.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. And they answered it.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman knows how they answered the question up in Edmonton a few weeks ago on the school question.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No doubt of it.

Mr. BENNETT. And they will answer the same question later on in Ontario.

Mr. FIELDING. Don't forget Quebec.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman may set that off against Centre Toronto. But be that as it may, not only do we find these two inspired local members buying 60 acres of land, but, upon inspiration that came from Ottawa, they go back and buy 200 acres more at $1 an acre. then there is another batch of it picked up at $10 an acre. The result is that as soon as it changes hands it advances from $1 and $2

an acre to about $60 an acre. We do not know and we have no intimation here as to who this Mr. Crawley is, or how Mr. Crawley came to be appointed. We have no intimation here as to how the case was conducted on behalf of the Crown, and it will seem as strange to the country as it was to the electors there. Perhaps the hon. minister may enlighten us why it is that these local members should go and pick up 300 or 400 acres of land which they could buy at $1 and $2 an acre and which had lain there useless for years and that suddenly an intimation is given to these gentlemen that this land is to be used for a large militia camp ground. The hon. minister states that this is a desirable tract of land, being surrounded by magnificent orchards. It must have been the irony of fate that there should have been beautiful orchards around a tract of land that went begging at $1 an acre. It must have been struck by lightning.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. You ought to go down there and see it.

Mr. BENNETT. I might have seen it for a long time if it could be purchased at from $1 to $2 an acre. It strikes me that it is a fair matter for discussion and I think the hon. minister should endeavour to let us know what made these gentlemen wake up so suddenly and buy this waste land at $1 and $2 an acre that immediately advances to $60 an acre. Perhaps an inkling was given to these gentlemen in the same way as it was given to certain gentlemen in regard to the half-breed scrip in the Northwest. It seems that there was an Order in Council passed that was never made public until months afterwards, and when it was made public there was nothing left. The senators and members from the Northwest interested had picked up all the scrip that was going begging. I hope the question will be renewed again when the estimates are under discussion, and that the hon. minister will enlighten us as to why these local members were permitted to pick up this land at $1 and $2 an acre and to sell it afterwards at $60 an acre.

Mr. FIELDING. Has it yet been established that it is worth $60 an acre? Why does my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) assume that the government agreed to pay $60 an acre for it? The matter is still before the courts, and if the land was purchased recently for $1 or $2 an acre is it not a reasonable assumption that that fact will be investigated by the judge of the Exchequer Court, and that whatever weight is entitled to be attached to that argument by the court will be given to the transaction by Judge Burbidge? Would that not be a more reasonable assumption rather than to take it for granted that Judge Burbidge is going to authorize the payment of $60 an acre for that which was purchased for from $1 to $2 an acre? If it is a fact that the property was purchased recently for $1 or $2 an acre, that fact undoubtedly would be investigated by Judge Burbidge and it would have whatever weight it was entitled to in fixing the value of the land.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would Mr. Justice Burbidge, having referred this matter to this gentleman in Nova Scotia, Mr. Crawley, be in a position to know if this land had been purchased for this price, if it had not been represented to him here in this manner?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the business of Mr. Justice Burbidge to know all these things. That is the purpose for which he holds his court. In regard to Mr. Crawley, I know nothing of his relations with this transaction, but I know that Mr. Crawley is a most respected barrister in Nova Scotia, a son of the late Rev. Dr. Crawley, a man whose name is honoured throughout Nova Scotia, and I have no hesitation in saying that I would have the fullest confidence in the perfect fairness of any transaction with which Mr. Crawley is connected.

Mr. BENNETT. It would seem that some person must have confidence in Mr. Crawley and as Mr. Crawley has made his report Judge Burbidge will have to deal with exactly the same evidence when it comes before him. If Mr. Crawley's judgment is good, I do not assume it is going to be appealed against. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will recollect a very remarkable case in Quebec. I refer to the case at Levis. This was a most extraordinary case. Perhaps the case with which we are now dealing may outrival it but it is hardly possible that it could do so. The Levis case was one in which the Intercolonial Railway desired to acquire a lot of land. The then Minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Blair, sent down one of his trusted agents. He went around and saw the proprietors and they were all ready to sell at $1 a foot. When he made his report what happened? The minister, Mr. Blair, initialled the report and recommended the purchase of the land. Mr. Archer, a barrister of Montreal, and a partner of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine) and Mr. Pugsley, were retained by some of the parties and what happened after that? The price was advanced from $1 a foot to $2.50 a foot. Then came a letter from the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) advising Mr. Blair to accept a figure 300 per cent more than had been originally offered by the parties who owned the land and that was backed up—this is all on record in 'Hansard'—by the statement that the Prime Minister has recommended that the deal should be made on this basis. Then there was an appeal to the Exchequer Court with the result that the augmented price was allowed. I think that experience has taught us that these appeals have not resulted in the country

getting cheap property in the long run. I know nothing about the merits of this case, but I do remember the Levis case in which, as a result of the interference of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, this land doubled and trebled in value.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Solicitor General). I do not know what happened in the case of the St. Charles branch expropriation; I am not familiar with that case in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) says that Judge Burbidge increased the value of land 300 per cent. But, there is one fact that is very patent to the House. It is that according to the Exchequer Court Act the judge has the right to refer any case to an arbitrator, or a referee if it pleases him. I appeared on the Exchequer Court in Quebec representing the Crown in a certain claim of Mr. H. M. Price of Quebec in which the court referred the case to the registrar, Mr. Audette. A report is made on the facts by the registrar, or referee and then the judge is free to accept or reject that report. He applies the law to the facts. It has happened not once, not twice, but in hundreds of cases in which reports were made by a referee or arbitrator or registrar that the judge would not accept his report. He would reverse the report. It happened in one case in which my firm was interested sime months ago in the matter of Paul vs. the King. The report of the referee was in favour of our clients, but when it came before the court it was reversed. It happens every day. The judge is entitled under the Exchequer Court Act to refer a case to a referee or arbitrator. Therefore, there is nothing very surprising in this case in the fact that it was referred to an arbitrator in the province of Nova Scotia. The judge is not bound by the report which is made by the arbitrator or referee.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not the judge bound by the evidence taken by the referee? I ask that question because of a remark made by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). The hon. Minister of Finance said that it was the judge's business to get the evidence and to find these things out. Is it not a fact that the judge will take no evidence except such as is brought before the referee where the investigation is made?

Mr. LEMIEUX. If the judge is not there himself the registrar is there. The registrar acts for the judge in fifty cases out of a hundred usually. The court is there, the court controls the case, and my hon. friend, I am sure, would not say that Mr. Justice Burbidge would accept only one-sided evidence in that case.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not suggesting anything of the kind. I merely want to see that we understand each other.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend knows that the court is always represented by the registrar.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to find out whether the judge had before him such evidence as was reported by this referee. The judge does not hear original evidence; he simply goes on evidence taken by the referee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The judge decides, not on one-sided evidence, but on full evidence. The court is conducted on legal lines. There has been no complaint on that score.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is quite open to the judge of the Exchequer Court, when he proceeds on the report of Mr. Crawley or any other person, to order further evidence if he is not satisfied with the evidence before him. He is in no sense bound, as my hon. friend would intimate, by the report of Mr. Crawley. He may order either a new reference or a hearing of evidence before himself as Exchequer Court judge; or, after hearing this evidence, he may order a new hearing, he may set aside Mr. Crawley's report entirely. So long as the case is not decided by the judge himself, it is open to further evidence.

Mr. MONK. Does my hon. friend the Solicitor General know whether any decision was rendered in the Exchequer Court in the case referred to by the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett); and if so, what figure was fixed by the court for the indemnity?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not aware that any amount was fixed by the Exchequer Court. I understood from my hon. friend that it was not referred to the Exchequer Court, but that the amount was fixed by the department.

Mr. HAGGART. Perhaps the Minister of Railways would be informed on that point—what the expropriation at Lévis cost per foot.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not familiar with it. It was some time before I was in the department, and I do not know the facts. I have heard of that, as I have heard of the St. Charles branch case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I would ask the Minister of Militia to be good enough to bring down and lay on the table as soon as convenient the data in this matter. I may say that I do not propose waiting to take it up on the militia estimates. I find that the militia estimates are passed on some evening, conveniently, when certain gentlemen happen to be out of the House. The estimates are then quietly slipped through.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman knows that an item was reserved in the estimates.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I know. That is also held to the end of the session, and passed through in the same way. I would like the hon. gentleman to bring down the name of the owner of these 640 acres that were purchased for a drill ground, the cost of the ground, the award of the commission, the nature of the timber used in the butts, whether cedar or hemlock—he can get a report from his engineer on this point. I do not think I have laid myself open to the charge of being unfair. However, I will not discuss that, as I shall have another opportunity of doing so. I want the report of Mr. Crawley to the Exchequer Court judge brought down.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. How can I get the report?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am notifying the government, and the hon. Minister of Militia is a member of it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If my hon. friend will allow me, it seems to me that every object will be served when this case is completed. I have no doubt that the judgment will be given in a short time, and I shall be glad to lay the judgment, the evidence and all the papers connected with the case on the table of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. The minister will see that when the judgment is delivered that will end it. Maybe we can throw a little light on the matter to help the judgment.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I think the Minister of Militia, instead of feeling hurt at this matter being brought up, if he has the interest of the country at heart, should be glad that we are strengthening the hands of Judge Burbidge and helping him to get this collateral evidence. I trust that the minister will have all this information brought down at an early date.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will bring down such papers as I can get. I have not any idea of the owners of the land, except from what I have read in the newspapers and what the hon. gentleman has said. Any papers in the department bearing on this matter I shall be glad to bring down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. FOSTER. We are not discussing this question from any other standpoint than that of the public interest, at the present time at least. The minister has heard today that that land, that was bought for $1 an acre, was sold to the government through the medium of interested parties, who no doubt got information that it was to be taken for such a purpose, or would be likely to be taken, and were therefore quite willing to go into the speculation. Neither of these gentlemen would have bought one arpent of that sand land unless he expected to turn it over in a speculation. Now that the minister has heard of this immense bill, which must have astounded himself, of $38,400 for this land, on the report of the referee, based on evidence obtained by one of the most able and not one of the scrupulous lawyers in the province of Nova Scotia, against a young man, not the ablest or the strongest, on the part of the Crown, he must see that it looks like a plant. I am not saying that it is, but it looks like it. The minister says that he cannot get at the value of the land. He can easily ascertain from whom Messrs. Dodge and Wickwire got this land, for he can get at the record of the transfer; there is a way by which the evidence of those who sold the land in the first place can be got, if they did not give it in the Crawley inquest; and if it transpires that that land was bought at $1 an acre by these people, not for their own use, but in order to palm it off on the government for $38,400, I do not care a penny if the case went through a thousand exchequer courts, it is a transaction that should be sat upon. If anything ever smelt like a plant, this does; and the minister will not do his duty unless he finds out what that land cost these go-betweens; and if it turns out that they got it for $1 an acre, it is the duty of the government not to pay that money if there is any power in the universe to prevent them.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree with my hon. friend. That is what the Exchequer Court was created for, and I would assume that, with the case left to be dealt with by that court, the public interest would be looked after. I assume that evidence was brought forward as to the proper price to pay for the land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Exchequer Court has nothing to do with that.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes; the Exchequer Court has the right to inquire for further evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Exchequer Court does not initiate the procuring of evidence. That is left to the parties—the Crown on the one hand and the claimants on the other.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps it is not a material point, but Mr. Justice Burbidge is himself a native of King's county, and would have enough knowledge of the value of land around there to enable him to make due inquiries.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Justice Burbidge does not take the evidence.

Mr. FIELDING. He can.

Mr. FOSTER. He simply appoints the referee.

Mr. FIELDING. At his discretion.

Mr. FOSTER. That will be the evidence taken by the referee. Who brings the evidence, who engineers it? Dodge &

Wickwire. Through whom? Through a very able lawyer, to say the least of it, who defends the case for the government. Mr. Tremaine, of McIlreith & Tremaine. Now the evidence is so engineered, it is so made to appear to Mr. Crawley by some means or other, they may be fair or they may not, that he gives a judgment that the land is worth so much.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He does not give a judgment but an award.

Mr. FOSTER. It is an opinion which is equivalent to a judgment. That comes before the Court of Exchequer and Judge Burbidge may have as much personal knowledge as he pleases about that land but he is bound to take the award of Mr. Crawley.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, no.

Mr. FOSTER. At least that is what I think. The court will in nine cases out of ten do so, and I do not think the government's responsibility is ended because this matter has been so engineered as to bring its final decision before the Exchequer Court instead of simply an ordinary arbitration. But there remains the fact that cannot be laughed or sneered away, that men who became interested in the matter because they knew something was in the wind, bought land at the rate of a dollar an acre for which they are now seeking to get $38,400 in gross from the government, and I do not think the government has quite cleared itself, its skirts are not clean if that be a correct statement of the case, even though they shelter themselves behind the judgment of the Exchequer Court which has to work under certain limitations and can be——

Mr. FIELDING. When I stated that Judge Burbidge might employ his personal knowledge I did not mean to assert that he is at liberty to use that personal knowledge in fixing his judgment. The hon. member for Simcoe interrupted to say that he could not use that knowledge. I grant that, but he can use that knowledge to make further inquiry, he can——

Mr. FOSTER. Under the same engineer.

Mr. FIELDING. He can take any machinery he likes to get the information, and I presume Judge Burbidge will do that.

Mr. STOCKTON. You say that Judge Burbidge can institute that inquiry. Is not the government represented on one side by its agents, and is it not the duty of the agent, if there is evidence to be precured, to place it before the judge?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly.

Mr. STOCKTON. It is not the duty of the judge to go around hunting evidence. It depends on the manner in which the case is presented to the judge how he will form his judgment and conclusion, and if the evidence is not there, no matter what Judge Burbidge's information may be as to the value of the ground in that country he is bound by the evidence placed before him. The Solicitor General shakes his head to say no, but I tell the Solicitor General that would be the judicial course for Judge Burbidge to take, according to the evidence presented before him and he is not responsible for the evidence placed before him. It is the agent of the government who is responsible.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have a very high regard for the opinion of my hon. friend, but surely he knows that when the report of the referee goes before the judge, the judge is not bound. Section 98 of the Act provides:

> The Supreme Court or Exchequer Court, or a judge thereof, may, if it is considered for the ends of justice expedient so to do, order the further examination, before either the court or a judge thereof or other person, of any witness; and if the party on whose behalf the evidence is tendered neglects or refuses to obtain such further examination, the court or judge, in its or his discretion, may decline to act on the evidence.

So it is not final, it is an every-day occurrence in the Exchequer Court that a referee is appointed; it happens in 99 cases out of 100 in the province of Quebec from the very obvious reason that Judge Burbidge is not familiar with the French language.

Mr. STOCKTON. If the evidence is placed before the referee and the case is adjudicated upon by the referee and the matter goes before the judge and the government takes no other action, then in 19 cases out of 20 the judge takes the judgment of the referee. I tell the Solicitor General that is my experience in the courts.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend has had a very wide experience. I have acted for the Crown for only two years, but I know that in 50 cases out of 100 when a referee is appointed by the judge of the Exchequer Court, and when the report is made to the judge he does not accept that report; generally speaking, he does not accept it, he requires further examination or sometimes he rejects it completely. That is my experience for the last two years and that is the law.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does he do that of his own motion or on motion of counsel for the government?

Mr. LEMIEUX. On his own motion, without the government interfering. He is above the government in these courts.

Mr. STOCKTON. Will the Solicitor General state a case to me in which without the suggestion of counsel for the govern-

ment the judge has taken the matter into his own hands and gone further and called further evidence ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It has been in every case where the judge has differed with the referee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to hear of one case. I have been practising in the Exchequer Court a great many years and I never heard of one. My hon. friend (Mr. Stockton) asked the Solicitor General for one case where the judge of the Exchequer Court without suggestion or motion from counsel for the Crown had overruled or asked for further evidence in respect of a report of a referee. Now I have a very fair knowledge of the practice of the Exchequer Court, at least up to two or three years ago, and I say I never heard of such a case and I do not think any other lawyers in the House except the Solicitor General ever heard of such a case. He says he can name 50 ; I would like him to name one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall name one at once, the case of Paul against the Crown. In that case——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Without suggestion from counsel for the Crown.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Without any suggestion whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is one.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I remember this one, there are so many I cannot recall the names for the moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was that case decided ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. A few months ago. Here is what happens. The referee is appointed, the evidence is heard by that referee. There are two counsel, one acting for the Crown, sometimes the Solicitor General, sometimes an agent of the department. The other party is represented also by his counsel. Then the report is made to the judge and the judge without any interference takes it upon himself not to accept the report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is where the counsel for the Crown do not object.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He does not consult even the counsel for the Crown, my hon. friend knows that surely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never saw him do it. My knowledge of the practice of the Exchequer Court is this : that the judge of the Exchequer Court, like every other judge in every other court I have heard of, leaves the conduct of the case to the counsel on each side. If he has taken a new course it is within the last two years, at least so far as cases from the province of Nova Scotia are concerned. I have been engaged in a good many cases and never knew him to do anything else. If counsel for the Crown declined to cross-examine witnesses brought by the claimant the judge of the Exchequer Court would not say a word. If counsel for the Crown declined to produce any evidence in contradiction to that brought by the claimant, the judge would have nothing to say, and if the counsel for the Crown made no objection when counsel for the claimant made motion for a judgment, the judge of the Exchequer Court would, so far as my experience goes, confirm the report.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The judge has acted differently to my knowledge and the law is there permitting him to ignore the report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not the point. My hon. friend does not seem to be able to understand the point. When counsel for the Crown raises objection there is a most ample power for the judge ; every one knows that. But the Solicitor General says that the judge of the Exchequer Court is in the habit of practically taking the case out of the hands of counsel for the Crown and doing their duty himself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am not saying that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It must be because he has learned a certain distrust of these counsel for the Crown that he has taken this course. He never did it in my experience certainly. He always supposes that counsel know more about their own cases than he does and leaves it to them to shape their case as they see fit. He leaves it to them to argue the case as they see fit, just as the judges in every court do. The judges do not raise objections which are not put forward by counsel on behalf of their own clients. To do so would be to take the case out of the hands of the counsel ; and most counsel, if they found a judge undertaking a course, which my hon. friend says is now the universal practice in the Exchequer Court, would simply take off their gowns and retire from the conduct of the case. I should certainly do so if the judge of any court undertook to conduct my case for me and to raise objections on behalf of my client that I did not propose to raise. It seems to me most unusual, yet I am bound to accept my hon. friend's statement that not only has it occurred in his practice but it is the almost universal practice.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall state the case again, as my hon. friend appears to believe I do not understand the question. I say that many times a judge may not sit personally in a case but appoint a referee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not what we are discussing. Every one understands that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The referee will make a report and the judge is not bound by that report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman went a great deal further. He said that where the counsel for the Crown made no objection whatever to the report, the judge would take the case out of his hands and himself conduct the case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never saw it done.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It happens every day in the Exchequer Court.

Mr. LENNOX. The position taken by the hon. the Solicitor General in very extraordinary. There are a good many lawyers in this House, and I think he has stated a position new to almost every and perhaps to every lawyer in the House. The position he takes is that the judge of the Exchquer Court is not the judge but really the counsel, and the counsel, I understand, on behalf of the Crown. The Minister of Militia took the position, in the first instance, and it was followed up by the Solicitor General and the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), that of his own motion and without any suggestion from counsel the judge of the Exchequer Court would take the matter into his own hands and practically say to the counsel: You sit down. I am going to conduct this case. Well, although I am not a lawyer of prominence, I would not put up with any such treatment from any judge. I know that in some instances a judge will undertake to ask a question or two but very rarely indeed; but to say that in fifty cases out a hundred a judge will take the matter in his own hands is a very poor compliment indeed to the counsel acting for the Crown and a very poor compliment to the government who engage such counsel. It is well the people should know—assuming that the Solicitor General is correct—the kind of baby counsel which the Crown must have engaged cases before the Exchequer Court, because no counsel of sufficient ability to conduct an important case before the Exchequer Court would put up with that kind of treatment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me point out to the hon. gentleman the last line of section 98:

> The judge may, in his discretion, decline to act on the evidence.

Mr. STOCKTON. That is not what we are discussing. In the ordinary course of his duties, the judge has that discretion under the Act, but he would only use it on a suggestion from the Crown counsel, and the position taken by the Solicitor General to-day is that the judge of the Exchequer Court is the counsel for the government and not the judge as between the Crown and the subject to see that fair compensation is given for property taken. Well, let me say that the judge is not the counsel. He is there to hold the scales evenly betwen the Crown and the subject. The counsel on either side present the case as they think best, and the judge adjudicates on the case as presented.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Solicitor General will find almost the same words in any statute defining the powers of a judge. Certainly the Court of Appeal may in its discretion grant a new trial, but it does not act on that discretion without an application from counsel.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Exchequer Court has very exceptional power. You would not find the same in any court, but it is to be found in the statute governing the Exchequer Court.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the Minister of Finance be good enough to obtain the evidence in connection with this report of the referee and have it laid on the table?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that we have any access to the court which is not open to my hon. friend. We all stand equal before the courts. He is as strong a man before the courts as the Minister of Justice.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The government might pay for the copying of the report and a private individual might have to pay for it himself.

Mr. FIELDING. If that is the only difficulty, I do not think it need make any trouble.

Mr. FOSTER. In the event of further evidence being taken, would the government take measures to ascertain the price at which these intermediaries got the property at first? Even though that evidence be so arranged that the award of $38,400 is confirmed, after the statements made in the House that a large proportion of this land was bought at $1 an acre, will the government not take such measures as may be necessary to avoid paying such an extraordinary, such a criminal amount for that land?

Mr. FIELDING. I shall call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the statement made. He is responsible for the management of this case, as for all others before the Exchequer Court, and if the evidence already taken is in any way insufficient, I presume my hon. colleague will find it his duty to seek further evidence. I can offer no opinion. All I can say is that I shall call his attention to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all my hon. friend can do. What I wanted to have was if possible a promise not to pay that amount

of money with the acquiescence of the government.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I may add that from the moment the Department of Militia decided to take expropriation proceedings—as was done in the case of the rifle range at Ottawa and as is usually done—the whole matter was handed over to the Department of Justice, and it went out of the hands of the Militia Department.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—Archives—further amount required, including the salary of F. W. Grey, from March 1, 1905, at $75 per month, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $3,000.

Hon SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). For a number of years we have had an officer of the archives branch in Paris picking out documents bearing on Canadian history. These are to be copied. But the force who have been copying these documents have not been able to copy nearly as many as have been picked out. The result is that, while documents have been discovered bearing upon our history—and copies of which we ought to have—to a number sufficient to fill about 3,000 volumes, we have actually copied and on the shelves here only about 300 volumes. The archivist has asked that we should proceed more rapidly with this work and this we have been doing for the last few months. An additional amount is required for this work. Moreover the archivist has been trying to prepare an indexed catalogue of the works of his branch. There has never been a complete reference book of the papers and documents. For the work of preparing such a catalogue Mr. Grey has been engaged. I found it necessary to pay him $75 a month, which the Auditor General says is not consistent with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is Mr. Grey?

Mr. FISHER. He was professor of literature in the University of Ottawa until last fall. He has special qualifications for this work, being a well educated, well informed literary man. To explain why this item is put in this way: 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' I may explain, that, until recently the archives vote was supposed to be used without reference to the Civil Service Act. The Auditor General had allowed people to be appointed to that branch without passing the civil service examination. Hitherto I have been going on that assumption. But, not long ago, the Auditor General made up his mind that this was not consistent with the Civil Service Act. For the purpose of paying the people who had been engaged on the original understanding, it is necessary to put in these words.

Mr. FOSTER.

Arts, agriculture and statistics—for the purpose of assembling at Ottawa and nationalizing live stock records of the Dominion, $5,000.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to reduce this vote, by $2,000. I shall have to ask for the whole $5,000 eventually, but I find that I shall not be able to spend more than $3,000 on this service before July 1st.

Mr. FOSTER. I received a letter a short time ago from the Holstein breeders. I have not the letter at hand at the moment, but as I recollect it, they seemed to think that too much respect had been paid to the freight handlers' side of the question. The minister will probably know to what I am alluding and will be able to explain it.

Mr. FISHER. I think I can explain it. Probably my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has received the same representations which have been made to myself. I do not think the difficulty he mentions is exactly the one which is most dwelt upon by the Holstein breeders. In assembling the records so that the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa might be able to affix the official stamp to the pedigree certificates, I found, on investigation, that it was absolutely necessary, as a practical matter, that the keeping of the records should be conducted here and not at other points in the country.

Mr. FOSTER. That is it.

Mr. FISHER. The Holstein breeders have desired to keep their records still at a place called St. George, in Western Ontario. I have had to say to them that I did not see how it was practically possible for us to affix the stamp of the department to these records, and examine them in the way we ought to do before affixing that stamp, unless the records were kept here. All the other record associations have agreed to transfer their records here. I have made that a part of the conditions on which the official stamp could be affixed, and I have informed the Holstein breeders that I am ready to do in their case what I have done in the case of other breeders, but I cannot see how I can make them an exception, when I have made this condition a sine qua non with the other associations.

Mr. FOSTER. That would seem fair at first glance. But are there no exceptional circumstances in the position of the breeders of Holsteins? I understand they have hitherto kept their records at St. George. I suppose they have an office there and that all breeders of Holsteins send in their pedigrees to that office?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, I take it their objection is that they would be put to expense by establishing an office here?

Mr FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then what is it?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know what it is. I have been given various reasons for it, but the Holstein breeders have given no reason except that they desired to keep their records at St. George. Other breeders' associations have transferred their records from the places where they were formerly kept. More of them were kept in Toronto, and these have been transferred to Ottawa. Some records were kept in Nova Scotia and some in New Brunswick, and these have been transferred here. There are some in Quebec which I hope will be transferred here within a few weeks or months, some who have made objection. But they all agree without exception that it is in the interest of the whole work that the records should be transferred here. The Holstein people are the only ones that have yet held out any objection.

Mr. LENNOX. How many associations will transfer their records here ?

Mr. FISHER. I think about a dozen.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the minister will expend $5,000 altogether, and $3,000 now. Would he tell us how this money is to be expended?

Mr. FISHER. I must premise that explanation by one or two statements. The nationalization of the records is for the purpose of combining all the records so that there shall be only one herd book for any one breed. There have been in some cases several herd books.

Mr. LENNOX. The statutes said only one association.

Mr. FISHER. The Dominion statute said there should be only one national association, but there have been several local ones. For instance, in the province of Quebec there is a herd book in which various kinds of cattle, sheep and swine are all registered. Each individual breed has been registered in Toronto, called The Dominion Swine Breeder's Records. But in the province of Quebec, Yorkshire swine and Berkshire swine have been registered. Now the object of the nationalization of the records is to do away with all these, so that there may be only one national record. For that purpose we have got to assemble here the various records that have been in existence. We find that with those records are certain books and documents which it is necessary to have here for the proper carrying on in future of this work. When an application comes in for registration, we have to refer to the books to see whether the pedigree is right for registration. I have had to make financial arrangements with some of these smaller herd books for the purpose of getting their books made up. For instance, I have had to pay to the Nova Scotia Department of Agriculture, $300 in consideration of which they have agreed to send all their books and documents up here. I have made an arrangement with Mr. Henry Wade, of Toronto, for a number of books which are his private property, not the property of the Breeders' Association but which are very necessary to have for my officers here to carry on this work in the department. I have had to pay $500 for those books. I have had to make an arrangement with the New Brunswick government and pay them $600 for what they have. I expect to have to make an arrangement with the Quebec breeders for some of their records, I do not know how much I shall have to pay. Besides that, we will have to purchase a considerable number of record books. For instance, we will have to procure volumes of shorthorn records in England, we will have to have in some cases certain record books in the United States, so as to be able to refer back when an application comes in ; we have to buy these books. The record associations themselves have books many of which we will have to obtain for the purpose of the department. It is for these purposes that this money is needed. We have already made arrangements which involve an expenditure of nearly $2,000, and I expect before the 1st of July to have to expend another $1,000. The rest of this money I will not expend until after the 1st of July. I hope $5,000 will cover our needs, but I am not sure of it.

Mr. LENNOX. The $5,000 are the initial expenses to put it on a working basis ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I hope that will do, but that does not mean for the expenses of the current year. That will come in under the vote for the live stock division, which I will ask parliament to grant in a short time.

Mr. LENNOX. That will be granted from year to year to keep it going.

Mr. FISHER. That will be part of a large vote which I ask parliament for my live stock association.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Prospectively, how much will that vote be?

Mr. FISHER. It will be larger for the next fiscal year than it is for this year. It covers many objects. I think I shall have to ask for about $50,000 next year. I may say that is part of the large vote which appears in the main estimates of $220,000 to cover the agriculture and dairying branches which used to be under Professor Robertson.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like the minister to state about what he thinks the actual expense will be of the change that was made by the recent Act, that is, to keep this national register in operation once it is assembled here at Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER. I think it will cost about $3,000 a year in the future.

Mr. LENNOX. Who gets the fee ?

Mr. FISHER. That fee goes to the Breeders' Association, we have nothing to do with it. The agreement which this association signed with me specifies distinctly that I shall have nothing whatever to do with their finances, because those are the finances of the individual breeders' associations. I may say that those breeders have met together and have appointed a small committee, of whom Mr. Robert Miller is the chairman and this committee have the management of their affairs. All we do is to provide for the necessary examination of the certificates of pedigree. We have to supply them with house room for their work when they are brought here, and supply the stationery.

Mr. FOSTER. The information I have is to the effect that there was a convention held in March, 1904, to discuss this matter and to organize, and that the stock breeders generally did not consider it wise to change their offices for various reasons. Their objections in that regard were set at rest by statements made by the minister, and by the live stock commissioner. Who is the live stock commissioner?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. F. W. Hodgson.

Mr. FOSTER. All the stockmen who had gathered and had discussed the matter were not favourable to the central office being established at Ottawa. He says that the breeders left that convention in 1904 thinking that they had been met sympathetically by the minister and the live stock commissioner, but they were disappointed, when, in the months of January and February last, they were met by the commissioner who referred to them certain letters from railroad freight managers which were in the line of favouring the central office at Ottawa. Most of the breeders associations fell in on that account with what they were not very well satisfied with the exception of the Holstein breeders association, and they stood out against it. A memorial, I dare say, has already been received by the hon. minister from the breeders belonging to that association. My informant says :

> We do not want to be coerced into doing that which we do not believe to be contrary to the interests of our association.

He seems to think that it is the live stock breeders in conjunction with the railway people who are pressing for this. What interest would the railway people have in it ?

Mr. FISHER. I will explain that when my hon. friend sits down.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the chief part of the information outside of the memorial which the hon. minister has.

Mr. FISHER. I will explain to my hon. friend that his correspondent is mixing up two things that are entirely different. The question of the railways, which I will deal with at once, has nothing whatever to do with the transference to Ottawa of the records. For some time back—perhaps for six or seven years—my department has been dealing with the railways with the object of securing special rates for thoroughbred live stock in Canada. We have been very successful in this inasmuch as when a certificate of pedigree has been presented with a way-bill of registered live stock the railways have given as low as less than half the usual rates.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be for breeding purposes ?

Mr. FISHER. For breeding purposes and only for thoroughbred registered stock. That was done through the mediation of my live stock commissioner.

Mr. LENNOX. Would that include shipments for exhibition purposes too ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Would it include sending stock to exhibitions ?

Mr. FISHER. That is another matter. We have also obtained special rates for exhibitions, but what I am speaking of are the ordinary shipments by farmers which are made every day in the year. If a farmer in western Ontario wants to buy a bull for the improvement of stock in Ottawa or in this neighbourhood he can get about half rate on the shipment of that animal if he presents a certificate showing that the animal is thoroughbred. In the same way, if you want to send an animal to the Northwest Territories, or the maritime provinces, or anywhere in Canada, this arrangement is made for the special purpose of encouraging the improvement of stock. We appealed to the railways and after a good deal of negotiation and trouble we got a special rate. I must congratulate the railways upon being sufficiently public-spirited to agree to this arrangement in the interest of live stock men. Difficulties were constantly arising as to what pedigrees should be recognized. There were different kinds of pedigrees and the railway companies frequently made complaint to us, as the department at whose instigation and at whose request this privilege was given, saying that they were troubled and bothered because they got all sorts of pedigrees issued by different associations and they did not know which to recognize. This came to a head last winter when the railway companies threatened that they would have to abrogate the privilege. When it came to that point the question of the nationalization of records was proceeding, and we expressed the hope that in a short time we would be able to issue national records when all other records in Canada would be practically wiped out or ignored. In the process of these negotiations the railways came to the live stock commissioner

and through him to me and they said : We will continue these rates, but we want you to indicate to us which records we are to recognize. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), has also come to me and asked what records he should recognize of animals brought in from abroad for breeding purposes and entitled to free entry, and I have instructed my live stock commissioner to go into the matter to see what report he can make upon it. While the movement for the nationalization of records was in progress the suggestion was made, either by the railways or the live stock commissioner—I forget which—that we should get up a certain form of record or pedigree, that that should be the recognized form and that the railways, when they get that kind of form, would know at once that it was the recognized pedigree and they must give the better rates. That negotiation is in process to-day and I think it is very well understood that the railways are only going to recognize pedigrees which are stamped by the Department of Agriculture.

But, that point has nothing whatever to do with the transference of the records to Ottawa. It is a matter of general application. It is a matter with which personally I have very little to do except to authorize my live stock commissioner to go ahead. It is a matter in which the live stock commissioner, working in harmony with the officials and the representatives of different breeders' associations, has been negotiating with the rest. That matter as to the transference of the records here has been described a little incorrectly, or, at least, certainly not consistently with my interpretation of what occurred. My hon. friend says from this letter that at the convention that took place a year ago last March in Ottawa the live stock men asked for the nationalization of the records but wanted to keep their records in their own hands. I said certainly that I would not consent for a moment on behalf of the Department of Agriculture to interfere with the management of the records, but I did point out very clearly to them that to do the work which they asked me to do, namely, to affix the departmental stamp to each pedigree as it was issued, required that an officer of mine should have access to their books, should have an opportunity of looking over and investigating the way in which they were issuing their pedigrees, or else I could not take the responsibility of affixing a government seal to these pedigrees. If I did that without examining into the method pursued it would be a mere perfunctory operation which would be of no value to them, which would do no good and which might discredit the department. If it were to be anything more than a mere perfunctory operation it would require that my officer should see how the certificates were issued by each record association, and that he should satisfy himself that they were carrying on that work not in a way dictated by us but in accordance with their own rules and regulations. That is the whole sum and substance of our supervision.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they will have to have an office here and keep the books here ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I do not see how that work could be satisfactorily performed unless the issuing of these pedigrees by all these associations is carried on here. That is the whole sum and substance of the difficulty or difference or grievance. I may say that up to the present time every breeders' association which has been in negotiation with my department has acceded to my request in that respect, with the single exception of the Holstein Breeders' Association.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a matter of compulsion, or is it optional with themselves ?

Mr. FISHER. Entirely optional.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. They may come around yet ?

Mr. FISHER. They may. I wrote to them the other day, impressing upon them that they would stand in the way of their own interests if they held out in this case.

Mr. BLAIN. What explanation do the Holstein men give ?

Mr. FISHER. I have had no explanation, except that they do not wish to move to Ottawa, the present holder of the office preferring to retain it in his own hands.

Mr. BLAIN. What is his name ?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Clemons.

Mr. HERRON. Where is the office of the Holstein Breeders' Association at present ?

Mr. FISHER. At St. George, in the county of Brant.

Mr. HERRON. I may say that the people of the west consider that the live stock department in charge of Mr. Hodgson is doing a very valuable work in the way of bringing the western men and the eastern men engaged in stock interests together. That department has done a great deal to advance the interests of the stockmen of the west, especially by securing for us better facilities for shipping stock on the railways. I hope the work will be continued.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like the minister to inform the committee whether he will continue to incorporate other associations, or whether the policy will be limited to those now in existence ?

Mr. FISHER. By the law I can only incorporate one association for each breed. There are some breeds which are not incorporated, but I would be very glad if they could fulfil the conditions to be incorporated, and I have instructed the Live Stock Commissioner to encourage that as much as possible. For instance, there is no associa-

tion of the breeders of thoroughbred horses in Canada. Canadian breeders have to register in the United States. I think it would be very desirable, in the interest of horse breeding in Canada, to have such an association, and I would be glad to encourage it in every way. However, it is quite open to the breeders of thoroughbred horses to have such an association or not, just as they choose. There is no coercion on the part of the department, but my policy is to encourage and help it in every way possible.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood that the Act which was introduced a little while ago was by way of compromise to get over a difficulty and have the various associations concentrated here. Having that in view, I thought probably the policy of the government would be not to establish any more associations, with the object of completely nationalizing this matter in the end, by getting the various associations to surrender their rights and to come under the control of the government. I am not saying that would be the best policy, because I am not sufficiently informed to form an opinion, but I want to know if that was the view of the government.

Mr. FISHER. With regard to getting the associations under the control of the government, my policy is the very opposite. I think it is in the interest of the country that the management of these associations should be in the hands of the breeders and not under the control of the government or of any department. At the same time, I think the department can serve these people in a limited way, and I want to do that. With regard to forming new associations, there can be only one association for each distinct breed or class of animals. Where one is already formed, no other can be formed.

Mr. LENNOX. What I referred to was the registration being in the hands of the government and other matters being in the hands of the different associations.

Mr. FISHER. The breeders do not think so, and I have not wished in any way to interfere with that feeling on their part. In all my communications with them I have been very careful to insist that the government would take upon itself just as little interference with their work as was possible to carry out their views, and what I am doing is being done only at their request. I want it thoroughly understood by the country that neither I nor any other officer of my department desires or will be permitted to encroach in any way upon the rights and privileges of the breeders themselves in their own sphere.

Mr. CHRISTIE. I think what brought up this whole question of nationalizing the records were the difficulties which the breeders had with the railways, which they have had for several years in connection with the shipping of thoroughbred live stock. The people of the west could get a thoroughbred animal brought to the west from any place in the east at half rates. The difficulty arose in regard to horses. The Clydesdale Association is the recognized association; but there is another association called the Draught Horse Association, which relates to horses which are not thoroughbred Clyde horses, but which may be part Shire and part Clyde. That association issues pedigrees, and these horses were coming out to the western country and being sold as thoroughbred horses. The railways got on to this, and notified the thoroughbred association that the arrangements made with them would be cancelled unless carried out as agreed. That induced the breeders to look into the matter to see what could be done, and the question came up of nationalizing all associations, with headquarters at Ottawa; and the breeders of thoroughbred stock are very anxious that this should be carried out. The minister has stated correctly that the management of every different breed is in the hands of the breeders, while the seal of the government is put on the certificate of any association when the government is satisfied that it is a proper one.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Is there any standard of what constitutes a thoroughbred animal? I suppose there is no means in the hands of the government for checking the registration of animals which are not thoroughbred, though they may be known as such in different sections of the country. It seems to me that in order to make the certificate valuable, there ought to be some means of showing that an animal is really a thoroughbred animal of a certain recognized class.

Mr. FISHER. The breeders themselves are very jealous in regard to that; I do not think anybody could be more so. As a safeguard, however, I may say that under our Dominion Act for the incorporation of record associations the rules and by-laws of the association have to be submitted to the Department of Agriculture and approved before the charter is issued. Then the pedigrees have to be issued under these rules and regulations and the chief use of my officer in examining the pedigree before he stamps it with the official seal is to see that it is issued properly, subject to those rules and regulations. We have first of all to acknowledge the correctness and the propriety of these rules and regulations and then all we have to see is that the pedigree is issued under those rules and regulations. If the rules regarding a society did not secure that it should be a properly bred animal we would not sanction them and would not give a charter of incorporation to that society.

Mr. STAPLES. I have had a little experience in bringing stock to the west. Two

or three years ago I purchased a number of heifers in the east at a certain price, getting about two-thirds of a carload of pure bred live stock. Then I filled up the car with high grade heifers, but I found that I could not get the benefit of the special rate for that reason. I do not know whether anything could be done in connection with the railway companies to give a person who wanted to bring out say half a carload of pure bred stock and the balance grades the benefit of the special rate. I figured the matter out from every point, and I found that it was to my advantage to pay the regular shipping rate, the carload rate, and take the full carload. I only wanted about twenty pure bred, and when I put in the other ten I found it was cheaper for me to pay the regular rate. It is not every farmer who can afford and has the capital to invest in a full carload of pure bred stock and therefore he receives no benefit from the special rate. Some arrangement should be made between the association and the railway companies whereby farmers would be able to get the benefit of the special rates. I was told by the railway companies that if every one of these had been thoroughbred except one I would have to pay the full rate. It would be a good thing for the breeders in the east as well as those in the west if some arrangement could be made whereby we would have a special rate on less than a full carload.

Mr. FISHER. Arrangements have been made for a special rate for the carriage of pure bred stock. Of course if you do not take a carload you cannot get the carload rate. The arrangement most usually practised is for two or three people to combine together and take up a carload, in which case they get not only the benefit of the rates, but also cheaper care. However, I shall bring the matter before my live stock officials and see if some improvement cannot be made.

Mr. STAPLES. It is not easy to go among your neighbours and find out which one wants to get thoroughbred stock. I am speaking of an individual case.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the scale of rates that the railroad will give under the Dominion Association of record as compared with the rates that are being given already to the individual breeders' association ?

Mr. FISHER. There is no difference. Lately we have had just as good rates as we expect to have in the future unless we can make better arrangements.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it will not make them any higher ?

Mr. FISHER. I hope that perhaps in the future we will be able to get better terms than in the past. What I meant was that the railways found so much confusion regarding pedigrees that they threatened to take away the advantage.

Cattle quarantine—further amount required, $40,000.

Mr. LENNOX. How much was the old amount?

Mr. FISHER. A hundred and fifty, I think.

Mr. ELSON. I wish to ask the minister what course is usually pursued in regard to quarantining cattle?

Mr. FISHER. That is rather a broad question. Does my hon. friend mean cattle coming into the country?

Mr. ELSON. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. They are kept for ninety days in quarantine at the quarantine station when coming in from Europe or any port not in America. We have no detention on the American frontier, except that if they do not bring a certificate that there is no disease where they came from with certain exceptions, and if they do not bring a turberculine test certificate we detain them until they are tested. That takes two or three days.

Mr. BLAIN. I wish to ask for some information with respect to the spread of glanders among horses. I have a communication here from a gentleman in my own county. I shall not read it all but shall quote a paragraph or two. He says :

About August 1st last I bought a horse from a farmer near here, and about September 30th the government veterinarian called and found the said horse to have symptoms of glanders and ordered same to be destroyed, which was done in his presence, but nothing whatever has been done by way of remuneration for this horse which cost me $65.

Further on he says :

I was put to about $25 expense by being unable to use my stable and by pulling down and rebuilding same. You will kindly take this matter up for me with the proper parties, which I hope will act wisely in the matter.

(Sgd.) J. M. BRUMMELL,
Mona Road.

February 14, 1905.

This seems to be a case of hardship, but it is possible the minister may be able to give the committee a satisfactory explanation. In looking over the report of the Dominion veterinarian, Doctor J. G. Rutherford, I find several references to the question of the spread of glanders among horses. At page 11 of that report the gentleman says :

I regret to have to report that it has been necessary, during the past year, to deal with a large number of cases of glanders. The disease has, as usual, prevailed to a greater extent in the Northwest Territories than elsewhere in the Dominion, 219 horses having been destroyed

there during the year. This is a considerable increase over previous years.

The minister will notice that the spread of glanders in the Northwest Territories is on the increase. Further on he says:

The serious outbreak discovered in the Ottawa district in August, 1902, has claimed a great deal of attention, and largely occupied the time of several of our officers.

A number of minor outbreaks have also been dealt with in Ontario and Quebec, while several cases have occurred in British Columbia. The disease made its appearance in the Yukon Territory during the winter months, and a considerable number of horses have been destroyed by the territorial authorities. 313 horses have been killed during the year by our officers, while a very large number of contact animals have been submitted to the mallein test and dealt with on the system outlined in my report of last year.

Coming to the question of compensation, at the same page, he says :

I would, however, strongly recommend that some compensation should be paid to owners of horses slaughtered after reacting to the third test, so long as they show no clinical symptoms of the disease. While there may be a question as to the necessity, or even the wisdom, of paying compensation for horses killed when clinically affected such animals being highly dangerous not only to other horses but also to human beings.

It appears, in the opinion of the chief veterinary, that horses afflicted with glanders are dangerous, not only to other horses with whom they come in contact, but to human beings such as the man engaged in taking care of them and working them.

Further on he says :

The experience of all other countries goes to show that the payment of a reasonable compensation for animals destroyed is one of the strongest inducements to owners to report outbreaks of disease to the proper authorities.

Then he gives the number of horses destroyed by the various veterinary inspectors in different parts of the Dominion. When a veterinary surgeon enters a farmer's stable, finds a horse affected with glanders, and decides, after thorough examination, that the animal should be killed and orders it to be killed for the better protection of the other horses in that neighbourhood, it seems to me that the government should make some provision for the payment of at least some portion of the amount which the farmer has to lose. Take the case of the gentleman I have mentioned, who bought a horse for $65, which the veterinary ordered to be killed. It was killed in his presence, so that the owner lost the $65 and in addition had to pull down and rebuild his stable at a cost of $25. The animal was killed in his own interest to some extent but also, according to the report of the chief veterinary, in the interests of the other owners of horses in that neighbourhood. It will be remembered that this man bought the horse from one of his own neighbours, which the veterinary surgeon ordered to be destroyed. I think that the law should be so changed that when an animal of this kind is killed the government should pay him some compensation.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with my hon. friend, but the question is one that has come up a good many times in this House, and there has always been very considerable disinclination shown by parliament to the payment of compensation. My hon. friend can well remember the discussions we have had regarding the payment of compensation in the case of animals infected with tuberculosis, which were killed to prevent the spread of the disease, and the same question has arisen on other occasions in connection with other diseases. There have been sporadic cases of glanders throughout the country, but more largely in the Northwest than in the east, and the department did not see its way clear to grant compensation, in the face of the views expressed in parliament. No doubt there were some individual cases of hardship. In fact some came before me that concerning which I felt the greatest hesitancy, but at the same time I did not see how I could give compensation without being properly authorized. The disease, however, seemed to be spreading, and it was represented to me that it was because no compensation was being paid. On this account the owners of animals afflicted with the disease were keeping them concealed and using them and spreading the disease, whereas if compensation were allowed they would perhaps have drawn the attention of the veterinaries to the cases and have been willing to have the animals slaughtered. After discussing the matter very carefully with my colleagues last summer and also in consequence partly of certain discussions here when we amended the Contagious Diseases of Animals' Act, I eventually recommended the passing of an order which would authorize me to pay compensation where the animals were clinically affected. An animal is clinically affected when the disease is apparent to the ordinary uneducated eye. The owner could see that the animal was diseased without knowing what the disease was. Under such circumstances we felt that the animal had reached the stage when it was practically worthless and therefore we need not pay any compensation. However, we passed the order on the 19th September last, authorizing me to pay compensation when the animals were not clinically affected, but reacted to the mallein test, which is supposed to be an absolute proof of the presence of glanders. My veterinary said that the danger of spreading the disease was not so great in the case of animals clinically affected as in the case of animals which had come in contact with those and

had become merely affected by the disease but did not show it, but in which the disease was liable at any moment to show. The result was that when an animal was found to have come in contact with one clinically affected, we tested it with the mallein test. But first of all we made regulations by which, at the option of the owner, he might have the animal quarantined. Otherwise it would be slaughtered and no compensation given.

This went on some little time, and we found a great deal of feeling throughout the country. Some people got compensation and their neighbours did not. It was difficult to explain the difference between one case and another. The ordinary person who did not receive the explanation could not understand the difference and many felt they were being badly treated. This occasioned a great deal of difficulty. And we found again that people who had clinically affected horses were using them as much as they could, but trying to conceal the symptoms, and probably spreading the disease. Many representations were made to me by members of parliament and others throughout the country; and, eventually, after careful consideration, it was decided to undertake a vigorous campaign against the disease and stamp it out as far as possible. For this purpose, we decided to pay compensation in every case and to slaughter all horses affected, wherever found, without reference to the desire of the owner. On that understanding a further Order in Council was passed on the 25th of March last, authorizing me to slaughter horses affected with glanders and to pay the compensation which the law provides in other similar cases.

Mr. BLAIN. What would that be ?

Mr. FISHER. Two-thirds of the value of the animal as estimated by the veterinary surgeon who authorizes the slaughter. This is the same as in the case of other animals slaughtered under similar circumstances. I find that, since this Order in Council was passed and with the activity with which I considered it necessary to prosecute this campaign to stamp out this disease, we are killing a great many horses and paying out a very large amount of money. I shall be obliged to ask parliament, for the next year, to give me a very considerably larger sum to deal with this disease in this way.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been paid out since this order came into force in March last ?

Mr. FISHER. Since the commencement of payment, the sum paid out is $29,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mostly in what part of the Dominion ?

Mr. FISHER. Wherever a case has occurred.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Where has the disease been most prevalent ?

Mr. FISHER. In the Northwest. At present there are two or three outbreaks in Quebec that have been occasioning a good deal of trouble. But the Northwest appears to be the chief seat of the disease. It is about a year or a year and a half ago that we first found cases in Quebec. There have been a good many about Ottawa. Last summer or fall, about 75 or 80 horses were slaughtered within five miles of where we sit.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Can that be traced to the importation of western or Mexican horses ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not think so. That statement has been made, and it may be correct; but we have no proof, and I think we would have had proof if it had been true.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. This is going to run into a large sum of money.

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I have told my colleagues that I would probably have to ask for $100,000 additional.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister paid out any sums for horses in the Northwest ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think so. We have been dealing with every part of the country exactly the same.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A great many horses were killed by order of the veterinary of the Mounted Police at Fort Saskatchewan.

Mr. FISHER. When ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Last November and December.

Mr. FISHER. If they were not clinically affected we would pay compensation for them. I have already explained that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Some complained that the veterinary had ordered horses to be killed that need not have been killed. I refer to the country east and north of Beaver lake.

Mr. FISHER. I can look up that instance. We have constantly had representations of that kind, and I have had them carefully looked into. I have been disposed to deal with such cases on the principle of giving the owner the benefit of the doubt, because I have felt that often it was a case of hardship. Still, I never had authority to pay compensation for the slaughter of horses for glanders until September 19th last. Many cases occurred before that—scattered cases. There were many cases of hardship in the Northwest in the case of settlers whom I would have been glad to deal with generously had I had authority to do anything, but I could

not give compensation because the Order in Council was not passed until September 19.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. minister include Manitoba when he speaks of the 'Northwest.'

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. STAPLES. How long is it since compensation was paid in Manitoba ?

Mr. FISHER. None was paid until September 19.

Mr. STAPLES. Have they been receiving compensation there since September 19?

Mr. FISHER. Any horses that were slaughtered by any of my officers since the 19th of September last were compensated for provided they were clinically affected. This was up to March 25, when the Order in Council was passed to allow me to pay for any horse slaughtered on account of glanders.

Mr. STAPLES. I have had a good deal to do with this question of glanders in Manitoba since I came here, because in my own district the people have sustained great losses. I have taken up this question with the chief veterinary officer, but he has only been allowing compensation in Manitoba since January last. I understand that compensation was not given until some arrangement was made between this government and the government of Manitoba. I think it would be only fair in Manitoba to those who have sustained losses through this cause that the rule should be made retroactive so as to place the people of Manitoba on the same level as the people of other provinces. During the months of December and January, I believe, about twenty-five horses were slaughtered in my own district for which no compensation was given. Those in other provinces who had sustained similar losses having been compensated, I feel that we are entitled to the same treatment.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples) is not fully seized of the facts. The orders for the slaughter of the horses to which he has referred were issued by the provincial government of Manitoba, and with that work I had nothing to do. While we were at work in this matter the provincial government also entered upon the work. The provincial government asked my department to take over the business of settling for horses killed on this account in Manitoba. I agreed to do this, but, at the same time, I said I could not be responsible for what the provincial officers had been doing, that I could only act through my own officers. The arrangement was concluded about January between the chief veterinary officer of the department and the provincial authorities. Since that time, I understand, the provincial government have not been doing any work in this line, but my officers have been doing the work. I will deal with Manitoba just as I have dealt with every other province, but I cannot undertake to pay compensation for horses, the order for slaughter of which was issued by the provincial government and carried out by the provincial officers. We only pay compensation under any circumstances, for any animals in any part of the country, the slaughter of which has been ordered by my own officers.

Mr. STAPLES. The provincial authorities, I understand, have turned the whole matter over now to the Dominion authorities, but when this matter was under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, and when those who had their horses slaughtered asked for compensation, the answer they invariably got was : We have nothing to do with it, it is under the jurisdiction of the federal government. Now, the provincial government, as I understand, were getting ready to hand over the entire jurisdiction to this government, the department here were willing to take it over. Now, as this transfer was contemplated ever since September, I think that those parties in the province of Manitoba who have had to lose their horses should receive compensation up to that date. I know farmers out there who had to slaughter their last horse, and they can ill afford to suffer the loss. There is another question. I would ask that the government here appoint local veterinaries as well as district veterinaries, I understand that the officers now looking after glanders in Manitoba are appointing certain veterinaries whose jurisdiction covers large districts. The local council asked that you should appoint as well a local veterinary in each municipality, and let them report to those who have jurisdiction over a larger district. I think the minister will see the force of that. A disease breaks out, and by the time you reach the man who has to issue a certificate, and before the horse can be slaughtered, the disease may have spread. There is another difficulty. According to the Act a person is not entitled to compensation unless the horse reacts to the third test. The trouble is that the moment the farmer—I won't say all the farmers, but a certain class of horse dealers—the moment they see a horse has the sign of glanders, they immediately trade him off. I believe that if fair compensation was granted for a horse that showed the slightest sign of the disease, we would much sooner stamp the disease out than we can do when we have to wait until the horse reacts to the third test.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Staples), not unnaturally, confuses these different orders. When we dealt with the question of the mallein test, we gave a certain option to the owner, that if he was not satisfied with the first test he might hold

his horse in quarantine, in which case he could not sell it except under severe penalty, and the purchaser could get back at him without any trouble. He could hold the horse in quarantine and afterwards have it re-tested. This was an option which we gave to the owner, because sometimes he was not satisfied with the first test. But it is only when the owner desires to do so, and if the owner so desires and takes that option, we also say that we do not then undertake to pay compensation. If he is going to get his compensation he must hold to the first test. If he is not satisfied to do that, he can hold his horse in quarantine, and if it is retested and found to be diseased, he will have to lose his chance for compensation. We do that for the purpose of discouraging the holding of an animal in quarantine which we believe is diseased. I may say that the mallein test is looked upon by veterinaries as a pretty fair test, and we believe that a horse which has re-acted to the mallein test is diseased and ought to be slaughtered. If a man insists upon holding his horse after it has re-acted on that test, we think he ought to lose his chance of getting compensation. If he were to sell it in the way my hon. friend points out, he would be subject to a severe penalty under the law, and the purchaser would be easily able to get back his purchase money.

Mr. LAKE. I am glad to hear the Minister of Agriculture say that he has decided to grant compensation in all cases in which horses are slaughtered with the intention of trying to stamp out this disease of glanders. Only the other day, in one of the smaller newspapers of the Northwest, I saw a statement to the effect that the department had decided to grant this compensation in cases where there were clinical symptoms. It is a question in which I have been taking some interest, and I was surprised to find that it was not made more generally known that the department had changed its policy in this respect. There is another question that I would like to bring up in connection with this change of policy on the part of the department. On the 19th of September last, apparently, the minister was first authorized to grant compensation for horses which showed no clinical symptoms, but which re-acted to the mallein test. Between that time and the 25th of March, when the new policy was adopted, there have been a considerable number of horses slaughtered. It is not always quite certain, even when the symptoms appear to be clear to the veterinary who happens to be examining, that a horse is affected with glanders. Veterinaries are liable to err just as much as doctors. I am convinced in my experience with outbreaks of glanders in the Northwest that many mistakes have been made, that horses have been condemned as having clinical symptoms and have been slaughtered by the government officers which have not been affected by glanders at all. Now, it is probable there were many such cases between the 19th of September and the 25th of March, and I think it would be good policy in consideration of any cases of hardship which may have occurred during that period to make this order retroative, at any rate, as far back as the 19th of September last. I think no harm will be done by doing so. I further think that information in regard to the new policy of the department should be spread broadcast through the country. A great effort ought to be made to stamp out this disease. I think when it is known that the government will pay compensation, even when there are clinical symptoms present, it will encourage the owners of horses to bring out any horse which is under suspicion and have it examined. In this way the department will be more likely to stamp out the disease.

Mr. FISHER. It would be difficult to make this retroactive. I am afraid if we once began that we would never know where to stop. I would not like to start it.

Mr. STAPLES. Suppose I were able to testify from personal knowledge of cases where men had lost their horses slaughtered, and suppose that what I said was corroborated by other strong evidence, in that case I think compensation should be allowed. I might ask the hon. minister why it was that the province of Manitoba was not considered until some time in January, when other provinces were receiving compensation ?

Mr. FISHER. It was due to some objections the Manitoba government themselves had to handing over the work to us. We had been negotiating for some time and we were ready to do it, but they did not seem to want us to take it over.

Mr. LENNOX. Did not the Order in Council apply to all Canada ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. It was not undertaken in Manitoba because the local government officers were doing the work.

Mr. STAPLES. Why had you not the same right to go into Manitoba and deal with the disease there as you had in other provinces?

Mr. FISHER. Because the local government was doing the work.

Mr. STAPLES. They were doing the work because it was very necessary that they should do it until it was taken over. I do not see any reason why the province of Manitoba should be held up when all the other provinces in Canada were being assisted.

Mr. FISHER. They were not held up in the slightest degree.

Mr. STAPLES. They did not receive the same assistance.

Mr. FISHER. That was their own fault.

Mr. STAPLES. Will the hon. minister consider the advisability of appointing a local veterinary surgeon ?

Mr. FISHER. We tried that but we found that it does not work well at all. The local veterinary is frequently influenced by the feeling in the neighbourhood and we have to send a man from some other place. It is the duty of any local veterinary, whether called in or not, if he knows of a case, to report it immediately to the department. We have found that the handling of these cases, especially where compensation is concerned, by a local veterinary is very unsatisfactory and I could not undertake to return to that method.

Mr. BLAIN. Are the horses to be killed under the instructions of one veterinary examiner and as the result of one examination, or under the instructions of the government veterinary examiner without any corroborrative evidence ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they are to be killed on the report of the government verterinary. That is the case in regard to the slaughter of other animals—hogs, cattle and horses.

Mr. BLAIN. I rather agree with my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) that the hon. minister should have made this Order in Council a little better known to the people of Canada, and I think, that, particularly when the House is in session, these special orders which are passed by the government should be made known to the House at least. Here is a special Order in Council passed on the 20th March when this House was in session by the instruction of the hon. Minister of Agriculture himself ; yet, the House has been in session continuously since January 11 to this moment and the hon. minister has never thought it to be his duty to make a statement to that effect in the House so that the members would know it. When Orders in Council are passed regarding important questions touching the whole of the people of Canada I think the hon. minister should make a statement to that effect, so that members of parliament should be well informed on these questions. My hon. friend shakes his head.

Mr. FISHER. I only shake my head because that is not the practice.

Mr. BLAIN. I am condemning the method because it is not the practice. Here is the hon. Minister of Agriculture, having charge of the duty of checking the spread of a very dangerous disease among horses, a certain Order in Council is adopted and then cancelled and a very important Order in Council is passed on the 19th of September, a few days before the issue of the writs for the general election. It may have some significance perhaps, but I will not discuss that. nor another Order in Council passed on March 20th. I am very much surprised that the hon. minister did not think it his duty to stand up and make a statement so that those representing different districts throughout Canada interested in this question would have an opportunity of communicating the contents of this Order in Council to their constituents instead of having to wait for several weeks for the people to be informed on the question. I condemn legislation by Order in Council.

Mr. LAKE. In reference to the question of whether this provision should be retroactive or not I wish to point out that it appears that a man whose horse was examined on the 25th March by the veterinary inspector, and found to have clinical symptoms, will receive compensation for the horse. If the veterinary happened to get round to his neighbour the day before, that neighbour would receive no compensation for his horse. It seems a case of hardship and there will be a great deal of heart burning in certain places in regard to this matter. As the department have practically agreed that this compensation should be granted for all horses slaughtered they should have gone one step farther and made the 19th September the date from which the payment of compensation should begin.

Mr. FOSTER. If the committee will pardon me a moment or two there is a question that is raised here which is I think a somewhat important one. Is this legislating by Order in Council for the payment of public money without the authorization of parliament ? If you can do this it seems to me you can do almost anything.

Mr. FIELDING. There must be an appropriation.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be an appropriation, but there must be an appropriation for an expenditure in view of that legislation by Order in Council. No such policy as this has been pursued in Canada before. The Minister of Agriculture is launching out under an Order in Council which includes a ciass of expenditure which has not before been recognized by parliament but which is distinctly outside of the policy heretofore in vogue. For instance, there was no authority at all at a certain time to pay even part of the value of any horses which were killed on account of this disease. I think that policy remained up to or within a very short time ago—up to September, do I understand the minister ? Am I right in this that up to September there was no payment for horses that became diseased in this way and were slaughtered by the orders of the veterinary ?

Mr. FISHER. There was no provision by Order in Council, but the statute always has contemplated that provision being made by Order in Council at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be, but the hon. minister comes down this afternoon

and says that as a result of this Order in Council he will expend probably $100,000 this year. Does my hon. friend and does the government not think it would have been wiser to have brought the matter before parliament before such an expenditure was engaged in and made necessary, or does the government think that it is the proper way to launch the country into very large expenditures on a policy not before contemplated or authorized by the House? If by Order in Council you can take up new expenditures not heretofore authorized by the House, and if by Order in Council you can go on with operations which will call for hundreds of thousands of dollars it is taking the wrong step first, and what the hon. Minister of Agriculture should have done was to have come to the House and explained the grounds for his belief that a new policy should be introduced, and if after discussion parliament agreed with and endorsed it, then a new expenditure might be engaged in. It looks very much like bringing the country into a large expenditure simply under action by Order in Council.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend to a certain extent, perhaps, is right, but still not quite. There is a large vote every year for the protecting the health of animals and for cattle quarantine. That money is first of all voted by the House and it is then expended under the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, which Act authorizes the payment of compensation under Order in Council. The power was fully in existence when the vote was passed. It has been exercised in days gone by in regard to other diseases, and power was clearly and distinctly given by the Act to Council to pass an order at any time in regard to this class of payments.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is stretching it.

Mr. FISHER. To-day, for instance, there is $40,000 additional on this year, which is very largely due. Of course, if the House says that it will not grant the money, the Order in Council will have to be rescinded.

Mr. FOSTER. That same argument could be used in every case. I think it would be better to ask the House for the money first. My hon. friend talks about $100,000. If he makes a policy of this kind general throughout the Dominion, $100,000 would be a small amount compared with what he would have to pay. It would amount to hundreds of thousands. Then the point comes, how far should the government, acting for every individual in the country, bear the whole or the major part of the expense? Then, the minister will have to be very careful of two things: first, what diseases come over the border, and, secondly, what steps are taken in our own country to stamp out these diseases? A very profitable trade could be carried on in old and diseased horses if the government paid two-thirds of the cost in every case. In the third place, he will have to be careful about the veterinarians he appoints, on whose recommendations the money is paid. I quite agree with the minister that local veterinarians should not be relied on in every case. Not that they will not be found honest, but the pressure upon them is often too great to withstand.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HERRON. I was going to ask the minister at six o'clock if this compensation allowed for animals slaughtered to prevent the spread of contagious diseases applies to anything except horses with glanders ?

Mr. FISHER. It does not apply to horses with any other disease. We pay compensation as a regular rule for hogs that are slaughtered for cholera. We also paid for many years for cattle affected with the Pictou cattle disease, a disease prevalent in a very small area of Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island. By the law the minister can pay compensation, but as a matter of practice the minister has never done so except on Order in Council. Council passes regulations authorizing such payments and the regulations do not authorize any payment of compensation except for hogs slaughtered for cholera, cattle affected with the Pictou cattle disease and for horses affected with glanders.

Mr. HERRON. The reason I asked the question is that in the locality where I live a very serious disease has broken out among horses this last year. Is the minister aware of the fact ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. HERRON. The maladie du coït.

Mr. FISHER. I think we have authority to pay compensation for horses affected with maladie du coït. I must have it looked up but I think that is the case.

Mr. HERRON. That I believe is a more serious and fatal disease than glanders at the present moment.

Mr. FISHER. It is very serious.

Mr. HERRON. And if it spreads to any extent I am certain it will be more serious. At present it prevails in a portion of Alberta, but we have had some hundreds of horses affected there in the last few years. I know one herd in particular where 20 mares and an entire horse worth about $1,000 have been under quarantine for 12 months before I left home. The owner has been ordered to slaughter the horses, but the animals are still alive. I think the government are experimenting to some extent with the disease at a large quarantine station at

Lethbridge. I would like to know the results.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is quite correct in what he says about this disease. It was introduced from the United States some little time ago. It was only recently, I think perhaps 15 or 16 months ago, that the chief veterinarian adviser of the department found some cases of it. Knowing the very serious character of the disease immediate active steps were taken to examine into the condition of affairs and as my hon. friend says it was found that there was a considerable number of affected animals. To act promptly we wished to see at first whether there was any necessity for slaughter, and we therefore cellected all the animals we could find affected with the disease in a certain quarantine station. My chief veterinary inspector went up and consulted with the horse owners and ranchers in the neighbourhood and some considerable number—speaking from memory I think over 200 horses—were collected in the quarantine grounds to which my hon. friend refers. We have been watching it there. The disease is chiefly visible at certain times in the year; in the spring it is more likely to be found than at any other time. My hon. friend probably is aware of the nature of the disease. The chief veterinary officer, Dr. Rutherford, is at present up in the Northwest examining further into the condition of affairs. He has been up there now two or three weeks and is going to stay there two or three weeks more for the express purpose of investigating the condition of affairs. We have not slaughtered animals for the disease yet wherever we find them; we quarantine them and if we slaughter them we will probably have to pay compensation according to the advice I receive from the chief veterinary officer. Here is a regulation relating to it:

> Every owner, breeder or importer of, or dealer in horses, shall on perceiving the appearance of maladie du coït, among the animals owned by him or under his special care, give immediate notice to the Minister of Agriculture and to the nearest veterinary inspector of the Department of Agriculture of the facts discovered by him as aforesaid.

Then it goes on about the entire horses and the rules against their running at large.

> No animal which is affected with maladie du coït shall be permitted to run at large or to come in contact with any animal which is not so affected.

And the officers were authorized to quarantine places where these horses had been, and they have power to isolate and quarantine these animals.

> The veterinary director general may, from time to time, order the slaughter, castration or other disposition of animals affected with maladie du coït.

Mr. HERRON.

We have not yet taken power to pay compensation. I believe that when my veterinary adviser returns, if the report is such as to require any slaughter of these animals we will be obliged to pay compensation. The law requires two-thirds of the value of the animal to be paid up to a certain sum. I hope within a few weeks to get a very complete report on the present condition of affairs, and until that comes I would not like to say anything more definite at the present time.

Mr. HERRON. Can the minister say where the disease came from? Is it supposed to have originated somewhere in Montana or Wyoming?

Mr. FISHER. There is a certain section of the United States where this disease has been common for a good many years. It was restricted in the United States by severe precautions and the authorities there asserted and our reports from there indicated that it was very circumscribed. Just where the disease came from into Canada we do not know. It had evidently been in the country for some little time before any report was made too late probably to make any satisfactory statement as to where it came from. I have no doubt it came across the line but just where I cannot say.

Mr. STAPLES. How any veterinary surgeon inspectors are there in Manitoba, who are they and where are they located?

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking rather from memory. There are Dr. Little, of Winnipeg, and Dr. McGillivray, also of Winnipeg, Dr. McGillivray, I think, did not reside in Winnipeg. I think he went there to live after he had been appointed one of our officers. Dr. Torrance is another. Then there is Dr. Robertson, who is at Emmerson, I think, and there is Dr. Schultz, of Gladstone.

Mr. STAPLES. Has each doctor a district?

Mr. FISHER. Each has authority anywhere in the province, but each probably does his main work in some district. Those in Winnipeg are liable to be called out of the city from any part of the province.

Mr. STAPLES. Upon what date did the minister take over the control of matters with regard to glanders in Manitoba?

Mr. FISHER. I have not the exact date. I think it was some time in January or the beginning of February. Of course, we always had a certain authority in these matters of animal diseases, just as the provincial governments have. We have always had officers in Manitoba and were doing certain work. But the provincial government were dealing with glanders and ordering the slaughter of horses affected with that disease. So long as they were doing that work, we did not think it wise,

nor did they, that both authorities should engage in it. But, when we made changes affecting the whole Dominion including Manitoba, it was suggested that we should take over the whole matter and that the Manitoba government should cease to deal with it. Eventually we came to an arrangement of that kind.

Mr. STAPLES. Then, I am to understand that, owing to the minister not exercising the authority he has, and the fact of the provincial government dealing with the glanders question, those who were unfortunate enough to have horses slaughtered on this account will receive no compensation. In view of the fact that people suffering similar losses elsewhere were compensated, I think that is hardly fair. I would like an explanation from the minister why Manitoba is not dealt with the same as other provinces from September, when the Order in Council was passed up to the time when this department took control of them.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, the work done by that provincial government was done under the provincial laws. I am not familiar with these laws, but I am informed that there was a provision by which certain of the municipalities could enforce the law.

Mr. STAPLES. But the provincial law could not prohibit the Minister of Agriculture from exercising his authority under the Dominion law?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. STAPLES. Then, I claim that the rule should be made retroactive and that these people should be compensated.

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter that may be open to argument.

Mr. HERRON. I was glad to hear the minister speak of maladie du coït and to know that he has recognized the importance of this matter. It is a far more fatal disease than glanders, and the shipping of a carload of horses from where it exists may spread it all over Canada, for it is a hard disease to check. If there is danger of it being brought in from the United States the horses coming from that country should be examined with the greatest care. I would urge the minister to guard carefully against the spread of the disease where it exists.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister has referred to the provincial law giving the municipalities jurisdiction in regard to glanders. I think this was optional. Some of the municipalities gave compensation and some did not. I read in one of our local papers that one of the Dominion officials, Doctor Schultz has been in my district and, in conjunction with the local veterinary, has ordered the shooting of a number of horses for glanders. That particular municipality gave compensation. But I see that they have had a great deal of glanders in a district probably forty miles in length and that many horses had to be destroyed. The municipality has suffered so much that they have given notice of the repeal of the by-law for it was too great a drain on the municipal treasury. I presume that the horses shot now will be compensated for by the Dominion government. Do the officials to which the minister has referred make reports at stated intervals to the department, or do they report to the head office in Winnipeg? Is there any superior in Winnipeg to whom they report?

Mr. FISHER. Every case is reported here direct—a separate report for each case.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Doctor Little, Doctor McGillivray and Doctor Torrance are all in Winnipeg. Are all on an equality, or is there any to whom the others report?

Mr. FISHER. All report here direct. Speaking from memory—as the chief veterinary officer is in the west, and I have nobody at hand who can give me the exact information—I think that one of these officers was given some general charge of the whole province. But they all have authority in all parts of the province and they all report here and not to any officer in Manitoba. But one of them is looked upon as the leader.

Mr. STAPLES. Doctor McGillivray?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, I think so.

Mr. STAPLES. What salaries do these officers receive?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say offhand, but I think they receive from $1,200 to $1,500 a year?

Mr. STAPLES. On what principle are these officers appointed? Why are they all selected from Winnipeg?

Mr. FISHER. They are not. Dr. McGillivray did not live in Winnipeg until he was appointed. Dr. Schultz did not live in Winnipeg. There is another of these officers living in Crystal City. I think that Dr. Little and Dr. Torrance were the only two who lived in Winnipeg until Dr. McGillivray moved there. And I think the reason Dr. McGillivray moved to Winnipeg is that as the railways centre in there one can more quickly and cheaply reach any part of the province from Winnipeg than from any other place.

Mr. STAPLES. Other veterinaries made application for appointment. For instance, take the southwestern part of Manitoba. There was one veterinary in Carman, a thoroughly eligible man, from a political as well as from every other standpoint. And Carman is a central point. Yet this gentleman did not get the appointment. Upon

what principle is the selection of those officers made ?

Mr. FISHER. My chief veterinary officer is a Manitoba man, and I referred the matter largely to his opinion, as he knows about it more than I do or anybody else, having lived in that province many years and having been a member of the local legislature there, where he had a great deal to do with the framing of the Manitoba law with regard to veterinary work.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Does the $1,500 include travelling expenses ?

Mr. FISHER. No ; they send in their expenses.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be satisfactory to the committee if the hon. minister would explain how he finds that he has the power to appropriate the money he did last year for the purpose of compensating for the destruction of cattle. At the time that we granted the appropriation last year there was no law in force enabling him to grant compensation to any one in the case of the destruction of cattle on account of glanders.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, there was.

Mr. LENNOX. There was a law enabling us to make compensation, but no provision for compensation until an Order in Council was passed. At the time we were making the grant there was no Order in Council. Consequently there was nothing at that time before the House which would authorize the paying of this money. It was only subsequently, on the 29th of September last, that the Order in Council came into force.

Mr. FISHER. Under the 12th section of the Act the Governor in Council may order compensation to be paid the owners of animals and also make regulations. Those regulations are embodied in an Order in Council, and then we pass an individual Order in Council for every individual payment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister, in fixing the compensation, observe the limit set forth in section 12 of the Act of 1903 ?

Mr. FISHER. Always.

Mr. LENNOX. This afternoon he said that the limit was two-thirds the value of the animal.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, up to a certain point.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister did not say that.

Mr. FISHER. I think I did.

Mr. LENNOX. He simply said that the amount paid was two-thirds the value of the animal. Will he explain now what it was he did say ?

Mr. FISHER. I followed the regulations exactly. There was an Act passed last year changing the compensation from one-third in some cases and three-quarters in others to a flat third all through. The statute of 1903 covers the whole Act. Then last session we passed an amendment with regard to compensation alone.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the minister tell what amount of money was paid in compensation between the passing of the Order on the 19th of September, to the final order that was passed on the 20th of March ?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say exactly, because the statement is not divided according to those dates, but from October 22, which was the date of the first payment under the Order in Council of September, to February 20, there was $8,942 paid. I could not say how much was paid in each province ; but in round figures it was chiefly in the Northwest Territories and Quebec. There was not one case in the maritime provinces.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister might give us the figures.

Mr. FISHER. Up to the present date, $29,000 ; up to the 20th of February about $9,000, that was about a month before the change. That is as far as I can give the figures.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. How do the returns look for the present month ?

Mr. FISHER. They are pretty heavy. Since this decision to pay for all cases was come to, on an understanding that a most determined effort was to be made to stamp out the disease, I have given orders to my officers to be more active in the matter. I think that within the last month they must have reports coming in for close on to $20,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is there any prospect of overcoming the disease ?

Mr. FISHER. I could not say that yet.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is the payment of this large amount of money liable to be attended with any abuses in the way of claims ?

Mr. FISHER. I think not. I have been trying to guard against that. I do not know whether my hon. friend was in when I said that we only ordered the slaughter on the report of our permanent officers, and it is on their valuation of the animal that we pay, we do not allow outside valuation. That is the case with all the animals slaughtered for which we give compensation. The veterinary who orders the slaughter fixes the value. Then the Act limits the amount of value which may be put upon an animal, so much for a thoroughbred, and less for a grade animal.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What is the average price paid for horses, on a two-thirds valuation ?

Mr. FISHER. I am told the payment lately has come to nearly $100 a piece.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is a big price for a western horse. Could the hon. gentleman tell us what class of horse it is, is it an ordinary western horse that seems to be affected, or is it the progeny of horses that have been taken from the east ?

Mr. FISHER. The horses that come into contact most frequently are the working horses, and in many cases these teams are worth a great deal more than we are allowed to pay compensation for. The horses that are running free we have not got at yet, to any extent.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. You may have a great big proposition.

Mr. FISHER. It is a serious proposition, I grant.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a possibility, it seems to me, that the minister may have to pay in cases that he does not contemplate. The Order in Council referred to, or a summary of it, provides, as the minister says, for compensation in the cases dealt with by subsection 2 of section 12 of the Animals Contagious Diseases Act, of 1903, as amended by chapter 6 of the statutes of 1904. Section 12 of Act of 1903 says :

The Governor in Council may order a compensation to be paid to owners of animals slaughtered under the provisions of this Act.

Of course the general provisions of this Act in that regard would be the preceding section 11 :

The minister may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious diseases, or suspected of being affected, and animals which are or have been infected by or in close proximity to a diseased animal or animals suspected of being affected by a contagious disease.

But if the minister will look at section 10, he will find that where the animal is offered for sale it may be seized by any inspector, and so on, who should report the seizure to the mayor, or reeve, or any justice of the peace having jurisdiction, and such mayor, reeve or justice of the peace may call in a veterinary to examine the animal. That is a summary of the clause. Of course it provides that the animal may be destroyed by the officer appointed by the minister, but it also provides that the animal may be destroyed on the order of the mayor, reeve or justice of the peace, on an examination which need not necessarily even be an examination made by one of the veterinaries appointed by the minister. I think that is pretty clear. I am not saying it is a very material point, but it does away with, or brakes in upon what the minister contemplates, that is, that he shall have through his officers complete control of the matter.

Mr. FISHER. Section 12 gives the Governor in Council latitude of paying compensation or not, just as they like.

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly.

Mr. FISHER. The Order in Council only authorizes the payment of compensation when the slaughter has been ordered by an officer of the department ; consequently, I think that fear which the hon. gentleman has expressed in regard to the latitude allowed under section 10 would hardly come in.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister might possibly be able to carry it out in that way. It says that the inspectors are authorized to slaughter, and then it says that the minister is authorized to order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals which are slaughtered under the provisions of section 12 and the amendments thereto. Section 12 provides for compensation where an animal is slaughtered under the provisions of this Act. Section 10 provides for the slaughter of an animal in a way which is not contemplated by the Minister, and I am very far from saying that it would be just to deprive a person of compensation because his animal happened to be slaughtered by order of a justice of the peace or mayor or some one of that kind upon an inspection by a local officer when this provision is made in the Act. I think it embraces a larger class of cases than that which he has referred to.

Mr. FISHER. I only referred to that to show that there is no danger.

Mr. LENNOX. I hardly think it is a danger. I think it is right enough, but it extends farther than the hon. minister would have us understand.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the veterinary surgeons who are employed in Manitoba at salaries amounting to $1,500 and expenses are employed the year round working exclusively for the government, or are they carrying on their own business and doing what the government require of them ?

Mr. FISHER. They are supposed to give all their time to our work and they are employed the year round.

Mr. HERRON. Does that apply to the veterinaries in the Territories ?

Mr. FISHER. In the Territories the work is done almost exclusively by officers of the mounted police, who work under my department in that respect. They are employed in their work as members of the mounted police and we make them a special allowance for the work they do for the Agricultural Department. But, I have some special officers in the Northwest and what I have stated applies to these. I would like to say that there is an officer in Winnipeg, Dr. Torrence, who is not paid by the year but who is paid

so much a day when he is employed. He does not give his whole time to our work.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister say who these officers report to and from whom they get their instructions ?

Mr. FISHER. The chief veterinary officer, Dr. Rutherford.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the hon. minister gentlemen employed in Ontario in the same way ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see that we have here in Ottawa, G. W. Higginson. Is he in connection with the department ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, he is paid. He is an officer giving his whole time to our work. I think that Dr. Higginson lives at Rockland. He is doing certain work there in that neighbourhood for us.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then there is Mr. A. E. Moore.

Mr. FISHER. Dr. Moore is a permanent officer who makes his headquarters here, but who travels all over the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. He is one of our most valuable officers.

Mr. TAYLOR. J. D. Whyte ?

Mr. FISHER. He makes his headquarters at Sherbrooke, Quebec, and works all along the frontier between Quebec and the United States in connection with the health of animals as well as travelling through the English speaking parts of Quebec.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see in the Auditor General's Report the name of M. Philps, Chatham. He draws a salary of $50 ; his livery expenses amount to $48.50 ; pair of rubber boots $6 and travelling expenses $15.05. What does Mr. Philps do ?

Mr. FISHER. He has been working in connection with the outbreaks of hog cholera. He requires rubber boots to go into the hog-pens. We have to provide all our officers with rubber boots. They put on these boots to go into the hog pens and when they come out they take them off and wash them thoroughly so as not to carry infection. If they went into the hog-pens with leather boots the infection would be carried by them.

Mr. TAYLOR. He gets a salary of $50 and his livery bill is $48 ?

Mr. FISHER. Quite possibly.

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I ask the hon. minister what information he has from Essex and Kent relative to the hog plague ?

Mr. FISHER. My information is that it is lessening to some extent. I cannot speak more positively than that. This spring we have not had so many reports and we have not had so many deaths as we had last year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. May I ask the hon. minister if the officials who have been employed for the last four or five years are lessening in number ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I have taken off any of the officers yet. I hardly think the situation would justify me in doing so, but just as soon as it will justify it there will be a decrease.

Mr. CLEMENTS. While I am thoroughly acquainted with the regulations regarding the hog plague there I may say that complaint is made that hogs are allowed to be taken from one township in which they have the disease and in which a quarantine has been ordered by a veterinary surgeon into another township where there is no disease perhaps ten miles distant. Is that a fact ?

Mr. FISHER. No, that is not a fact unless the hogs are being taken to a packing house. We allow hogs to be shipped from a township which is quarantined because of the presence of disease to a packing house when they are fit for slaughter. Of course, this refers to animals that are free from disease. We do not allow them to be shipped to any other place, but we have a special provision allowing hogs to be shipped to a packing house on condition that they are immediately slaughtered. We had a good deal of difficulty in regard to that because people sold hogs which were not ready for slaughter and upon arriving at the slaughter house, finding that they were not fit for slaughter, they were resold to farmers in the neighbourhood. We traced innumerable outbreaks of hog cholera to that cause. We made a regulation providing that the hogs were to be immediately slaughtered and the packing house people were strictly enjoined against shipping them out or selling them alive. Since the enforcement of this restriction the number of outbreaks of hog cholera has materially decreased in the neighbourhood of slaughter houses.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The disease has abated in my district to such an extent that we think the number of veterinary surgeons now employed to inspect these hogs is unnecessary. Instead of being veterinary surgeons they are hog inspectors who are employed to inspect the class of hogs that the hon. minister has spoken of and which are being sent to these factories. If a heavy fine were imposed upon these factories receiving these hogs for re-selling them, it would be a great saving to the country and the hon. minister would be able to reduce the number of officers who are drawing large salaries in my district amounting to $1,200 and $1,500 a year and expenses.

Mr. FISHER. We allow the hogs to be shipped provided they are healthy, and therefore they have to be inspected by some competent person who can say whether

they are healthy or not. The people there have been very urgent indeed in their request to us that we should give as much latitude as possible for the shipment of hogs. My hon. friend himself, I am sure, has had representations as to the stringency of the quarantine, and we have had similar representations from municipal authorities as well as from individuals. I have done everything I possibly could to make the quarantine as little irksome as possible. For that purpose I have retained inspectors with the view of enabling the people to ship out such hogs as they might, so that their feeding operations should not be interfered with more than was necessary in the public interest. I confess that the work is quite expensive, but it has been done in the interest of the people there, and I think it was justifiable, because those people make their living and derive the profits of their farms largely from the hogs they ship. We have to continue the inspection for some time after the outbreak, because we cannot be sure that the disease will not reappear.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I admit that it is a difficult question, and the minister has my sympathy to some extent. He knows that my district is probably more heavily affected in this matter than any other in the Dominion. There are a great many complaints there, and I think they are quite justified. Where a farmer had only three or four hogs affected out of 100 or 150, it seemed wholly unnecessary to kill the whole herd. Owing to the way the farmers were treated by the inspectors, they simply evaded the law, and I do not believe there has been one farmer in a hundred in the last year or two who reported the disease to the inspectors at all. I believe there are a number of inspectors there who should be dismissed. These men feel that they must do something for the money which the government is paying them; but it would be far better for the government to deal with the local inspectors, who, I think are more capable of taking care of the matter than the officials the government has there at present.

Mr. ELSON. I would ask the minister what progress is being made in stamping out sheep scab, which was found to exist three or four months ago in the province of Ontario?

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot give my hon. friend much information on that subject. The officers of the department have been watching it and following up cases wherever they could find them. I have not heard of any particular report within the last two or three weeks. Before that a considerable number of cases were discovered. My hon. friend knows that it is a disease which we do not require to slaughter for. It can be cured by proper treatment, and we impress that fact on the farmers. We have even gone so far as to send inspectors where we have heard of cases, and have given full instructions. We of course quarantine the affected flocks and have them thoroughly disinfected and cleaned. I think we have located every case; I do not think there is any case that we have not dealt with. In the spring, when the farmers shear their sheep, they are pretty sure to notice any symptoms of the disease, and every case that is discovered is treated. I do not think there is a flock infected in Ontario to-day which has not been attended to. More than that I cannot say.

Mr. CLEMENTS. What does the department term the hog disease that exists in my riding?

Mr. FISHER. We generally call it hog cholera.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Our veterinaries state that it is not hog cholera, but a certain plague. I may say that there are scores of farmers whose hogs have had this disease, but they have not reported it, and in a great many cases their hogs have got well. They have simply killed two or three which were sick, out of the flock, and the rest have got well. I think it is entirely unnecessary to kill the number of hogs which the officials of the department have demanded to be killed in the past.

Mr. MACLAREN. In what section of Ontario does this sheep disease exist?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I ought to say that, because I should have to speak entirely from memory, and I might make a mistake.

Mr. WILLIAM WRIGHT. I would like to call the attention of the members of this House to the over lapping of authority between the Dominion government and the local governments in regard not only to diseases of animals, but to various agricultural matters. We have local government officials as well as Dominion officials dealing with the matters which we have been discussing tonight. That seems to be an unnecessary overlapping of duties, and some arrangement should be made to have the authority vested exclusively either in the Dominion or in the provinces. There may be good reasons why this work can be handled better by the Dominion government, but they have not become manifest to me yet from the discussion that has taken place or from anything that I have been able to read on the question. I think these matters could be better handled by the local governments, which already incur very large expenditures for these purposes. I think we ought to look into this question and see whether a reduction of the expense could not be made, either by a joint arrangement be-

tween the Minister of Agriculture of the Dominion and the Ministers of Agriculture of the various provinces, or by transferring the whole business to the Dominion or to the provinces. The position seems to be this, that any province that takes hold of this matter energetically, and stamps out disease in the province would only have for its pains the privilege of putting up its share of the expense, while other provinces would throw the responsibility entirely on the Dominion ; thus a premium would be put on the carelessness of those provinces. But if the Dominion undertakes the responsibility, it should handle the business exclusively. I would like to ask the minister whether any steps have been taken with a view to coming to an arrangement with the various provinces with regard to matters touching agriculture in general.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, there is no line or organization which can prevent the passage of contagious diseases from one province to another. If one province is neglectful of these matters the other provinces will suffer. The constitution seems to allow provinces to pass laws relating to the health of animals, and also enjoins on the Dominion parliament to do this, too. We have passed certain laws. Those laws the provincial governments may enforce or not, just as they like. The provincial governments have power to pass laws also. In Ontario, for instance, there is quite a strong law against glanders, but at the same time the provincial government have taken no active steps to enforce that law. Some years ago they did for a number of years, but they have not done anything recently, and one of the most expensive enforcements of that law was here in Ottawa, where we had, a year and a-half ago, to slaughter a large number of horses in this neighbourhood. The provincial government knew perfectly well that the disease was in existence. We had another reason why it was difficult for a provincial government to do this. Some cases of the disease spread across the bridges here into Quebec, and we traced cases of glanders across the river and up into the lumber camps which had come straight from Ottawa, and the people there complained that this disease came straight from the province of Ontario. It was a matter which was not provincial, but interprovincial, and it seems that, under such circumstances, the provinces have a rather fair claim that the Dominion government should deal with these things. I confess that since I have been in office dealing with these things the work has grown a good deal. We have demands to do things, and, in view of the interests involved, I have tried to meet the demands as much as possible. That is one reason why the vote has increased, and I suppose that as the country increases and the industries increase, the people will demand more attention to their interests, and we will have to give it as time goes on.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to ask the minister whether he has decided on a policy in regard to the retention or otherwise of the present quarantine ground near Estevan ? I understand a certain amount of that ground has been permitted to go into the hands of private individuals, which has broken up the block as it originally existed. The land is good arable land, and the citizens of Estevan, I think, are very anxious that it should be settled up. I think myself that considering that the land is already broken up in this manner, it would be a wise thing to move the quarantine ground a little further west, where good pasture can be obtained in a single block.

Mr. FISHER. I am speaking a little from memory, but I know in the case of one or two of these grounds up there we have passed them over into the hands of the Interior Department for the purpose of settlement. I am not quite sure of the one at Estevan, but we have rather found out by experience that we do not need such large areas for quarantine purposes as we originally retained, and, unless I am mistaken, I think that ground, or a large portion of it, has been handed over to the Interior Department already. I shall look into the matter and let my hon. friend know.

Mr. BLAIN. Where can we find the reports of these inspectors ? The minister stated that they report to the chief veterinarian for the Dominion. Do the officers in Ontario give a weekly or monthly report to him ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that there is any general report. When they find a case of disease they send in a special report of that case. These are not published, but they are on the files of the department, where any member of the House can see them. We do not undertake to publish them ; the report of the department simply gives the report of the chief veterinary inspector. Reports such as I spoke of a little while ago are reports of individual cases of disease.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand the minister says that when a veterinarian goes out and finds a case of disease he make a special report to the head of the department here. These gentlemen are employed for the full year—365 days. There are a good many of them who scarcely find a case at all during the 365 days, and therefore no special report is made.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken in that. I do not suppose there is a week that every one of them does not send in something.

Mr. BLAIN. Special cases ?

Mr. FISHER. Cases they have dealt with. We keep them busy ; I can assure my hon. friend they are all as busy as they can be.

Mr. BLAIN. I know they are busy. Some of them have been very busy during the last election. My hon. friend beside me suggests that a large number of them are in London and North Oxford at the present time.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. I think these men are not overworked, to say the least of it, and that they should give a written report, so that the members of parliament and the country can understand just what they are doing. I could give some cases right at the present moment of what some of these gentlemen are doing. I rather think they have a great deal of liberty. The minister shakes his head. That is all very well, but I know what I am talking about on this point.

Mr. FISHER. Would my hon. friend give a special case ?

Mr. BLAIN. The minister would like me to mention a case. If he would look over the large number of days in which they are not giving any report and ask them for a report of those days, I think he would find something that would be rather interesting, and that he would give them more work than they have been doing in the last three or four years. I think these men should give a weekly written report to the department, so that it would come under the inspection of the members of this House, in order that the country might fully understand that these gentlemen are at work and would not have too much leisure time to work on special cases.

Mr. FISHER. I can assure my hon. friend that they have not much leisure time. I have had to appoint extra officers every now and then, because there is more work than the officers appointed can do. They make constant reports. I do not know that any of them make reports at definite times. There are sometimes two or three in a week, then perhaps not a report for a week and then another batch ; but there is a constant stream of reports ; there is constant communication with the central authorities here, both asking instructions and giving information. They do as much as my hon. friend suggests and, in many cases, more than that.

Mr. BLAIN. Do these officers have passes on the railways ?

Mr. FISHER. I am told that three of them have. Three of them are especially engaged in supervision of the railroad traffic in animals. Dr. Orchard is the chief. He has a pass. He is the special inspector of cars which carry live stock, and he has a pass on all the railways. Mr. Peterson, while not a veterinary surgeon, is connected with the Department of Agriculture in Manitoba and represents the department in certain ways. He has a pass on the railways of Canada. Dr. Rutherford himself has one.

Mr. BLAIN. I see in the Auditor General's Report that more than one of these officers gets $1,000 per year and expenses. What do those expenses include ? Do they include railway fares and living expenses while on the road ?

Mr. FISHER. They include the disbursements they are obliged to make while on government business. They have to give details, which must pass the accountant of the department and then pass the Auditor General.

Mr. BLAIN. A man could not make very extensive travelling for twelve months during the year on an expense account of about $200. I see one for $300 and some very much less. Compare that with the expenses of a commercial traveller, who gets $5 a day for travelling expenses, and you will see that these men cannot do much travelling and must be engaged in some other business.

Mr. FISHER. Some do work in the locality and have no railway travelling at all. Others travel more. We do not pay them so much a day like commercial travellers.

Mr. BLAIN. If they are driving, you would have to pay their livery fare and their living expenses on the road. It is absolutely impossible that these men can be devoting their full time for the year when their travelling expenses are only $200 and some less. They cannot be engaged in very active work at that rate.

Mr. TAYLOR. What are the duties of W. W. Starkey, of Brampton, which is in the constituency of my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain).

Mr. FISHER. I think he is an inspector of cattle yards and sheds in Toronto.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Some of these gentlemen were quite busy in my election last November. While I have every confidence in the head veterinary surgeon, I am not aware that any of his officials has ever prescribed for the hog cholera which is prevalent in my riding. If we are paying officials a salary for attending to these matters, they should be able to prescribe a remedy for that disease.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know of any remedy for it.

Mr. STAPLES. Up in the province of Manitoba during the last couple of years we have sustained serious losses from the mange in horses. Is the department taking any action towards stamping it out ? When it gets among the horses it makes them weak and useless for their

work. A good many people keep using the horses thus afflicted, and there seems to be no restriction to prevent the disease spreading.

Mr. FISHER. I was not aware there was any great spread of the disease in Manitoba. There is a good deal of it in the western ranching country, and we have been taking active steps to reduce it. We issued bulletins a while ago with instructions how to treat the horses so afflicted, and our officers in Manitoba have instructions to deal with it wherever they find it.

Mr. STAPLES. I will give the hon. minister a list of certain districts where I know it exists.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be very glad indeed to have it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does this appropriation of $40,000 include the cost of enforcing that order about mange ?

Mr. FISHER. Part of it would go to the enforcement of that order.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. About how much ?

Mr. FISHER. I could not say. We discussed that a little while ago and I have no further information than I gave then. Dr. Rutherford is in the Northwest but the trouble with the mange is later in the season than now. I know of no new developments regarding it at present.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I endeavoured to get the cost of enforcing the order last fall and the minister informed me that when the supplementary estimates would be down, he would be in a position to give the details.

Mr. FISHER. I forgot about that but in the next supplementaries I will give the information.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I also asked the cost of the different tanks provided by the government at different points. I also asked when these vats were built and the approximate cost. I see that there were four.

Mr. FISHER. I shall get that also. The expense of handling the whole matter came to about $17,000 but that does not include the cost of the tanks. These were put up out of an appropriation to public works for cattle quarantine. I will get the figures for my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. With regard to making the order in March apply to last September, if the minister will look at the Act carefully he will agree that in the amended Act of 1904 coupled with section 12 of the Act of 1903, it is optional with the Governor in Council to give compensation or not, but once compensation is given it can only be given in one way. The government can give compensation or not, but, if it gives compensation, it must give it in accordance with the terms of the statute and cannot discriminate as between animals exhibiting a greater or less degree of disease. The minister pointed out—and it is very reasonable—that, in case of clinical symtoms, the government did not contemplate paying under the Order in Council of last fall. But the Act, after providing that the minister can provide for the slaughter of animals to prevent the spread of contagious diseases, goes on to say :

> The Governor in Council may order compensation to be paid to the owners of animals slaughtered under the provisions of this Act.

I need not read subsections 2 and 3, as they are repealed by the Act of 1904, and others substituted. Under the subsections repealed there is a limit to the compensation to be paid, but under the new provision there is no limit except that it is to be two-thirds of the value of the animal before it became affected with infectious or contagious disease, or it came in contact with or in dangerous proximity to animals affected. Thus it is provided by the statute that the compensation should be a certain thing. I submit to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) and also to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who has had a very long experience in the construction of statutes, that the government have the alternative of giving compensation or not giving it, but there is no discretion in the Governor in Council in the amount of compensation or the conditions under which it is to be given if any is given. Therefore, I would submit that you cannot legally or fairly discriminate as to cases arising between the Orders in Council of September, 1904, and the Order in Council of 1905. I am glad that it is so, because I believe it will be a good thing if the minister could see his way to remedy what will be to some extent a grievance—that these people in the west by reason of, I will not say the conflict, between the authorities, but of lack of adjustment between them, should fail to receive compensation in any way. I do not ask the minister to decide the matter now, but to look into it carefully. If he will turn to what I understand to be the embodiment of this Order in Council in this blue book and read the express provision there, I think he will be convinced that it is a fair reading of the provision that compensation should be made to these people that had animals slaughtered between September last and March last. I quote from page 173 of the report of the Minister of Agriculture, the latter part of paragraph 9 :

> And the Minister of Agriculture is hereby authorized to order compensation to be paid to the owners of such animals at the rate set forth in subsection 2 of section 12 of the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903, as amended by chapter 6 of the statutes of 1904.

That is, compensation should be made, if made at all, to the extent of two-thirds

of the value of the animal without discriminating as to whether the disease is ascertained by examination by the eye or by scientific test.

Mr. FISHER. I am ready to look into the matter, because I should be glad if I am allowed to make compensation in any case of hardship.

Mr. STAPLES. I am glad that the minister (Mr. Fisher) has agreed to look into the subject. The people of Manitoba only ask fair play in this matter. The people of the other provinces have been compensated since September and I do not see any reason why, especially as evidence can be brought to show that these animals were slaughtered on the certificate of a veterinary, the owners should not be compensated just as the owners of animals similarly slaughtered in other provinces have been.

Civil government—office of the Auditor General—

To provide for the salary of 1 chief clerk from June 1 to June 30, 1905, at $1,900 per annum.. .. ..$	158 33
Further amount required for clerical and other assistance..	3,000 00
Further amount required for printing and stationery..	300 00
	3,458 33

Mr. FIELDING. These are items which the Auditor General has asked for. The first is for the creation of an additional clerkship, and the others are for clerical and general assistance and stationery.

Administration of Justice—further amount required for miscellaneous expenses including Northwest Territories, $20,000.

Further amount required for travel of judges—Manitoba, $1,000.

Further amount required for travel of judges—Northwest Territories, $500.

Mr. FIELDING. The amount estimated for the year 1903-4 proved to be entirely too small, and accounts amounting to $16,000 had to be carried over and paid out of this year's appropriation. The increase is owing to the rapid increase of criminal business in the Northwest Territories, and that is also a consequence of the rapid increase in our population there which, with all its good qualities, has a few criminals.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I conclude that has something to do with the cost of the immigration which we have talked of in this House a good many times. We have not been careful enough to see that we got the proper class of immigrants. I hope that in future we will not require an increased vote for the administration of justice in the Northwest.

To provide salary of W. T. Archibald as Dominion parole officer, from May 1 to June 30, 1905, $333.33.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is this officer?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Justice has appointed an officer to look after prisoners when they leave the penitentiary, and I think he renders the most useful kind of service possible. This is an officer of the Salvation Army, who has given a great deal of attention to that class of work, and the Minister of Justice is utilizing his services with great profit to all concerned.

Franchise Act—to complete cost of voters' lists for election of 1904, $10,000.

New addition of Electoral Atlas, $3,500.

Mr. FIELDING. I promised to get some further information, and I hope before the evening is through I will have my officer here who understands that item.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How often are these printed and distributed? I know they have not been distributed so far as my riding is concerned, at least I have not received any.

Mr. FIELDING. I will have to allow the item to stand.

Mr. TAYLOR. While the minister is getting information, we want to know what benefit this new addition of the electoral atlas is.

Mr. FIELDING. That item was mentioned the other night. This electoral atlas is a series of maps of the various electoral districts of the country, and they have to be reprinted from time to time when changes are made by redistribution.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the minister bring down information showing how often the voters' lists are printed?

Mr. FIELDING. I will ascertain that.

Payments for legal services re legislation respecting Sunday observance—R. U. McPherson, $1,362.04; J. A. Patterson, K.C., $95.35, $1,457.39.

Mr. FIELDING. These gentlemen are both barristers at Toronto, and the government have agreed to pay them for their legal services to the Dominion Lord's Day Alliance in having the question of Sunday observance raised in the Supreme Court. These gentlemen were employed by that organization to prepare a Bill for the observance of the Lord's day. They were heard before the members of the government on several occasions. Questions were raised as to the authority of parliament to pass the Act, as to whether it was within the jurisdiction of this parliament. Up to that time Sunday observance had been treated as a provincial matter, but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1903 had decided that certain legislation of Ontario was ultra vires, and by reason of this decision the Dominion organization came to Ottawa for further legislation. The question of jurisdiction having been raised, a reference was made to the Supreme Court.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is Mr. Patterson a partner of Senator Kerr, of the other House ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the information on that point. I suppose any of my hon. friends can answer that question.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will let the item pass, but will the hon. minister inquire?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend says that he needs the information I will promise to get it for him.

Mr. TAYLOR. We need it.

Mr. FIELDING. Does he say that he does not know already?

Miscellaneous—for legal expenses, $1,800.

Mr. TAYLOR. In connection with what branch of the service?

Mr. FIELDING. These are for legal expenses incurred in the Finance Department partly in connection with the Martineau case and partly in connection with the prosecution of counterfeiters in Toronto.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Who were the lawyers ?

Mr. FIELDING. The information was furnished me, but I cannot put my hand on it at the moment. We will let it stand.

Mr. TAYLOR. Let it pass.

Miscellaneous—'Canada Gazette,' further amount required, $1,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is due to the increased expense of the 'Canada Gazette.' The information I am furnished with is that the particular item which caused the additional expense is the publication of the railway tariffs which were published under the new Act. This caused some additional printing.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much was the main estimate?

Mr. FIELDING. $7,000. This is the cost of printing irrespective of the question of receipts.

Item allowed to stand.

Miscellaneous—printing—further amount required, $12,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is due to the length of the session. It is to cover the extra expense of last year's printing which was very heavy, amounting to $14,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this in connection with the Printing Bureau or printing outside ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was all done at the Printing Bureau.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did the length of the session make it greater? Would it cover the 'Hansard'?

Mr. FIELDING. No, this would not cover the 'Hansard.' 'Hansard' is a separate item.

Mr. TAYLOR. What does it cover?

Mr. FIELDING. I would prefer that the item should stand as the information furnished is not complete enough. It says that it is due to the length of the session, but it does not show the particular branches for which this work has been done. A memorandum has been sent by the King's Printer, but I will get further information.

Item allowed to stand.

Miscellaneous—commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the army and navy—further amount required, $500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does that really mean ? I do not object to it but I would like to know what it means. I thought these things were imported without payment of duty.

Mr. PATERSON. So they are and this is an amount that is the equivalent, I have not the particulars with me but I can get them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not objecting to it, but I simply want to understand it. If these articles are imported without payment of duty why do you require any commutation?

Mr. PATERSON. Let the item stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Excise—contingencies—further amount required for travelling expenses, rent, fuel and stationery, &c., $3,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required to enable the department to meet the expenditure from April to the end of the fiscal year. Fifty thousand dollars of a vote of $60,000 has been expended and as it is desirable that business should not be interfered with owing to lack of funds this $3,000 is required to make both ends meet.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You should not require a great deal more for fuel at this time of the year.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at this time of the year.

Civil government—Department of Public Works—to provide for payment of chief engineer at the rate of $3,500 per annum from December 1, 1904, to June 30, 1905, $58.33.

Mr. FIELDING. This officer's salary was increased from $3,400 to $3,500 and this accounts for the difference.

Public Works—capital—Quebec harbour improvements, $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the cost of this work?

Mr. FIELDING. This is the balance required for the close of the year on account of the construction of improvements in the

harbour of Quebec. The work is under contract to Messrs. Dussault and Lemieux.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the matter with the Harbour Commission ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is outside the work of the Harbour Commission. The Harbour Commissioners have certain funds at their disposal, but this is independent of them.

Mr. BERGERON. How do you manage the work in Quebec? Is the department doing some work specially outside of the work done by the Harbour Commission ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, whatever is done by the Harbour Commission has to be done out of the funds of the harbour board under the Harbour Commissioner's Act. This is a general expenditure out of the Dominion treasury.

Mr. BERGERON. How do we stand now with the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec ?

Mr. FIELDING. They have a balance at their disposal out of the present authorization of between $300,000 and $400,000, and they have works in hand and contemplated which will take all of that and probably more ; but that is independent of the appropriations referred to in this item.

Mr. BERGERON. Where does that $300,000 or $400,000 come from ?

Mr. FIELDING. Several years ago we consolidated the Acts respecting the harbour commission of Quebec, and any funds previously authorized which were not expended were carried into the new Act. There was a balance, if my memory serves me rightly, of $300,000 or $400,000. The Harbour Commissioners are undertaking works which will take all of that sum and probably more.

Mr. BERGERON. How much do they owe the country now ?

Mr. FIELDING. A very large sum ; I cannot give it off-hand. A few years ago they issued bonds which have a certain priority over the government debt. There is a considerable debt, but it does not touch this item at all.

Mr. BERGERON. No, but it touches the treasury of the country.

Mr. FIELDING. A good many harbours touch the treasury of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. I think that is the worst.

Mr. FIELDING. Quebec is a very important harbour, and we must provide for its development.

Mr. BERGERON. Would it not be a good plan to abolish all these harbour commissions and have the harbours all put under the control of the Department of Public Works?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a large question as to which I cannot give my hon. friend an answer to-night.

Mr. BERGERON. I see it stated in the newspapers that something is going to be done in that way in Montreal—that the harbour commission is going to be changed and the harbour put under the management of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I do not know whether or not the newspapers are correct; but if that is done in Montreal, why should it not be done in Quebec and everywhere else?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not yet done in Montreal, and if we wait until it is proposed there my hon. friend's question will be much more in order. It is not connected with this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. This vote of $50,000 is not to be spent by the harbour commissioners, but it is all public money, and I think it would be a very good thing if all these moneys which are now spent by commissioners were spent by a minister directly responsible to parliament.

Mr. MORIN. I would like to ask the minister whether the government intend to do anything in the port of Quebec to repair the wall which fell down last spring ? About 600 feet of the cross wall tumbled into the basin, and last week I was told that nothing had been done yet. A gentleman who was here from Quebec requested me to ask the government what they proposed to do. He said the present condition was a great injury to the trade of Quebec ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is a portion of the work which comes under the control of the harbour commissioners. I had an interview several days ago with gentlemen representing the harbour commissioners, who pointed out the necessity of the repairs to which my hon. friend has referred. It is contemplated that these repairs will be made as far as possible out of the funds which remain unexpended by the harbour commissioners. I think the carrying out of the work which the harbour commissioners desire to do will cost a considerable sum in excess of what is available in their hands ; but they are having plans made, and I understand that they will undertake very soon the repairs to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is this $50,000 to be spent ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is for the extension of what is known as the Quebec breakwater extending from the Louise embankment. That is under contract, and this is to pay the balance due to the contractors to the 30th of June.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. FIELDING. Dussault & Lemieux.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of their contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. $437,000.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that contract let ?

Mr. FIELDING. In 1903.

Mr. BERGERON. And this amount is over the amount of the contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is the excess of what we expected would be required under their contract in the present fiscal year.

Mr. AMES. How much have they already received all told on this contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount to the 31st of December, 1904, was $107,692.86. The deputy informs me that the amount expended since would probably amount to $50,000.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that contract to be finished ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is to be finished during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BERGERON. If they have spent $107,000 out of a contract of $437,000, they have to spend over $300,000 this year.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The work was to be finished during the present year, but it is probable that they will not be able to finish it.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that their fault, or what is the cause of it ? Who is supervising that work ?

Mr. FIELDING. An old engineer of the department stationed at Quebec named Valiquet. The work that has been done is very satisfactory. Apart from the fact that it has not gone on as rapidly as was expected, there is no complaint.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What penalties do these contractors have to pay for not finishing their contracts in time ? When he is answering that I would like to know what competition there was for the work, when let, and how many tenders were received. I am afraid the minister has not the information to-night, that we ought to have on this matter. I would like to know how many tenders were received,what each tender was and who were the tenders and if this was the lowest.

Mr. FIELDING. All that I have no doubt has been before the House, but I shall gladly get it again, if my hon. friend wishes it, on the supplementary item.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Would the minister tell the penalty for nonfulfilment of the contract in time ?

Mr. FIELDING. The general penalty is that when a contractor tenders he is obliged to put up a certain sum by way of security, and if he does not go on, that will be forfeited. What else can be done ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would suggest that tenders might have penalties attached that unless the contract is fulfilled the contractor will have to pay so much a day as damages. I think this is sometimes in contracts and I think it might very reasonably be put in because I do not see any reason why a man should contract to do a work and not have it done unless he can give better reasons than those generally given for not completing it in time. Apparently this contract is not half done yet.

Mr. FIELDING. As respects the adoption of a new plan in dealing with contracts that is a wide matter and while glad to have the hon. member's suggestions I would not undertake to assent to his proposition to-night. The department is acting in the light of long experience, and I have no doubt the officials take every precaution open to them. It is sometimes found necessary to extend the time of contracts.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is one-half the work done ?

Mr. FIELDING. According to these figures, no. Only $150,000 out of $400,000 and odd has been expended so that is less than one-half.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is not very satisfactory is it ?

Mr. FIELDING. The deputy minister informs me that the latter part of the work is apt to be done more rapidly. There is always time lost in commencing the work in gathering plant, &c., so that although less than one-half has been done now that does not show that the work will not be completed within the time specified.

Mr. BERGERON. How many tenders were there and what is the amount of each tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. The deputy, speaking from memory, says there were six tenders and this was the lowest.

Mr. BERGERON. Can we not have the name ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but I have not them now. I have no doubt all the information on this has already been given, but I do not say that is a reason why we should not give it again. When the main estimate was taken in all probability it was discussed as the matter has been running for several years.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has the main estimate for this year been taken ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; it would be discussed in the last year or the year before. I would suggest that as this is a contract and has to be paid, we might pass this item,

and when on the main estimates all this information might be brought down.

Mr. AMES. Will the minister be prepared when the main estimates are voted to answer the question of the hon. member for Lennox, as to whether there are in the contract any penalties for failure to fulfil the contract within a specified time.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly I shall be very glad to bring down the contract.

Mr. MONK. There is an exploratory voyage in Hudson bay under the superintendence of the government, and a number of the men employed on the steamer which has gone there have left orders for the payment of their salary during their absence. These salaries are not being paid because the vote of last year, as I understand, has been exhausted. Have any steps been taken to pass the necessary supplementary item in order that these arrears of salary may be settled? I ask this because a number of these men's families are in want at the present moment and I think that the supplementary estimate is really a pressing matter.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is included in an item which was passsed on Friday night and as soon as we complete the various votes we will have a special supply Bill to cover all these cases and to meet payments of this nature ?

Mr. TAYLOR. We will allow this to pass and have the discussion on the main estimate.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly that is fair.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario, $26,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. We shall have to ask this item to stand.

Mr. BENNETT. Before it is dropped may I ask how many tenders were received for the dredging at Fort William and Port Arthur and who were the tenderers ?

Mr. FIELDING. Nine tenders were received for the Port Arthur dredging.

Mr. BENNETT. And the names, please.

Mr. FIELDING. A. F. Bowman, Southampton ; John H. Hickler, and Neil Macdonald, Sault Ste. Marie ; the Great Lakes Dredging Company, Limited, Port Arthur ; C. S. Boone, Toronto ; Wm. Davis & Sons, Ottawa, the Port Arthur Dredging & Harbour Improvement Company, Port Arthur ; Roger Miller, Ingersoll, and M. J. Haney, Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. Whose tender was accepted ?

Mr. FIELDING. A. F. Bowman was the most favourable.

Mr. BENNETT. And the rate ?

Mr. FIELDING. The rate was 14 cents per cubic yard of clay.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister any objection to giving the rates of the other tenderers ?

Mr. FIELDING. The contract is not signed although it is awarded. I would prefer the hon. gentleman to renew the question several days later. The question is a proper one, but we prefer not to make this public until the contract is signed.

Mr. BENNETT. And the Fort William names, please ?

Mr. FIELDING. The tenderers are the same, with the addition of James Morphy, Lewis Walsh, and John King, Fort William.

Mr. BERGERON. To whom was this one awarded, for Fort William ?

Mr. FIELDING. To Mr. Bowman, at 12 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the contract been signed ?

Mr. FIELDING. The contracts are being prepared in the department but have not been signed.

Mr. BENNETT. Has any valuation been made of the Collingwood dry dock, if so by whom and what was the amount at which it was figured for the purpose of getting the bounty ?

Mr. FIELDING. The valuation made by Mr. Louis Coste was $540,000 or a little over.

Mr. BENNETT. Has a year elapsed since the official valuation was made, and what time will the bounty be payable ?

Mr. FIELDING. A year has not elapsed.

Mr. AMES. When item 65 comes up again will the hon. minister lay on the table copies of the ten offers that were made, and also a copy of the specification ?

Mr. FIELDING. If the contract has in the meantime been executed and the transaction complete, there is no objection to bringing down all the tenders, but the practice is not to make the details public while the matter is pending. In a few days the whole transaction will be completed by the execution of the contract; and if not brought down on this estimate, we have no objection to bringing the information down on the main estimates, which are yet to be dealt with.

Mr. BERGERON. Was the contract given to the lowest tenderer ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, in both cases.

Public buildings in Richibucto, New Brunswick, $1,600.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to pay the balance due the contractor for fittings, &c. A part of this was paid from the general appropriation temporarily and a special vote is required to provide for the same. The

total amount of the contract for the fittings is $2,000, and the total amount expended on the building and fittings up to the 31st December, 1904, was $17,343.23. That expenditure includes, not only the building, but the electric lights, electric boxes, boiler, heating apparatus, and so forth. The contract for the building itself was $9,716.

Mr. BERGERON. Were tenders called for ?

Mr. FIELDING. The heating apparatus was contracted for separately by Mr. F. Powers, of Lunenburg, and it amounted to $799. Mr. Reid, the contractor, was asked to give an offer for the fittings, and he received $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. How many tenders were offered ?

Mr. FIELDING. There were four for the building itself.

Mr. BERGERON. The building cost $9,000 and the fittings almost as much more.

Mr. FIELDING. In the $17,000 is included the purchase of the site, which was bought from Phinney & Steeve, Richibucto, at $800.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the size of the lot ?

Mr. FIELDING. 230 feet by 416 feet—very nearly two acres.

Mr. BERGERON. Who acted for the department in making the purchase ?

Mr. FIELDING. The department sent down an officer to examine the site and inquire from local people the value.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there an officer of the department who goes there in the public interest, or was it a favour to some friend of the government ?

Mr. FIELDING. The practice is that, when this place is not at too a great a distance from Ottawa, the chief architect sends an officer from the department. But when it is deemed not necessary to do that, they employ a local officer of the Department of Public Works. This local officer collects the opinions of these who are well informed as to the fair value of the land.

Mr. BERGERON. Tenders were not asked for, I imagine, until the government had bought the site, or, at least, knew what it would cost. So, they had $800 for the site and $9,000 for the contract. But there is a big difference between that and $17,000, which is the total cost.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has forgotten what I said. The contract was not for $9,000 but for $9,800. There is nearly $1,000 accounted for. Then there were some extras on the contract. Then, there is $800 for lighting and $700 for heating apparatus. Then you have the fittings and so on.

Mr. BERGERON. But that is still far from $17,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suppose the minister has before him the items making up the total ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think I ought to have, but I am sorry to say I have not. If any hon. gentleman would rather have the details, I am quite willing that the item should stand over until the statement is prepared.

Mr. BERGERON. I think it would be better.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The item stands.

Public Works—chargeable to income—public buildings—Ontario, London drill hall and armoury—electric wiring and fixtures, grading sidewalks, &c., $6,000.

Mr. FIELDING. There was a contract for the electric wiring amounting to $4,750 of which the contractors have received $950, leaving a balance of $3,800. There is due on granolithic walks $750, grading of the site $250, balance on architect's commission $376, incidentals $204 and other items up in round figures $6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What has it all cost ?

Mr. FIELDING. The total cost to March 1st, 1905, is $193,944.67.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. The contract was for $133,897.

Mr. BERGERON. What was that to cover ?

Mr. FIELDING. For the building as ordinarily understood. They are extras as set forth in the list I have before me.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a difference there of $60,000 over the original contract.

Mr. FIELDING. But then the total cost includes site, fittings, kerbs, levelling and other things of that kind which are not part of the building but which must be paid for.

Mr. BERGERON. But the point is this—the government comes to parliament and we are supposed to vote the money required for a building as they explain it to us. But we find afterwards that there are extras or incidentals that bring it up to a much larger figure.

Mr. FIELDING. I have the items set forth here, if any hon. gentleman wishes to hear them.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the minister to say that this work is all completed. Why should the work be done before the money is voted ?

Mr. FIELDING. The chief architect says that the work is practically completed. There may be some of the outside work going on.

Mr. BERGERON. According to the figures the minister gave there is a sum due their architect. What is that for ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is for the superintending architect employed to supervise the work ; that is, in lieu of the clerk of works.

Mr. TAYLOR. But why should the government go and build granolithic walks and all that kind of thing before the money is voted and only after the work is done, come to parliament for the money ?

Mr. FIELDING. As Minister of Finance I join heartily with my hon. friend in the view he expresses. But, as acting Minister of Public Works, I may have to take a different view.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What was the original estimate for this work ?

Mr. FIELDING. The original estimate was $15,000 for the building, including, heating and lighting, and the cost has been $158,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How about the contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. These are for outside work and also for the site which cost $27,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Was not a site belonging to the government used for this building ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it was a new purchase.

Mr. BERGERON. From whom ?

Mr. FIELDING. There were a number of lots purchased from various people.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is not on the site of the old building, is it ?

Mr. FIELDING. An entirely new site.

Mr. BERGERON. Wasn't there a drill hall there before ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not on this site.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of the site of the old building ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is erected on a separate site that had to be purchased at a cost of $27,000, including legal expenses.

Mr. BERGERON. What has become of the old site ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is still there ; I can guarantee that it has not been carried away. I do not know whether it has been sold or not. There are some old buildings on the site that have been sold.

Mr. BERGERON. Can the hon. gentleman bring down the information about that?

Mr. FIELDING. I will.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the minister tell us what is the accommodation in this drill shed, what forces can it accommodate?

Mr. FIELDING. The main drill hall is 80 feet by 195. There are in connection with it eight armouries, a gun-shed, three harness rooms, several rooms for officers, band room, lecture room, room for army medical and army service corps, sergeants' mess, quartermaster's stores, bowling alley, lavatory, bathroom, room for caretaker. It is a very large and spacious place.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the government building a bowling alley ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not an unusual thing in drill halls.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the government keeping it up ?

Mr. FIELDING. So far as the maintenance of the building is concerned, the government will keep it up. I do not know who will provide the balls.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—improvements and repairs, supplies, &c., $8,000.

Mr. FIELDING. These improvements include overhauling and renovating the steamer 'Challenger,' that is a part of the quarantine apparatus.

Mr. BERGERON. We voted some time ago an amount of money for that same purpose.

Mr. FIELDING. That was in the main estimate ; this is to wind up the affairs of the current year. The expenditures at Grosse Isle are under the supervision of the Public Works Office at Quebec.

Northwest Territories—Lloydminster immigrant building (revote of lapsed amount) $2,500.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What has been done at Lloydminster ?

Mr. FIELDING. This building was commenced in 1903-4 by the Department of the Interior ; the total expenditure has been $20,246. This sum will finish it. The vote of last year was allowed to lapse. This building was begun by the Department of the Interior and is now finished. It is charged to public works.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is it for immigration purposes ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and the militia building is for drill purposes; but it is charged to public works. That department is the builder for all departments.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This building is also used for police purposes, is it not ?

Mr. FIELDING. The department are not aware, but it would be, I presume, used for any Dominion purpose.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They should put a fence around it and make it look a little

neater. Thirty thousand dollars is altogether too much for a building of that kind, but things were done at that time with a rush.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What material is it built of?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Wood.

Public Works—income—British Columbia—Dominion public buildings—improvements, renewals, repairs, &c., $3,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Do we require to have these general votes all the time ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the adjournment will the hon. Minister of Finance state what business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. The motion for supply will be made to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. No autonomy Bill to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think not to-morrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thought we were promised that to-day or to-morrow for certain.

Mr. FIELDING. By whom?

Mr. TAYLOR. When it was left over last week.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know whether there has been any understanding between my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), but it will be subject to what the Prime Minister may say to-morrow. He did not intimate when he went away that it would come up.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think there was a general understanding that it would be taken up Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. FIELDING. I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to reserve that question until the Prime Minister is present.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, it will be estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Public Works ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think so.

Motion agreed to, House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, May 30, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST—DISCUSSION OF BILL.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Finance, in the absence of the Prime Minister, when it is proposed to resume the discussion of the Bill establishing the new province of Alberta ? The Minister of Finance will perhaps remember that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice —who, I regret to learn, has been indisposed for a day or two—made a statement as to what, in his opinion, is the difference between clause 16 as originally inserted in these Autonomy Bills and the amended clause 16, which has not been discussed very much as yet, although it has been before the House for some time. Since the Minister of Justice made that statement—a very carefully considered statement which he read to the House—there has not been any opportunity, so far as I am concerned, to make any observations with regard to it, and if it would be convenient to the government I would like to speak on that question at as early a date as possible. In saying this, of course, I do not desire to put the Minister of Justice to any inconvenience if he is indisposed ; I merely mention it in order that my request may be conveyed to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of Justice. I am unable to discuss the question until the government brings the Bills on again.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). A similar question was put to me at the adjournment last night. I then expected I would be able to see the Prime Minister this morning, so that I would be able to give an answer, but unfortunately he has not been at his office. I therefore do not feel at liberty to answer the question at present, but I will communicate with him, and my hon. friend will receive an intimation later. The absence of the Minister of Justice has an important bearing on the matter, and, as my hon. friend knows, he has been in very poor health.

GEORGIAN BAY ISLANDS—QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. GEORGE D. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to speak on a question of privilege. On Thursday last, in my absence from the House and the city, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), during the discussion of the estimates of the Department of the Interior, made reference to the sale of an island in the Georgian bay to Mr. Frederick W. Grant, and the suggestion was thrown out here and repeated in the public press that the purchaser of this island being my brother, I necessarily had something to do with the transaction. I desire, Mr.

Speaker, in a very few words, but in language as explicit and as emphatic as is in my power to use, to say that my first knowledge of the transfer or sale of this island from the Department of the Interior to Mr. Frederick W. Grant was when I read of it in the Toronto press on Friday. I in no way approached the Minister of the Interior, nor any person in his department, either by letter or by personal interview, and, so far as my recollection goes—and I think it is to be depended upon—I knew nothing of the matter whatever. As to the merits of the purchase and sale of the island, that is a matter as to which the Department of the Interior and the Minister of the Interior can well defend themselves.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. I did not exactly catch what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Grant) said at the outset of his remarks, but I rather gather that he stated that I had alleged that he interviewed the minister.

Mr. GRANT. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me interrupting him? I said the suggestion was thrown out; I read it from Unrevised 'Hansard,' page 6718.

Mr. BENNETT. As to the suggestion, it is for the hon. gentleman to make his deduction from what I did say, and for the public too. I did not make the statement emphatically that the hon. gentleman had at all interfered in the matter, owing to the fact that I had not seen the correspondence. Had I seen the correspondence perhaps I might have made a similar statement to that which I made formerly in reference to the hon. gentleman in connection with another matter, after I had the advantage of seeing the correspondence. On that occasion I found out this, that the hon. gentleman had written a letter to the department alleging that of his own knowledge the timber on——

Mr. FIELDING. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that we ought not to go in to another matter. This is a personal explanation on one matter and I do not think we should go into another matter.

Mr. BENNETT. With a personal reflection on another member.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. BENNETT. And I am endeavouring to get away from that.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no reflection.

Mr. HAGGART. But this is on a motion for supply.

Mr. SPEAKER. This is before the orders of the day; there is no motion for supply.

Mr. BENNETT. Then under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman having made what I may say is a personal attack on myself——

Mr. FIELDING. No it is not.

Mr. BENNETT. I have no doubt I have touched on a very ginger spot. The Minister of Finance has seen some very ginger spots lately and is always willing to jump to the rescue. I am quite willing to discuss this island matter where it is best known, and I think that when the people there know all the circumstances they will think this is about as crooked——

Mr. FIELDING. Order.

Mr. BENNETT——as the timber deal on Hope Island——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT——in which the hon. gentleman was mixed up.

SUPPLY—MANITOBA VOTERS' LISTS.

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

Mr. THOMAS GREENWAY (Lisgar). I purpose availing myself of this opportunity to bring before the House a matter which is of considerable importance to the province from which I hail. I am quite well aware that in doing so I am trenching upon a policy which has been adopted by this House and by this government of adopting the provincial franchises for the purpose of Dominion elections, and I fancy that so far as that principle applies to the provinces in general it is a good policy. But if I cannot show by the statements which I propose to submit to the House that it is right and incumbent upon the government to adopt a different policy in reference to the province with which I am to deal, then I shall not say anything more about it. It will be within the recollection of those who are conversant with Manitoba politics that in the province of Manitoba adopted in the year 1902 the then government adopted a policy of personal registration; that is to say that every voter, no matter who he was, no matter how long he had lived in the country, no matter how much property he owned, no matter how well known he was, had to come at a certain time to a certain registration booth to register his vote otherwise he had no vote. At the time of the introduction of that Bill I occupied a seat in the legislature and I was very much opposed to the system of personal registration in that way. I do not know that there is such a system in any other part of the empire. If there is I am not conversant with it. The inconvenience of such a system to the province of Manitoba must be manifest to any one who is at all acquainted with its circumstances. The sparse settlement, the long distances it is necessary to travel, the expense, and the inconvenience of it altogether is very much against the system, and the results have shown that the opposition to the system at the time was well grounded. The importance of this subject will appear when I say to the House that there is not in existence in Manitoba to-day, in one single

constituency for the House of Commons, a legal voters' list. We were asked to accept that law because it was commended to us as a new departure, as putting in the hands of the judges of the county courts the compilation of the lists and taking it away from partisan officials. That was the system which was adopted in 1903 in the compilation of the lists. The judges appointed the places for registration, appointed the courts of revision, appointed the registration clerks and all the details in connection with the compilation of the lists were prepared by the judges of the county courts. That certainly looked like a reasonable recommendation. That was continued for a while and the 1903 elections were held upon lists which were compiled in that way. A number of registration booths were appointed in each local electoral division, a number of days extending from the beginning of the week until the end of the week were given for the time of registration, and in that way although, it was very inconvenient and very expensive and entailed a great deal of work upon the respective parties still a fair, a reasonably fair list under that system was compiled. Now, Sir, I am one of those who think that the government having decided and the Commons having decided by the law of the land what shall qualify a voter, that the voter ought to have the means of registering his vote with the least possible expense and the least possible inconvenience. I think that is a good principle to lay down. Parliament having settled the franchise, having said what the qualification of a voter shall be, the machinery ought to be provided which will enable that individual to get registration or whatever else may be adopted for the compilation of the list and get his name upon the list with the least possible expense and inconvenience. I said that was the system which was adopted in 1903, and the judges of the county courts of the province established the registration booths, completed the lists and the elections were held upon these lists. Previously our law had been that no list would be compiled until prior to an election, so that when a proclamation was issued providing for the compilation of a list it was notice to the public that an election was about to be held and that some time within three months the list would be completed and the election held upon that list. That was the law under the government which I had the honour to lead for a number of years; that was the law which was introduced by our opponents in 1903 when this system of personal registration was adopted. But Sir, these gentlemen last year, in 1904, conceived the idea that it would be well for them to prepare lists for the purpose of the Dominion election. And they amended the law to provide that the compilation of the lists should take place each year during the month of May.

Mr. STAPLES. They did not make any provision for striking red lines through it.

Mr. GREENWAY.

Mr. GREENWAY. I will tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) something about the red lines before I am done. And that reminds me that I have to deal with the hon. gentleman before I conclude the remarks I am about to make. If, after I am done, the hon. gentleman will stand up in this House and undertake to defend this iniquitous system, then I shall lose what little confidence I have in the hon. gentleman from Macdonald (Mr. Staples).

Mr. STAPLES. I can do that with a clearer conscience than that with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) can defend his voters' list when he had the compiling of it.

Mr. GREENWAY. I am dealing with the preparation of the lists under the system established in Manitoba to-day, and I propose to deal with it notwithstanding the interruptions of my hon. friend from Macdonald. Now what did these gentlemen do? The compilation of the list which had been recommended by us because of all the details being worked out by the judges, was at once changed. Instead of leaving it to the judges, an Order in Council was passed, an Order in Council appointing the registration booths, fixing the time when these should be kept open, appointing the courts of revision and settling all the details. That was the system adopted by these gentlemen in 1904 for the purpose of preparing the lists to elect such gentlemen as the hon. gentleman for Macdonald. I shall give all the details in order to acquaint the House with the nature of this outrage—there is no other name for it—which is being perpetrated upon the people of Manitoba to-day. Why, Sir, in 1903, under the judges system, when the work was done by these gentlemen who knew the country and knew the circumstances, we had six days of ten hours each for registration. But under this precious system which I am going to discuss in a few minutes, we have one day. The Order in Council which was passed last month provided that there should be 7½ hours of registration. In 1903, when the lists were prepared by the judges, we had 480 registration booths in the province of Manitoba—I want my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) to make a note of that—we had 480 registration booths open for six days. In 1905, commencing the day after to-morrow, we are to have one day for each electoral district in the province of Manitoba—one day. It was provided by that Order in Council that that one day should be of 7½ hours; but, on account of the public feeling which was aroused in Manitoba, they have now increased it to 13 hours. This, is not, as I will show you later on, a question of time but a question of convenience. Under this new system, we are to have 40 registration booths for the province of Manitoba, instead of 480, and we are to have one day instead of 6 days. Or reducing it to hours, we had 20,790 hours for registration in

1903, and in this year of Our Lord, even by the increased time which they have given —they sent out an advertisement after the Order in Council had been passed—they have given just 520 hours. And, in an effort to make it appear that they are doing in favour of the voter they ask them to start at seven o'clock in the morning. Now, that may impress some as being a little unfair; it may occur to some hon. gentlemen who possess a love of fair-play that it is not the thing to do. All I am asking for is fair-play; all I want is that we shall have the means of preparing a complete list of the voters of the province.

Let me give some figures to show how this will work out. I take only a few constituencies, because I do not desire to weary the House. I take ten constituencies out of the total of forty, and give the extreme distances voters will have to travel in order to register their names: Avondale, 40 miles; Carillon, 78 miles; Dauphin, 70 miles. Then I come to the case of Emerson, which is somewhat peculiar. Emerson lies along the boundary, and there is a muskeg or morass in the centre, so that you cannot travel directly from one side of it to the other. People living in some of the townships of Emerson, in order to register their names, will be obliged to travel by railway to Winnipeg and thence by railway to Emerson a total of 164 miles. In Gimli, a constituency lying to the north, to reach the registration point some of the people will have to travel 210 miles; Gladstone, in a somewhat more populous constituency, 110 miles. In Kildonan and St. Andrews, the home of the old natives of Manitoba, along the Red river, they have to travel from the extreme points, 260 miles to reach the place where they must register their names; Springfield in the constituency of my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), 105 miles, Swan River, a Northwestern constituency, 145 miles. Now, Sir, that does not suit even some of the friends of the provincial government of Manitoba, and I do not think it would suit my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) if he had to travel any such distance as I have been speaking of to register his name as a voter. In the other constituencies, the distance varies from 25 miles to 75 miles. I have here a quotation from a Conservative country paper in the constituency of my hon. friend who was interrupting me. Perhaps he knows the paper; it is the Miami 'Herald' published in a nice little town in the constituency of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples).

Mr. STAPLES. That is the town in which thirteen were disfranchised by the red line.

Mr. GREENWAY. There are some things that the hon. gentleman talks about concerning which he knows very little. Perhaps he had better send and get a copy of the Miami 'Herald' if he has not one already. This is what it says:

> The new provincial voters' lists are to be made up in June. Carman is the only place for registration in Dufferin. The editor happens to be one of those compelled to drive twenty-one miles and return.
>
> He should not have grumbled, it is a mistake for a gentleman to grumble who has only to go twenty-one miles. That is far below the average, I think he is down at the minimum point.
>
> The editor happens to be one of those compelled to drive twenty-one miles and return or lose his franchise, and we much prefer the latter. We have always been Tory heretofore, but if registered now—well we would feel like putting a government in power that would do the square thing with the registration booth. The prospects are that the Miami boys will stay at home.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is it that these gentlemen don't want to do the square thing? Simply because of an advantage, which I shall point out directly, that they gain by the compilation of the list of 1904, and they are determined that that list shall remain until they have another provincial general election upon it; they are determined, because the number of unregistered Liberals far exceeds the number of unregistered Conservatives. That is the reason, and I will undertake to prove that to you by some evidence which I have in my possession, giving a comparison between the system adopted by the judges and the system which now prevails. Let me give a few instances with regard to some other constituencies. The first constituency I have upon my memorandum is the constituency in which my hon. friend from Portage (Mr. Crawford) resides, Beautiful Plains. Under the judges system of registration they had 16 places of registration and 96 days for registration, six days for each place; under this government, in 1904, when they were compiling a list for the purpose of electing members of the House of Commons, they gave us 10 places and 10 days. I will give you the results in a tabular form:

Constituency.	Judges' system.		System of 1904.	
	Places.	Days.	Places.	Days.
Beautiful Plains	16	96	10	10
Dauphin	17	102	11	12
Gladstone	15	90	17	18
Gimli	14	84	12	12
Killarney	12	72	7	12
Rockwood	12	72	8	9
Swan River	15	90	7	7

Now, Sir, I want to say here that that was a studied thing, that was the entering wedge that they proposed to drive home upon this last occasion to prevent the peo-

ple from being registered. In the polling subdivision where I happen to reside there was a very large area, 108 square miles, with 320 odd voters in it. It had given the largest Liberal majority that was given in the previous local election, by any single polling division and therefore it must be punished, and they got two hours to do their resignation, from 11 o'clock until 1 o'clock, and one was the dinner hour. That is what they did right at my own home. I went to the gentleman who was registration clerk and asked him who was responsible for this iniquity. He said, not me. I said, I did not think it was. Now, Sir, let me come to the present system of registration and say a word or two about that. I have given you the distances that people have to travel, and I want to show you why it is that these gentlemen have adopted this course ; it is because of the incomplete list, and because they are determined that the Liberals of Manitoba shall not register. In the constituency of my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Cyr), and in the local constituency of Emerson, where I pointed out that it was most inconvenient for electors to register, there are at least 500 available voters for registration, and there will not be 100 of them who will register, there cannot be, there is no provision for it. Let me just remind the House that under the system which we have there is a long list of interrogatories that have to be answered by each person applying to be registered. It does not make any difference who he is, what he is, or how well known he is, he has to answer these interrogatories. It takes quite a time in case there is no dispute over the qualification of the voter, and in case there is a dispute it takes longer. You could not by any possible means register within the thirteen hours that is given by the government, and in a place where there are more than 150 voters it would be impossible for them to register. In the city of Winnipeg, if my hon. friend who represents Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) were here he could tell you that there are available to-day for registration at least from 4,000 to 5,000 voters. Under this precious system it is possible perhaps to register 300 of them, and the remaining thousands have to go unregistered—purposely, systematically it is provided that they shall not register. Why, Sir, I have been surprised when I have been thinking of the manner in which our governments are run, and when I find an old colleague of mine occupying the position of Lieutenant Governor of the province of Manitoba, becoming a party to such an outrage as this, I cannot find language which I would be permitted to use here, Mr. Speaker, to characterize a thing of that kind. I am free to admit that there is a general idea that a constitutional governor is supposed to do what he is advised to do, but surely there is a limit to that. Fancy a gentleman

thirty-five years a resident of Manitoba, who knows all the circumstances, who knows the conditions of the country, putting his signature to a document of that kind, by which at least ten per cent of the electorate of the province of Manitoba are to be disfranchised. I am within the mark when I make that statement. Now, Sir, I want to be perfectly candid with the House, I want to tell the House exactly how things stand. I have the voters' list here which professes to be the voters' list of the constituency of Lisgar. I will say something about that a little later on. We have heard a great deal as to the list and the disadvantage we were placed in by the compilation of it last year when we took no interest in it. I will explain that a little later on. If we were allowed to compile a fair list in Lisgar and if we had a fair list in Lisgar I am here to say in this House that the Liberals would gain at least 300 voters, and shall the doctrine be pronounced in this House or any other House that because they are Liberals they should be disfranchised? Is that a good doctrine to preach? I do not think it is.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Is he opposed to the principle of the Franchise Act introduced by this administration which leaves the preparation of these lists to the provinces ?

Mr. GREENWAY. I think the hon. gentleman was not present when I stated my position on that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps not.

Mr. GREENWAY. I said that as a rule I thought the policy of using the provincial franchise was a good one, but I proposed to show before I sat down that in this case it was not a good one and there ought to be an exception. I said a little while ago that we had not in the province of Manitoba a proper, legal list for any single constituency for the House of Commons. I was quite well aware of it before I came here, but to verify that belief and that opinion I sent a note, after I came down here, to the King's Printer and asked him if he would be good enough to supply me with the voters' lists of my own constituency, the constituency of Lisgar. I have in my hand what I received from him and I merely quote this to show the utter impossibility, even if the list were honestly prepared, of using the list which is prepared by the local government for the purposes of the House of Commons. I sent over to the King's Printer and he sent me this. You will remember that my constituency comprises two entire local divisions and parts of three others. I asked the voters' list for my constituency of Lisgar and I received this list. I went over the list which was quite a little chore and some people of the province of Manitoba got into trouble for doing what I did in reference

to this about which I will have something to say a little later on. The list I received contained 7,344 names. There are 4,237 that belong to me and there are 3,097 that belong to somebody else. How is that? Take the constituency of Emerson. There is one township in the constituency of Emerson brought into Lisgar and because that one township was brought into Lisgar this gentleman sends me the whole electoral list of Emerson. That applies to Mountain, and to Manitou, two other constituencies portions of which are in Lisgar. If we undertook to hold an election in Manitoba to-day we would not have a list upon which to hold it, and if anybody should undertake to prepare it, because there is no provision under the law by which these lists shall be made, the Attorney General would have him arrested and prosecuted for so doing. I want to say right here that if an election were to take place in any constituency in Manitoba, so long as we have the present Attorney General at the head of affairs, and I were asked to nominate a returning officer for the constituency in which the election was to be held I would not do so. I would not put my friend in the position of being persecuted as others have been.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) to say that one division of Emerson is brought into Lisgar?

Mr. GREENWAY. I did not catch what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand the hon. member for Lisgar to be finding fault because one portion of the local constituency of Emerson was brought into the Dominion constituency of Lisgar.

Mr. GREENWAY. I did not find fault with it at all. I was finding fault with the list. The hon. gentleman does not understand me. I was finding fault because the list was not right, and I was finding fault because the hon. gentleman's friends persecute people who undertake to put the list right.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would ask the hon. gentleman to state again what he said about part of Emerson being brought into the constituency of Lisgar.

Mr. GREENWAY. I said that because one township of Emerson was in the conconstituency of Lisgar, the King's Printer sent me the whole of the list of Emerson.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Exactly, that is what I understand.

Mr. GREENWAY. I was not complaining about that. I was not saying anything about what the district should be.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is exactly what I want to know.

Mr. GREENWAY. The hon. gentleman will know that another reason for complaint against the Liberals of Manitoba was that they had changed the polling subdivisions. According to the law of Manitoba it was supposed that the registration district under the law which was carried out by the judges should be the polling division. My hon. friend knows, if he thinks for a moment, that one part of the western end of my constituency and one part of the eastern end of his constituency comprise one polling subdivision and that in this subdivison there are 59 votes in my constituency and 142 votes in the constituency of my hon. friend. What is going to be done? Who is going to provide the remedy? Who is going to provide that the 59 votes shall vote in my constituency and the 142 in the constituency of my hon. friend? Somebody has to do it, somebody has done it, and because somebody has done it he has been persecuted and prosecuted by the local government. There have been a great many things said about this election. I know that the Minister of Public Works of the province of Manitoba, who has been quoted sometimes in this House and who has furnished my hon. friends opposite with a good deal of material, has told his friends in the east that they propose to carry every seat in Manitoba. Well, he was not without having some good grounds for his faith because he knew how the lists were prepared and he knew that the Liberals had neglected to take part in the compilation. This statement has been made very clearly and perhaps I might as well say here the reason why the Liberals neglected it. I am speaking for the purpose of being perfectly candid with everybody, and I find fault with my friends of the government who knew the state of affairs in Manitoba that they did not carry out their intention at the last session of parliament and give us the means of having a proper list. It was because of the understanding—I never had any personal understanding, but I know I am speaking by the book—that we are going to have a new list that the Liberals neglected the compilation of the list. It was because of the understanding that the government was going to take this course, that the Liberals, in the compilation of the lists, neglected them altogether, and it is because of the local lists which we had that these gentlemen in Winnipeg wanted to perpetuate those lists and get another advantage from them if they could. You could not have a better illustration of how these men acted than a little extract from a paper published in the town from which my hon. friend from Portage (Mr. Crawford) hails. The revision at the court house that paper says, is a production worthy of its authors. This was the revision of 1904 for the purpose of electing members to the House of Commons. Every canvasser upon the Conservative side in Manitoba was told that that was the list upon which the next Dominion elections were going to be run, and they were very eager to see all their friends

get on. Here is one of the results at the Court of Revision :

As a result of the revision 65 Tories were added and 105 Grits were struck off. No Grits were added nor Tories struck off unless in error.

That is a little bit of evidence of how that list was compiled and because this clipping expresses my sentiments, I may as well give it to the House.

But there are fully a hundred Grits that should go on and a hundred Tories that should come off, but it would have cost the Liberals $500 to get their friends on and their opponents off. Such a law is subversive of the liberties of the people and cannot be too quickly wiped off the statue-book. It is the duty of the House of Commons to pass legislation at the present session for a fair and impartial enrolment of the electors for the federal elections.

My hon. friend talks about the little red line, I happen to know that after we had got the evidence with reference to these lists, we had had the greatest difficulty in the world to get a candidate on our side. I am not revealing any particular party secret that is of much consequence just now when I say that I do know there are sitting in this House, men who declared they would not run because of the failure of the government to carry out the promise which I fancy was made. They were induced to run on account——

Mr. BENNETT. Of the stuff.

Mr. GREENWAY. They were induced to run, and the result was perhaps different from what they expected. I could confront my hon. friend, who interrupted me, with a good deal of evidence on the subject, because it is important perhaps to show the motive of the crime about to be committed next month. Let me refer him to a little inadvertence of his. During the time of the registration for 1904, he received a letter from his leader in Manitoba, of which he did not take that great care he should, or it would not have got into public print. A copy of it was published in some of the papers in Manitoba, and I merely cite this to show that these gentlemen knew then, as they know now, that we did not take any part in the compilation of the lists. I shall not read all the letter but my hon. friend, if he wants to read it through and refresh his memory, can find it in the reading room.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Read it all ; it is not very long.

Mr. GREENWAY. No, it is not very long, but I need not read it all, because there is a part of it which is not pertinent to the question which I am discussing. For instance that part which refers to my old time friend Mr. Richardson :

I presume you were busy with registration this week, but so far as I can learn no effort is being made by the Grits anywhere. That means one of two things. Either they are going to change the law or there will be no election this year.

An hon. MEMBER. Is that all ?

Mr. GREENWAY. No, but that is all of that. Then I have here extracts from the Conservative papers in Winnipeg, both senior and junior, crowing over the Liberals because they had failed to have anything to do with the compilation of the lists and then were laughed at by their friends. The 'Tribune,' which is the junior Conservative paper in Winnipeg, and is perhaps a little more zealous than its old time friend the 'Telegram,' because it is its junior, published a long article headed 'The joke of the hour.' And the joke of the hour was that the Liberals did not get upon the lists which were to be used in the Dominion elections. It is no wonder then that my hon. friend was disappointed when he found Manitoba went the way it did. And the hon. the leader of the opposition received messages from the gentleman to whom I refer, assuring him that Manitoba would send a solid contingent in his favour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What gentleman ?

Mr. GREENWAY. The Hon. Mr. Rogers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not aware of any such messages.

Mr. GREENWAY. I read the messages in the newspapers but perhaps they did not reach the hon. gentleman.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not see them.

Mr. GREENWAY. My hon. friend has been paying a good deal of attention to Mr. Rogers during the session and perhaps it is well he should not forget him just now. A few days after the election, Mr. Rogers came to Toronto and gave an interview, in which he undertook to account for the defeat of the Conservative party in Manitoba, in that interview he said :

Three-fourths of the voters in Manitoba were Conservative.

I suppose he meant three-fourths of those who were on the lists, but to a good many the privilege of voting was denied.

In every polling division in the province from ten to forty voters found, on presenting themselves at the polls, that they were unable to vote. Their names were on the official lists and the red line——

This is the red line about which my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has been dreaming.

The red line had been run through them and the deputy returning officers refused to give them the ballots.

I characterize that as one of the worst pieces of misrepresentation I know of. You have only to think for a moment of this fact. There were 545 polling places opened in Manitoba. If I take my hon. friends lowest

number, ten voters, there were 5,450 votes. If I take the average number at twenty, you have twice that; and I want to say right here that in the changing of the lists, which had to be done by some one, there was not in the whole of Manitoba one hundred errors in making those changes. Of course a red line or a blue line, or some other line had to be used to strike out the votes that I refer to. They did not belong to me in Lisgar but belonged to my hon. friend. When I read that, I took the trouble to go carefully over the polling books to find out just what happened in Lisgar, and what was the result? I found that there had been six Liberals left off the list and that three Conservatives had been misplaced. That was the sum total of the errors in Lisgar. My hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) on one occasion undertook to say that his majority would have been vastly increased had it not been for the red line, but I can tell him that if it had not been for the stuffing of the lists and for the preventing of Liberals getting on the lists, the hon. gentleman would have had no majority at all.

Now, Sir, I know of no better illustration of the unfairness of the Conservative papers than their action in connection with this matter. Early in the session we had scare head lines in all the papers, from the Montreal 'Gazette' down to the Toronto 'World': 'Frauds in Manitoba; startling developments in Manitoba in the preparation of the lists.' In my more than a quarter of a century's experience in Manitoba, I do not remember of there ever having been but one special fraud attempted, and that was by a gentleman who was sent up from the east, and whose name was Freeborn, and who came up for the purpose of teaching our people how they might spoil ballots. But upon this last and worst outrage these papers are absolutely silent. Now, Sir, it is not necessary for me to go over the entire list of the evidence I have. I have a number of extracts here from newspapers to show that the Liberals neglected the lists entirely. I can give you another very good proof of the fact that the lists were not complete. For instance, in the local election of 1903 there were polled in the province of Manitoba 54,500 votes; one constituency, Gimli, which was by acclamation, being estimated. In the election of 1904 for the House of Commons, when, by the steady increase which took place in our voting power in a country which is being largely settled like Manitoba, we should at least have had 3,000 votes more, in this Dominion election there was only polled 53,100 votes. Instead of there being 3,000 votes more than in 1903, which would have been the regular increase, there were 1,400 less votes, showing that the lists were not complete, and further giving evidence of the fact that the contention of the premier, when he wrote my hon. friend, was quite correct, and that we were paying no attention to the lists. That was the position in which we found ourselves. I said a moment ago that I had gone carefully over the parts of the country with which I am acquainted and made a very careful estimate of what is the percentage of that incomplete list, and I say now that upon the 1st day of July, when this list is completed by the present arrangement—it has been decreed by that famous Order in Council that it shall be completed within one month, allowing only one day for court revision by the judges in each constituency, making it impossible for people to be registered—when that is all over, there will be fully 10 per cent of the electorate of Manitoba that will be disfranchised. I wonder if my hon. friend from Macdonald will undertake to defend that state of things. I do not believe that in the history of Canada there ever was undertaken to be perpetrated upon the people such a gross outrage as the one we are discussing just now. I bring this matter before the House to-day for the purpose of pressing upon the government the necessity of providing that a proper list shall be compiled for the province of Manitoba. Surely, in face of the evidence I have presented, there can be no hesitation as to the necessity for it. There is no legal provision for the use of the present lists. We all know, and we have the evidence of our opponents, who say that it is not complete. Is there not a spirit of fair-play enough in my opponents, whom I am addressing, to say that there ought to be a means by which every man who is entitled to vote should be placed upon the list? Is not that good, sound doctrine? I think it is. I do not believe that any party would be guilty of trying to fasten—even if they threaten, as they did last year, to sit here till the snow flies—I do not think any party would be guilty of trying to fasten such an iniquity on the people of Manitoba. In view of the evidence I have given, I hope my friends will see their way clear to remedy this injustice. I want to say to our friends here that if we would take the list as we have it to-day in Manitoba, and if we would go to the courts of revision and that it would be possible or convenient to go to in all the towns in the different constituencies, it would cost the Liberal party of Manitoba $1,000 for each local constituency, or $40,000 in all, to make that list perfect. Ought that work be imposed upon any party? Is it a good, sound principle to force any party to do work of that kind in order to get voters upon the lists? The system which we have in force now is equal to running two elections instead of one. We have to go to an elector and say: We want you to go to such a place and register your vote; and he may reply: I will not go. Then you have to persuade him, you have to take him there and see that he is registered, and possibly take him back again; and then when he comes to vote you have to repeat the whole

thing all over. My hon. friends who have been running elections as long as I have well know something about that. Now, Sir, I do not think that is a fair policy to adopt. I do not think it is fair to our friends in Manitoba. I have spoken longer than I intended and longer than I would have spoken had not my hon. friends opposite interrupted me, but I think I have omitted nothing that is essential to show that the lists are incomplete and that my contention is sound, that they must remain incomplete, because there is no possible way under the system which has been adopted in the province of getting the names on the voters' lists.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). I am sorry I had not the pleasure of hearing the whole of the speech of my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), as I was in attendance at a committee of the House when I heard that the hon. gentleman was appealing to the jury of parliament in order to get what he calls fair-play, but not what I believe he considered to be the kind of fair-play that he dealt out to his opponents when he was premier of Manitoba. There may be a difference of opinion as to what fair-play is. It is well to remember, however, that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) has failed to appeal successfully to his own jury in the province of Manitoba ; he was turned down by the people of his province for all time to come, and now he appears as a private member of the House of Commons and endeavours to enlist the sympathies of the members of this House against what he is pleased to term an iniquitous electoral list. Our friends on the opposite side of the House were not satisfied with the old Dominion Franchise Act. They said it was too cumbersome and too expensive, and that it put the people to a very great deal of expense and inconvenience, but if we are going to change the present system of preparing the voters' lists, and if we are going to have an inexpensive system, as the hon. member for Lisgar says he desires, then that system should apply to all the other provinces of the Dominion, and should not be specially applied to any one particular province.

Now, however, things have changed ; there has been a revolution of feeling, in the more intelligent parts of Canada at any rate, and Manitoba sent the ball rolling in the right direction. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) would never have held the reins of government so long as he did in Manitoba on broad questions of public policy. He secured his support at least on two successive elections, by appeals to prejudice and passions of the people by means of the school question. This is what retained the hon. gentleman in power so very long and not the fact of his general policy being suitable to the people of the province. Now, because they have met with defeat on a couple of occasions in Manitoba the hon. gentleman desires that an exception should be made in the province in connection with the Dominion Franchise Act, and that you should take the provincial lists wherever there is a Liberal government in power and that you should have a new list prepared by the Dominion officials where there is a Conservative government in power. He has in mind no doubt the list that was prepared for the constituency of Lisgar two or three years ago at the time a by-election was held there. The Dominion Act calls for new lists to be prepared by the Dominion officials in the event of the provincial lists being more than 12 months old. At the time of the by-election Mr. Richardson was seeking the franchise of the electors, and by the way my hon friend referred rather skeptically to his old time friend Mr. Richardson. Time was when they used to hunt in couples ; time was when Mr. Richardson and the right hon. gentleman himself used to go from hustings to hustings and he appreciated the support that he received from Mr. Richardson at that time. They are not standing on the same platform to-day.

Mr. GREENWAY. He has gone Tory.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The fact is that the hon. gentleman and his friends have changed their principles and Mr. Richardson is still standing exactly for the principles that he advocated when he was a candidate for the hon. gentleman and his party. It is the party which has strayed away from their moorings and they should not be so very unkind to Mr. Richardson because he chose to turn his guns on the hon. gentleman now and because standing to his principles, Mr. Richardson in discharging his duties as a public citizen endeavours to lead the hon. gentleman back to his first starting place. There was a by-election in that constituency a few years ago. The provincial lists were more than 12 months old and a new list had to be prepared. The Dominion Act states that in the compilation of these lists the provincial law should be followed in so far as it possibly can be followed. What was the Manitoba Act ? That the judges should prepare the list, should appoint the officials, should have the courts of revision. Was that Act followed out ? Not at all. Mr. Sifton, the Minister of the Interior of that day, ignored the provincial Act in making a new list for Lisgar. This was one of the cases where that gentleman was superior to the law of the country or thought he was superior, and he therefore appointed not the judges of the province, but one of his own political organizers, a henchman, a private citizen who had been one of his own organizers. He constituted him the board instead of the judges of Manitoba. Was that adhering to the law ? What did he do ? Did he do everything in an inexpensive manner, did he do everything to suit the electors' convenience ? Not at all. He placed the registration booths in the most inconvenient places he could for the Con-

servative party and he adopted the same plan for the courts of revision. He made it as inconvenient as possible for the Conservatives to get on the lists or to get out the votes. The hon. gentleman is sighing for a return to this order of things. He gets up in the parliament here and tries to enlist the sympathy of the members with a tear in his voice telling what wonderful consideration he has for the good old days. He wants to go back to the good old days in Lisgar, when Mr. Sifton manufactured the list through a private citizen, ignoring the judges of the land. He is not so anxious to use the provincial lists as when the Liberals were in power. He says: I desire to see a fair list—and you would think he was in earnest when he says that. His recollection must be very short if he cannot remember when he was Prime Minister of the province, when he used to manufacture the lists. And what kind of lists did we have then. Did he have the judges prepare the lists? Oh, no. He would not trust the judges in the province. Who prepared the list? Partisan officers appointed by his own government some of whom had to fly the country for the country's good. I do not have to go at all outside my own constituency to find an illustration of the character of the partisan officials that that gentleman appointed. The law stated that they should take the last provincial lists, the last Dominion lists, and the last municipal lists as a basis in making up the new lists, compiling them therefrom and making any additions necessary, but in making the additions when we were supposed to supply affidavits in the absence of the person appealing for registration, I have myself sent in a list of electors accompanied by my affidavit, that they were legitimate electors, qualified to vote. I handed these affidavits in to an officer appointed by the Liberal government of the day and when the lists were printed a number of these names were left off notwithstanding they were accompanied by an affidavit. This is only one illustration of many, and when the revision was being held and the present Judge Richards was the revising officer, I asked the enumerator who prepared the list how it came that these names were left off. I said: Did you not see that this man's name, (taking one instance), was on the provincial, Dominion and municipal lists and that he had been resident of the province for years? Why did you leave him off? Yes, he said, but the laws says I am to get any other information possible that is available. I asked him why he had ignored the passing over of this man's name in the previous lists and had taken outside information. I asked his authority and he refused to give it. I pointed to the Liberal candidate who was there at the time and I said: There is you authority, you took the word of the Liberal candidate for it that this man's name should not be on the list, and refused my affidavit. Is that partisanship? And when the judge, then the revising officer, heard it, he immediately put down the name on the list and called down the enumerator for his partisan action. That is only one illustration of the character of those fair lists that prevailed during the regime of the hon. gentleman who is making such a hubbub about the lists in Manitoba. Take again in the city of Winnipeg. The Ogilvie Milling Company had 30 employees in a certain mill there. These men had been on previous lists, but at this particular time it was found that 27 of the names were left off and three were put on. Of course it was only a coincidence that the three who were put on were Liberals and that the 27 who were left off were Conservatives. When the enumerator was asked how it came that these 27 Conservative electors were left off what was his explanation? Well, he said, I have an old list to go by, and I found that these three names are on the list and I put them in the new list. He was asked what list he had and he actually confessed it was an old scrutineer's book that had been used in the previous election and he put on the three names that had been marked as voting Liberal and left off the 27 although they all worked in the same mill. And this is the fair list the hon. gentleman wants: to go back to the old days when they did not depend on intimidation and bribery alone but disfranchised the electors by leaving them entirely off the lists. The hon. gentleman has stated that a great many electors in Manitoba at the present time have to go 40, 50, or 60 miles or even more in order to reach the registration courts. And he tells us: When I was in power they had so many registration districts, they had so many courts of revision; two years ago when the judges were running affairs, we had half a dozen or a dozen in each constituency, while now there is only one. In this way, the hon. gentleman compared the revision that is to take place this year with the revision that took place two years ago and when he was in power in Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no comparison whatever. Why? Because the list of two years ago was a new list entirely on the basis of personal registration. Those who are already on the list do not need to go up and register again. We have a permanent population, you say, in Manitoba. Of course, there are always new people coming in, but those who, in the meantime, have become qualified, have the privilege of coming forward and registering at the registration booth or at the Court of Revision held some time after the registration, while the names already on the list are left on unless the parties have become disqualified in the meantime and application is made to strike them off. So, the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Greenway states only a part of the truth. Why should the country be put to the expense of making up an entire new list? That is where the hon. gentleman missed having a grievance. Had the provincial government provided for as many registration booths as when the list was being prepared, with all the extra officers and general expense, the hon. gentleman would have been the first to quote this as evidence of the extravagance of the provincial administration. But the provincial government know that this is an off-year, that there will be no provincial election. Nor will there be a Dominion election, unless the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) is unseated for bribery and corruption, or unless the place of his dear old friend, whom he rather reflected upon, the Lieutenant Governor of the province, which place is to become vacant this fall, attracts him, in which event we may have a by-election in Lisgar. But why should the provincial government have the same number of registration districts and courts of revision that they had two years ago when a new list had to be prepared? And the hon. gentleman's comparison of the number of miles electors had to go now to register their names with the number they had to travel for the same purpose two years ago is entirely unfair. The hon. gentleman cannot complain of the Mountain election having been won by unfair lists, because that is one of the constituencies in which the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite had actively looked after the lists, one of the Liberal organizers going there and spending most of his time last year during the revision. They expected two vacancies in that province. The first was Dauphin, where the Conservative member of the provincial legislature was going to be the Conservative candidate for the Dominion. The friends of hon. gentlemen opposite looked well after that list. Then, they knew that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) was discredited as provincial leader, his friends wishing to get him out of the way, were going to put him up as a candidate for the Dominion parliament, which would create a vacancy, in the constituency he then represented in the local House, the constituency of Mountain. And so they looked well after that list. But, in spite of their having a list as favourable to themselves as they could make it, the hon. gentleman's old constituency of Mountain, owing to the great upheaval of public opinion there, defeated his candidate, and, for the first time in twenty-five years elected a Conservative. Two years ago, the judges of the province revised the lists and made the nomination of the registration clerks. And, if fault is found it is found with the appointment of registration clerks by the provincial government to-day. I can only say the government have re-appointed very many of the men who were appointed two years ago. And, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) tries to make his explanation of the 'thin red line,' I think he could hardly have satisfied himself, much less the members of this House. He attempted to show that it was because certain polling districts belonged to two ridings, and that it was necessary to have the names appear according to their proper division. I have here a fac simile of the list for division No. 9 of Selkirk—except that there are black lines instead of red—which I show to hon. gentlemen opposite to make them ashamed of the officials their friends appointed. For, this subdivision was entirely within one constituency, we find no fewer than forty-two names struck off. Many of these men were disfranchised and many more would have been disfranchised had not they taken possession of the poll and insisted upon the deputy returning officer accepting their ballots. But, even when he did accept them, he put them in a separate envelope and did not count them in the general vote. So, when the hon. gentleman attempts to account for this disfranchisement of qualified voters by saying that it was necessary in the case of subdivisions which are in two constituencies, his explanation does not explain. In my own constituency, the returning officer is an honest, straightforward man, a fellow citizen of my own. He is above doing anything of a dishonest character. But he received instructions from some person. The law states that a returning officer shall prepare, or cause to be prepared, a list which he shall supply to the deputy returning officers and which he shall certify as correct. Did the returning officer for the constituency of Marquette do that? No. My agent waited upon him and saw the lists brought into his office and unpacked. He saw the red line scored through the names and asked the returning officer what explanation he could give of it. The returning officer admitted candidly that he did not do it. My agent asked where the lists were prepared in this way, and the returning officer answered that he presumed that they were erased in Winnipeg. My agent called his attention to eleven names in a certain district where the voters were wrongly described. For instance, a man living in township 15 range 17 was given as township 16 range 17. And, because of that, red lines were scored through the names. Of eleven names thus wrongly described, ten were those of Conservatives, and all had been scored out. One was a Liberal, and there was no red line through that name, although the description was wrong as in the other cases. My agent asked the returning officer: How can you certify these lists to be correct as required by law? And the returning officer answered: I will take good care not to do

anything of the kind ; I will write 'certified,' not 'certified correct.' And, if you will look at the Marquette list, which I moved to have laid on the table, you will find that that is the way it is certified. It was a quibble, I grant you; but the returning officer would not take the responsibility of certifying the lists to be correct, because he knew that they were not correct. These lists were scored before they came into his possession and scored in the office of the Liberal organizer in Winnipeg. Now, who were some of these officials ? Take one in the constituency of Selkirk. Everybody will admit that the men appointed to act as deputy returning officers and poll clerks should be men who have the confidence of the people of their districts. But in one district they had a man by the name of Duggan. He had been a bartender in the town of Selkirk. In his evidence he stated that he was a clerk in a hotel, and had previously been tending bar in Selkirk. And this was a gentleman who was appointed returning officer in that constituency, as was shown afterwards in the court. There were at poll 9, Beausejour, twenty-three names struck off; at poll 16 there were twenty-two names ; at poll 11, one name; at poll 26, fifteen names; at poll 27, seven names ; at poll 35, six names ; at poll 37, nineteen names. Some of these may have been put on poll 28, for the list for that subdivision was missing. Many of the lists which should have been sent back to the court were found missing from the ballot boxes and have never been found up to the present day. So far as we can learn, every one of these people was struck off and disfranchised, because they were not all allowed to vote at any poll, though they were entitled to do so.

Now it was invariable, so far as we can learn, there may have been a few exceptions by mistake, but the lists without exception were of Conservative electors. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman was rather venturesome to bring a question like this up in the House of Commons, with such a black record for his party. Not being satisfied with the thin red line in that constituency, they have used it in other constituencies as well. For instance in the constituency of Macdonald it was not known until the morning of the election by the Conservative portion of the community that these lists had been so doctored, and when they found it out they went to the law officer of the Crown, to the Attorney General and some arrests were made on that occasion. Investigations have been held and some of the charges have been thrown out on technicalities, for instance in one case where the charge was that they were erased from the list the word 'wilful' was left out, and on this the judge threw the case out because he held it was an error or omission. But there were other cases that never came to trial because the grand jury did not allow, as I think they should have allowed, in my opinion—I am not going to accuse them of being animated by political motives—but at any rate the grand jury did not see fit to allow other cases to come to trial. Nevertheless these gentlemen, through another process of law, are going to be made to face the music, and we will see if they can commit these crimes with impunity. I might read a great deal of evidence distinctly declaring that the witnesses had taken their lists into Mr. Leach. And who is Mr. Leach ? Mr. Leach was the Dominion Liberal organizer for the province of Manitoba. He has since secured his reward by being appointed to a position in the Department of the Interior, the usual refuge for all these gentry who were doing handy work for the Liberal party. Mr. Leach is to-day in the employ of the Dominion government as a reward for his political services. He opened an office in the city of Winnipeg, he had the returning officers send or bring their lists into him, and he even prepared the proclamations. These proclamations were prepared some time prior to the election by means of a personal canvas, and the canvas books were prepared throughout the province by the Liberal organizers long before the elections were held. In my constituency there was a gentleman by the name of McNab who had never been out of the constituency prior to holding the election, for 10 months doing just such work preparatory to scoring off those names. These lists were prepared under the direction and guidance of Mr. Leach. Can any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House defend that proceeding ? Who can say that it is right and proper for the Liberal organizer to take this work out of the returning officers hands, the gentleman who is by law appointed to prepare these lists ? They are taken entirely out of his hands by the Liberal organizer, and do you suppose that a gentleman of that kind is likely to do his work in a manner to commend itself to the fairness of both political parties ? Is it surprising that under these circumstances we find the thin red line doing its work very efficiently in many cases ? Let me read the evidence of one Ayotte, a deputy returning officer, when he was being cross-examined. He states that he took his list into the office of Mr. Leach, the Liberal organizer, who furnished him with his proclamation and asked him if he could fix the lists according to the proclamation, and he said he could. He is asked :

Did you leave the lists with him ?—A. Yes, sir.

Shortly afterwards he went back to Mr. Leach and obtained the lists altered in a great measure by having lines struck through names on the lists. He apparently did not take the trouble to ascertain whether the alterations made were proper or not, nor did he even examine them for the pur-

pose of ascertaining what were the nature of the alterations Mr. Leach had made, for he goes on in his evidence to state :

Mr. Knott : Q. You did not know anything about them, that is, the lists ?—A. No.

Q. They may have been different lists altogether for all you know ?—A. Yes.

Q. They may have been lists for Macdonald or Winnipeg ?—A. Yes, they may have been.

Q. You took his word (that is Mr. Leach's) that these were the lists you wanted, with the different polling subdivisions, and that satisfied you then ?—A. Yes.

Having received the lists in this altered condition, Ayotte certified to them as being correct, although he admitted he did not know whether they were correct or not. He then went and placed them in their respective ballot boxes, which ballot boxes he had kept in the Liberal candidate's committee rooms in St. Boniface. The Liberal committee rooms in St. Boniface were the headquarters for this gentleman, where he took his lists and left them in their boxes. All the official papers transmitted to him in connection with the election from Provencher were also kept by him in Mr. Cyr's committee room in St. Boniface, but how long they were there the witness could not tell. There was no safe there where they could be locked up, and it is not known how many people had access to them during the time they were there. He did not know just how long they remained in that committee room. Now this gentleman confesses that he took the lists to the Liberal organizer ; and he took them to be fixed in conformity with the proclamation, and that Mr. Leach had them fixed for him. He went and received the lists, without knowing whether they were the same lists, then he left them open in his box in the Liberal committee room where they remained until the election. Now if that is the kind of fairness the hon. gentleman wishes to re-establish in the province of Manitoba I do not think the people of that province of either political party will agree with him. I do not think it is necessary for me to read all this evidence. Probably some time we will have an occasion to go into this matter more fully. The hon. gentleman from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has seen fit to leave the House, therefore I do not think I need trouble you with any further quotations. I desire to say that there is no comparison whatever between the lists as prepared to-day under the Conservative government, in respect to fairness, and the lists that were previously made by the Liberal government. There is no responsible citizen in Manitoba, no matter what his politics, who would desire to go back to the old system. If you read the independent press of that province you will find them stating almost without exception that although the original lists may have taken a little more trouble to prepare, they were sure to be clean lists, and people could be sure that they did not contain the names of dead men, of men who had been absent for years, as was the case with the lists prepared by the agents of the Greenway government. People prefer to vote on clean lists, even though they are a little more expensive on account of various registrations that have to take place. Therefore there is no possible comparison between the present lists and what they were a few years ago. The Greenway law required the lists to be made just prior to a provincial election, once every four years. The present law provides for an annual revision and immediately prior to a general election a more complete revision will take place and the people will have all the registration districts they require. But this year's revision is merely supplementary to the original lists. I think when the speech of the hon. member for Lisgar is published in the province of Manitoba it will not meet with much approbation.

Mr. J. CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, I was rather pleased with the remarks of the hon. member, for Marquette (Mr. Roche) who has just taken his seat because of the fact that what he said went a long way to prove the point which my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) attempted to make. I noticed that he failed to defend the position that he now occupies in so far as our Franchise Act is concerned and in so far as the conduct of the government of the province of Manitoba is concerned. There is no question but that the condition of affairs as it exists at the present time by reason of the adoption of the provincial lists of the province of Manitoba is far from what it ought to be. The remarks of my hon. friend from Lisgar, I think, in every particular, embodied a true statement of the facts. I will try simply to enlarge upon the statement he made. I may just say before proceeding with the few remarks I intend to make that we expect that our friends on this side of the House will seriously study the situation, and that our friends on the other side of the House will do the same. I believe I am not going beyond the true state of things when I say that this side of the House is not wholly responsible for the condition of things prevailing in Manitoba at the present time. We, in the province of Manitoba, knew more than a year ago, in fact two years ago that means were not being provided by our provincial authorities in Manitoba whereby we were likely to get a fair list and we knew at that time that by the adoption of the provincial list, as provided for in our Franchise Act, we were not going to get what we considered a clean and proper list for use in our election. We knew the dangers which were ahead of us at that time, and we knew some of the consequences that were likely to take place, and this is one of the reasons why we looked to Ottawa a year ago for some change in this respect. We have a condition of things existing in Manitoba to-day which I may say is a dis-

grace to the whole country. That condition has been brought about by the adoption of the provincial franchise for Dominion purposes. Ever since the 3rd November last we have had a condition of things existing in the province of Manitoba which should not exist and which is not calculated to do our country any good. We have heard of the use of the red line in connection with our voters' lists, to disfranchise many of our citizens who by the use of this red line were deprived of their votes when the election came on. As far as the use of the red line is concerned, I am not going to say anything about it. The red line was used in some cases and other lines were used in other cases, because it was necessary to use a line of some kind or another. I am not going to defend anything that may have been improperly done to disfranchise any elector. These points are being discussed in the courts of Manitoba to-day. The courts have been appealed to to settle whether right or wrong has been done in that respect and I will just leave it in that position. I may just say that in so far as my own constituency is concerned, I have heard of no complaint in so far as the improper use of the red line is concerned. I have only heard of one elector being improperly disfranchised in that constituency in connection with the lists which were used on the 3rd November last. I took the trouble to look over the lists and just this one complaint was made at the time to me in connection with the disfranchisement of this elector. I know the gentleman in question very well. He is just as much entitled to vote as any person in this House or any person in Canada, but he, for some reason or other, was struck off at the court of revision by the revising officer. I just mention this to show the House that it is possible for errors to creep in here and there. This is one error which crept in in my own constituency in connection with this particular voter. This is the only one out of 8,000 voters in my constituency that I have heard of as being deprived of his vote through the use of any line and that line was the line the revising officer used at the time of the holding of the court of revision. My hon. friend from Lisgar has made his statement and it is not necessary for me to repeat a great deal of what he said. But, I would just like to say that I feel that the government of the province of Manitoba to-day are trying to create the impression that certain persons representing the Liberal party had a deep laid scheme whereby the elections were to be won by dishonest and illegal practices. They have tried to prove their case. They have had a great many prosecutions started against certain individuals who were connected with the elections held last November. Ten writs were issued against different parties in Manitoba particularly around Winnipeg. These parties were arrested for illegal practices in connection with elections. These ten cases have gone through different stages of the courts. In the first instance these parties were tried before the police magistrate who is a partisan of the provincial government, a very strong Conservative and it was naturally up to him to see to it that these parties who came before him should be sent up for trial. They were, of course. Naturally we expected that. These ten cases were all sent up to the higher court and each and every one of these cases was dismissed. Not one of them came to trial. Every one of them was turned down. Now, you would think that after the government of Manitoba had had an opportunity of testing this question on ten different points in ten separate cases that would end their work, but they have a different idea about these things. They are continuing these same prosecutions, not on quite the same charges but on similar charges. They have gone so far in the province of Manitoba as to vote money for the purpose of prosecuting these cases. At the last session of the local House they voted a certain sum of money to be used to prosecute those, who, in their minds, had done something illegal in connection with the preparation of the lists used at the elections on the 3rd of November last. I consider that the prosecutions which they are conducting at the present time are not based on any real honest motive at all, but that they partake more of the character of persecution than anything else. The men who have gone through their trials in different courts have been re-arrested. This whole condition is not entirely the fault of the people of Manitoba, but it is created through the act of this House. I claim that this is merely an excuse for continuing those conditions, and that to continue those conditions is something the members of this House should not ask the people of Manitoba to submit to any longer. I do not want to throw the onus for this condition of things on one party more than the other. This side is just as much to blame as our hon. friends opposite. Had our friends opposite last year been willing that the present conditions should continue, no doubt it would have been put an end to. They are therefore just as much responsible as we are, and I am not attempting to free this side of the House from any responsibility in that connection. Let me just read a few quotations from the 'Telegram' of the 10th November, 1905, and the 'Telegram' is a Conservative paper published in Winnipeg:

> Startling was the revelation made at the police court in Winnipeg yesterday as to the way in which Conservative names were struck from the voters' lists in the province before the last Dominion elections. . . . More shameless trickery was never resorted to.

This newspaper proceeds to say that the bogus ballot boxes of the province of Ontario were hardly a more damnable device than the lists in Manitoba, and charges that

the whole thing has been brought home directly to official Liberal organization. Well, I can only speak for the division I represent, and in that division I have not heard of anything of the kind existing in any shape or form. It may exist in other places; and if it does, this House, which is responsible for that condition, should make a change. That paper continuing, says:

It is now more than ever evident that this whole matter must be sifted to the bottom. When, on election day, appeals and protests came in to the Attorney General from all parts of the province against the fraud being practised on bona fide electors . . . all honest Liberals will join the Conservatives in insisting that the government will do its duty and bring the guilty to punishment.

Here it refers to Mr. Rogers:

As Mr. Rogers said at Wawanesa a few days ago, after referring to the trick ballot boxes of Ontario, there has been in this province a condition of affairs which, to my mind, is equally as serious, and even more bold and daring than the boxes. I refer to the methods adopted in certain constituencies by which, through the use of a red line, hundreds and hundreds of the oldest settlers were deprived of their rights and privileges when they went to ask for their ballots.

All I can say is that in my constituency there are some 8,000 votes, and I have yet to hear that any of those people were deprived of their right to vote through the use of the red line. The paper says further:

In view of yesterday's revelations the public of Manitoba will more heartily than ever stand back of the government in its efforts to serve the cause of justice in respect to the fundamental right of citizens to exercise their franchise.

Again on February 15, 1905, the same paper referred to the matter in glaring headlines: 'Provincial versus Dominion franchise.'

In attempting to extenuate the circumstances attending the erasure of names from voters' lists prior to the late Dominion elections, the 'Free Press' said editorially on Saturday.

To show you that it is up to this government to rectify the situation, I shall read the opinion of the 'Free Press' at that time:

In conclusion it might be said that the Ottawa government is responsible in a large measure for this whole trouble. If it had made proper lists for the Manitoba constituencies, it would not have required rearranging. By compelling the use of the local lists made for the constituencies whose boundaries do not correspond with those of the Dominion seats, they imposed upon their election officials a duty which they did not desire but could not shirk—the cutting and fitting of the local lists to the larger area. In discharging this duty they gave the Conservatives, smarting under their well merited defeat and eager for an excuse, an opportunity to raise a colourable cry of dereliction of duty on their part. We need and must have a Dominion franchise for Dominion constituencies, and the sooner the Ottawa government faces this fact and acts accordingly, the better it will be for all parties concerned.

The 'Telegram,' on the same day, says this:

Is it possible that the conscience of the organ is at last awakened, and that, scandalized at the revelations in the courts of malfeasance by Dominion officers in the performance of their duties in connection with the application of the provincial lists for Dominion purposes, it rebels against its masters at Ottawa and prefers a return to the methods condemned by its party rather than risk the repetition of the organized malpractices of its friends during the last election.

On the 25th February, the 'Telegram' again comes out on the same lines and refers to the situation as the revenge of the Liberal party:

Those who recollect the chagrin of the Liberal party in this province when they discovered the worthlessness of Mr. Sifton's promise that the Manitoba lists would be disregarded by parliament, and his advice that they need not worry about the revision, will not be altogether surprised that extreme measures were taken to retrieve the reputation of the Minister of the Interior for political sagacity.

In connection with the revision of the lists, I can only speak for my own division. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) referred to Mr. Leach and others in Winnipeg who prepared the voters' lists. But neither Mr. Leach nor any other person, except the returning officers, had anything to do with the preparation of the lists in Portage Laprairie. The returning officer had complete control and the red line used was made by them. We were greatly disappointed when we did not get what we expected a year ago and what we thought would be required to rectify the conditions that have been brought about through the adoption of the provincial law in that province for Dominion purposes. I for one can say that I was greatly disappointed and in fact it was very difficult for me to decide to be a candidate. Had it not been for the splendid record of the Liberal party since coming into power, and the great progress of the country during the past eight years, not a Liberal would have been returned in the west on the 3rd September last.

The chief reason why the Liberals were so successful in the west last election is because the people of the west were well satisfied with what the Liberal party had done for the country during the past eight years, and were more than pleased at the prospect of what the Liberal government would do for them in the future. Had it not been that hundreds of good Conservatives voted for the Liberal candidate, the prediction of the Hon. Mr. Rogers would have been verified. Let me give a few reasons why the red line or some other line was necessary. I have here the voters'

lists for the district of Portage la Prairie, provided by the King's Printer, and to show the impossibility of satisfactorily working out the law as it now exists I may mention that this constituency consists of parts of seven local constituencies, but not one whole local constituency. If you look at the old redistribution and the present distribution of seats you will find that the old redistribution followed the municipal boundaries almost completely. In my constituency I have a great many municipalities but there are only the boundaries of four municipalities that are not followed, or that are cut across in any particular way, whereas in the case of the local distribution of constituencies it is one of the worst kinds of gerrymanders it is possible to frame; hardly in any case have they attempted to follow the municipal boundaries. Some of the provincial constituencies in my own district include parts of as many as five different municipalities and possibly not one whole municipality. In the Federal division of Portage la Prairie comprising parts of several local constituencies, the municipal boundaries are followed very closely and we only cut four municipalities, and that is where they run off in the direction of the north pole. The Winnipeg 'Telegram' and our Conservative friends tried to make the people believe that there was no use for the red line or any other line, and that we could have got along without anything of that kind. Well, let us see about that. I have a map here of the electoral district of Portage la Prairie which shows the division of the polls, and you will see that at the outlying portions of the division there are eleven different polling divisions in Portage la Prairie which overlap and are partly in the division of Portage la Prairie, partly in Macdonald, partly in Dauphin and partly in Brandon. There are in these eleven overlapping divisions 1,494 names of voters. I find that only 556 of these voters belong to the district of Portage la Prairie and that 815 of them belong to some other electoral division over the line. Now all these names are properly designated on the list and properly located, and in order to get the list for the district of Portage la Prairie it was necessary for the returning officer in that division to strike off 815 names. Further, in these eleven polls there were 123 names that had no location at all and the returning officer could not tell whether they belonged to his division or whether they belonged to some other electoral division. The use of the red line or some other line became necessary to get the names that belonged to Portage la Prairie and to strike off the names that did not belong to that division, but here were 123 names in these eleven polling districts that had no location at all, and the returning officer had no evidence before him to show to what electoral division they did belong. He might be personally acquainted with some of these names although it was not possible he could be acquainted with all of them and in adjusting the list he was very liable to place one of these 123 names either inside or outside their proper electoral division. I do not exactly know how the returning officer arranged it. In No. 1 poll Lakeside, which is one of the municipalities in my division, there was one qualified voter in Portage la Prairie and 90 in Macdonald polling division, and the returning officer for Portage la Prairie had to strike those 90 names off to get a list for that one man. In poll No. 2, Lakeside, there were 123 not qualified, 112 qualified and 33 without any location at all. At poll No. 2, Portage la Prairie, there were 61 qualified voters, 93 not qualified, that is, who were on the list but belonged to some other division, and 19 that had no location at all. In poll No. 4, Cypress, which my hon. friend from Macdonald knows, there were 14 names that belonged to the constituency of Macdonald, only 46 that belonged to the constituency of Portage la Prairie and 2 without any location. In South Brandon there were 34 names on the list belonging to Brandon constituency, 56 belonging to Portage la Prairie, and 6 without any location at all.

In division No. 13 in South Brandon, there are 63 belonging to the constituency of Brandon and three belonging to the constituency of Portage la Prairie. There are only three voters who belong to my division of Portage la Prairie and the others belong to the adjoining division. Now those 63 names have to be struck off to get a list for the Portage district. In No. 10 Norfolk, there are 111 not qualified that belong to the Brandon division and only 24 that belong to the Portage division and 49 who have no location at all. In No. 11 Norfolk there are 86 names of unqualified voters belonging to an outside division and only 17 that belong to the district of Portage la Prairie. In Beautiful Plains, that is my own home, in poll No. 8 there are 47 names on the list that belong to Dauphin, 145 belonging to Portage la Prairie and 12 without any location at all. You cannot tell where they belong unless you personally know where they reside. In poll 17 Gladstone, 21 belong to Dauphin, and 21 to Portage. In 18 Gladstone, 15 belong to Dauphin and 38 to Portage la Prairie. That makes 815 names of unqualified voters on the last list. The returning officer in Portage la Prairie had to strike off these names by the use of a red line or some other line in order to get a list. Out of 1,494 names, 546 were qualified and there were 123 that you could not tell whether they were qualified or not because they had no location. I am satisfied in my own mind that it is not reasonable, it is not right, that we should be forced to use lists in that condition. It is not right or proper that we should delegate to some irresponsible person, if I may speak in that way, the power or the right to revise a voters' list in this way. I do not think it is right for us to ask a returning officer or

any one else to take that responsibility. I think it is up to this House to rectify that condition of affairs and make the required change. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) has not attempted to defend the situation as it now stands. He made no attempt at all to defend his friends in Manitoba and you will notice that throughout the whole discussion in connection with the preparation of the lists in Manitoba the Conservative press of that province and in other parts of Canada have failed to criticise or condemn or say anything about the operation of the present law as applied to Manitoba in the preparation of the voters' lists. There is not any question but that the returning officer has the power to make the changes. But as I said he should not be expected nor should any person else, to take that responsibility and some provision should be made here at a very early date, in fact we expect it to be done at once, so that we shall not be compelled to live under the conditions that exist at the present time. Another reason why the present law should not be continued is found in this circumstance. I have here the Manitoba 'Gazette' which gives the conditions for the preparation of the voters' lists now about to take place. My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has gone pretty fully into that and I can only add to what he has said in connection with the unfair manner in which the lists are being prepared at the present time. A few people possibly who live convenient to the registration booths can get their names on without any loss of time or great expense, but the great hardship is in the fact that people in Manitoba to-day, I might say thousands and thousands, if they are to get their names on the voters' lists and get the privilege of using the franchise when the election comes on, will have to travel hundreds of miles. I live in the heart of the province of Manitoba in one of the most thickly settled districts and people in that local division in order to register their names may possibly have to travel 120 miles at an expense of perhaps $10. Owing to the short time allowed for registration it would be impossible to register the number of voters who would apply for registration if all of those qualified were placed upon the list. I think there are all of 600 voters in that district not on the list at the present time. I was sorry to hear the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) make the statement that there was practically no change in the residents of Manitoba, that settlement was stationary. There is a great change in progress. More people are coming into Manitoba every day and it is increasing in population. A great change is taking place in many constituencies. I believe there are as many as a thousand votes in some districts which will not be registered because of the great expense involved and the short time allowed for registration purposes. I do not believe that in my own local division more than one-half can register in the time allowed. I have here the form which an elector has to fill out in applying for registration. The registration clerk has to fill out the form and to ask a great many questions and then there is a declaration to follow and I claim in many instances, that the ordinary registration clerk who is appointed, no matter how good or clever he may be, will take 15 or 20 minutes to get one elector registered. That means only a very few in an hour. Say he can register one in every five minutes, that is only 12 in an hour. Thirteen hours are now allowed and only about 150 names can be registered as it is personal registration and certain long questions have to be answered and the declaration read over. So it is impossible during the time allowed for those not on the list to get registered under the conditions as they are being carried out in Manitoba to-day.

Mr. STAPLES. How many persons not on the list at the present time would the hon. member say would apply for registration in any particular constituency in Manitoba? I venture to say that outside of Winnipeg there would not be more than 25 or 30 or possibly 100.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the polling division in which I live there are over forty Liberals to add, there are over twenty Tories to strike off, and in the whole division over 600 to register and I think over 300 to strike off. That is something I know about right in my own home, and throughout Manitoba there are thousands to add. And in the city of Winnipeg, I believe, there will be 5,000 voters to add. Now, the registration clerk who has been appointed for my own division, the division of Beautiful Plains, is a fine fellow, a good man. He is a good Tory, but I think he will do the fair thing. But he cannot do more than a certain amount of work in a certain time. I venture to say he cannot register the name of one voter in less than fifteen minutes. And it will take him nearly half his time to register the names of those who will apply for that polling division alone. Even in that central district of Manitoba, a district that has been settled for years, one of the most thickly-settled parts of the province, there are electors who may be obliged to travel 120 miles if they wish to have their names appear on the list. To attend before the registration clerk the voter must make a trip of 60 miles. If he fails to get his name on then, which is not unlikely, he will have to apply to the court of revision. So he will be obliged to travel 120 miles and lose four days, besides incurring an expense of possibly $10 or $15. I have here an extract from the Carberry 'News.' Hon. gentlemen know where Carberry is—on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, 60 miles west of Portage la Prairie. That newspaper says :

We boast about our fine franchise ; we lay great stress on the fact that British citizens in Canada, and in Manitoba especially, enjoy the rights of manhood suffrage ; we pride ourselves on the freedom of our institutions ; yet the Roblin government with one swoop deprives eligible voters of their inalienable right.

On June 1, John Balfour, registration clerk for Norfolk, will attend at Noble Dickie's office for seven and a half hours to receive applications for registration in this riding.

I may explain that, as provided for under the Order in Council, 7½ hours is all that was allowed for registration. But since then, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has stated, the time has been increased to 13 hours. As I understand it, this has been done only by a kind of notice from the Provincial Secretary—there has been no Order in Council extending the time to 13 hours. There has been only a notice advising the registration clerks that they might keep their offices open from 7 a.m. to 10.30 p.m.

He will be there for just that one day and for the number of hours specified and during that time applicants from MacGregor, Rosehill, Douglas, Creeford, Edrans, Wellwood and Brookdale and all intermediate points must be on hand to get their names on the list or go without a vote.

Suppose a voter comes from MacGregor to register. He pays his railway fare, his hotel expenses and loses at least a full day's work. The actual cash outlay will not be less than say $3. He pays this for a free (?) franchise. If he cannot afford to pay the money or lose the time there is no vote for him. It is simply legalized robbery by the government of either money or votes. If an eligible voter comes he loses his money ; if he stays away because of the expense he loses his vote. There is nothing fair or equitable about it. Our Tory friends may say it's as fair for one party as the other.

I may say that that is the only pretense of an excuse that has been made by the Conservative newspapers in the province of Manitoba for this outrage which is being perpetrated upon us—that it is as fair for one as for the other. My hon. friend from Marquette said there was not likely to be an election this year, so there was no need of going to expense in preparing the voters' lists. I do not think I ever heard a more rotten statement from any person as such a statement as that I have just referred to. The idea of an hon. member of this House bringing such an argument forward as an excuse for disfranchising Canadians ! If there is to be no election, there is no need to go to any expense at all. But if you are going to make a voters' list, let it be an honest one and a complete one. The Winnipeg 'Telegram,' a few days ago, made some attempt to excuse the action of the provincial government. This is what they said in their issue of May 3rd, 1905 :

The present year is an off year so far as elections are concerned, and the revision will be a more or less formal affair.

As I say, that is the only excuse I have seen in the Conservative papers of Manitoba for the existing conditions of things.

That is no excuse. It is unfair to both, manifestly unjust and clearly a crime.

There are probably fifty or more voters in MacGregor and its vicinity who are entitled to registration. Does it seem reasonable that these fifty should spend in the aggregate $100 to register when the registration clerk could visit MacGregor and get their names at a cost of $5 ? The same rule applies to other points in the riding.

The 'Telegram' states that this registration is only a formal proceeding and that no election will be held on the list thus revised. If that is the case, why spend money for revision at all ? Does the 'Telegram' thus acknowledge that the Roblin government spend the people's money in farcical schemes ?

I think I have said enough to show the situation in Manitoba. We are not here defending something the Greenway government may have done ten or fifteen years ago ; we are dealing with things of to-day. It is no excuse for the outrage of to-day to say that the Greenway franchise law of ten years ago was not all it should have been. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) has practically tried to argue that because the Greenway government did something wrong some ten or fifteen years ago, that was a reason why we should not change the existing condition.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to occupy more time. But I would like to give one or two figures to show the distances that citizens have to travel from in some constituencies in order to register their names. I have here the name of one division where electors have to travel 400 miles to get their names on the list. In another division, if they had to make the return trip, they would have to travel 220 miles. In Swan River they would have to travel 145 miles each way. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope this House is convinced that the state of things we have at the present time in the province of Manitoba ought not to be continued.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon gentleman is doubtless familiar with the action of the Liberal party in the legislature of the province of Manitoba. Might I ask him if the Liberal party have at any time moved to abolish this law inaugurated by the Roblin administration ?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know that I can answer that, I have not been in the provincial house. I have not the records before me, but I have no doubt they have moved against it. But even though they may not have moved against it, that is no justification for maintaining it on the statute book. I do not see the point my hon. friend is trying to make. I want to say this in conclusion, that a number of our friends in the province of Manitoba, honourable men, have suffered from proceedings being taken against them owing to conditions

brought into existence by this parliament of Canada ; they have been placed in positions in which they were forced to do certain things, and have been put to certain expense and loss of time, and obliged to defend themselves against charges. I think it would be only right for this parliament to recompense those men in some way or another, for although they have had to defend themselves in court, they have not been guilty of any illegal act, and I think they should be recompensed in some way for the abuse they have suffered and the time they have lost. I leave the situation as it now stands, and trust to the good sense of this House to rectify it.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me as a strange thing that this matter should be sprung upon the House this afternoon. It certainly was sprung upon us by hon. members opposite, because evidently they have had plenty of notice that the discussion was coming on, and have been preparing themselves for it. There seems to have been some object to gain in bringing on this discussion, and my feeling is that it is because they do not wish to resume discussion of the question which has been before this House for some weeks. I believe therefore they have an object in bringing on this discussion to-day. I would like to have had some time to prepare myself ; but we have to speak offhand, as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) did, although hon. gentlemen opposite have had some days or weeks in which to prepare their briefs. Now, Sir, I am sorry that the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) has seen fit to leave the House. There is an old saying that a man who fights and runs away, lives to fight another day. But I would not expect that of an old parliamentarian, a man of such long experience as the hon. member for Lisgar. If the hon. member for Lisgar had not made a personal reference to myself I do not think I would have detained the House with any remarks. The member for Lisgar said that he appealed to this House as to a jury. Well, Sir, I think I can give evidence to this jury on which they will have no hesitation in giving a decision to the defendant. Sir, there is no man in Canada who thoroughly understands the legislation under the Greenway government and the system of registration in vogue to-day under the Roblin government, but will say that the present system of registration is much more fair and just. The former system allowed men to vote who were dead, men who had been for years out of the country. Now the member for Lisgar said that he approved of the principle of the registration, that it was all right. Let me say that under the old administration and the old way of making up the lists, there was one man appointed for each local district to make the registration. He could go around and take affidavits all over the country. Although the registration was supposed to cease at a certain hour of the evening, I know for a fact that in my own town a number of names were simply handed in to this officer who was appointed to register the voters, and he put them on. That was done all over the province of Manitoba. If I had known beforehand that this debate was coming on I could have procured figures to show what it cost the Conservative party throughout the province to get names off the list that had no right to be there, names which had been put on under the policy which the hon. member for Lisgar advocated here to-day. Now, I cannot understand how an old parliamentary hand like the member for Lisgar could get up here and attempt to deceive this House, as he did in regard to the registration under the Roblin government.

When the Roblin government came into power Mr. Roblin said : We want a fair list. We do not want to prevent any one from voting who has the right to vote, but we want to prevent dead men from voting. The hon. member who used to represent Dauphin will remember how that system was conducted when the Canadian Northern Railway was being built up through that country. They used to take carloads of men who had not been there for some time out to that country to vote. They could do that under the old system, but under the system of personal registration that state of affairs is absolutely impossible. Well, Mr. Roblin set out to make a voters' list for Manitoba. My hon. friend from Lisgar tried to show this House how unfair it was that there should only be about 13 hours or one day in one place in a county to register the vote. When Mr. Roblin first undertook to make this voters' list he appointed about six men in each county. You must not confuse these with Dominion constituencies. We have no counties in Manitoba as you have in Ontario; we just have local districts represented by local men and then we have the Dominion constituencies. The local constituencies are somewhat small. Perhaps the average constituency in my part of Manitoba would be about 30 x 15 miles. In a constituency of this size they appointed six men at different places at which men could register their votes and this registration lasted for one week. To show you again how hard it is for those who are not legal voters to get on the list I may say that we have a long list of questions that a man has to subscribe to, and more than that he has to swear to the answers to these questions before he is enabled to place his name on the list. That is to prevent an unfair list and to endeavour to get a good list. Now, then we have six places in each constituency at which the registration lasts for six days, so many hours a day, going up to ten o'clock in the evening during which men are allowed to register. I think it is customary in most countries that you have a registration when you want to have an election. Mr. Roblin

thinks that when the list is over one year old it will not be a fair list, that there will be men on the list whose names should go off because they had left the country, or men might have come into the country in the interval and would be entitled to vote. So, Mr. Roblin went a step further. On the occasion of making the first list every citizen of Manitoba who wanted to vote at the coming election had to register his name so that you can understand it would take a considerable time, and I want to say, because I went through it and know something about it, that there was ample opportunity afforded. I am not speaking for Winnipeg, but I am speaking for the rest of the country when I say that we could have registered three or four times as many men as we registered during these six days. I want hon. gentlemen to understand that what I have described is the system of registration all along the line. That system was new but I want to say and I say it without fear of contradiction that there was very little complaint about it from Grit or Tory and that they were well satisfied with it. But, it was new and some electors said : I have been in the country a long time and I am not going out to register. So, for that reason, at the first registration, it was not possible to get all the qualified names on the list. So the next year Mr. Roblin said : I will give you one day, but I will give you six places. A gentleman was appointed, he went around to these six places in each small county after due notification had been given to the voters of the district that they could go and register their votes. That does not look very much like an attempt to keep qualified voters off the list, and it is a fact that they could have registered a great many more names. Is it not fair to believe that after the previous registrations which had taken place the registration of last year would not require so much time ? But, nevertheless, hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House complain of how far men had to travel in order to register their names. I think I am correct in saying that they did not have to travel any farther than they had under the Greenway registration because under the Greenway registration there was only one place to register, whereas there are six to-day. There may have been a few exceptions to that, but there were very few. I think any hon. member who followed the argument of my hon. friend from Lisgar will agree with me that it bears out the expression I made use of at the beginning of my address to this House when I said that he was talking against time and trying to defer the consideration of something that is more important than the question which he has brought up. Those who have to register in 1905 are only some young men who have become 21 yeras of age or those who have become otherwise qualified since last year—just a few. The other names remain. The voters whose names are on the list absolutely do not have to register. No one has to register if he is already on the list. Only those who have become qualified since the last registration are required to register. That would not take very long, and I have no doubt that in all the districts outside of Winnipeg—I am not speaking for Winnipeg—they will have ample time to register their votes without any trouble. I would ask this House to compare these two systems of registration. I have tried in as few words as possible to put before the House the system of registration prevailing in the province of Manitoba and I am confident that this House will agree that the remarks of the hon. member for Lisgar are very uncalled for.

I want to allude to one matter in connection with which my hon. friend from Lisgar referred to myself. It is a personal matter but I want to show this House the fairness of the hon. gentleman. I am surprised that he would bring that matter before the House. It would be bad enough for some young man like myself who has not had the parliamentary experience that the hon. gentleman has had. When I was nominated to contest the constituency of Souris my leader, Mr. Roblin, sent me a letter and I want to explain to this House what the hon. gentleman said about that letter and what the facts are about it. I ask any hon. member of this House if he should find a private letter if he would not consider it his duty to return it to the man to whom it belongs, or would he consider it to be his duty to have it photographed and published all over the country. Further, I want to say and I say it without fear of contradiction that that letter which you have heard read, and I do not think there is anything to be ashamed of in it, was stolen from my political file in my office and I know who stole it. I had it in my office on my political file.

An hon. MEMBER. Did the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) steal it ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I have too good an opinion of the hon. member than to blame him, but it was stolen and sent to the 'Free Press' of Winnipeg. It was also photographed and sent throughout the country, and every Liberal paper in Manitoba tried to injure me. But notwithstanding all this. I was able to redeem the county by 520 majority.

Mr. LEMIEUX. How could it injure the hon. gentleman when it came from his friend the leader of the opposition ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It did not come from me.

Mr. LEMIEUX. He said it did.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend is as much mistaken about that as he is about many things.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I was referring to Mr. Roblin, the leader of the government in Manitoba.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When you left the chair at six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I was replying to the attack made by the member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) upon the Manitoba voters' lists. I said that I believed this question was brought before the House this afternoon by gentlemen opposite in order to postpone the discussion on the Autonomy Bill, and in that effort I propose to be generous enough to help them to some little extent. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) tried to make out that the system of preparing the electoral lists in Manitoba was unfair and unjust, and my remarks were directed to prove that the registration under the Roblin government was far more effective and in every way fairer than the system under the Greenway government. The question is important and at the risk of wearying the House I shall explain the conditions in Manitoba. The topography of that province is different from that of either Quebec, Ontario or the eastern provinces. Beginning at the south eastern end of Manitoba we have ranges running from east to west and townships which are six miles square running from north to south. The average local constituency in the thickly settled portions would include about three ranges from east to west making 18 miles, and about 6 townships north and south or 36 miles. To show how fair the Roblin government was and how anxious it was that there should be suffcient time given for registration, the constituencies were laid off, in my part of the country at all events, into what might be called three tiers. There was first the registration clerk for the whole constituency and under him there were officers known as clerks. In the constituency which I have in mind there were three clerks in the north end, three in the centre, and three in the south making 9 clerks to register the names. They worked from Monday morning until Saturday night, their offices being open until 10 o'clock at night in order that working men might register, and I say without fear of contradiction that after the legal hour for closing at night not a single name was put on the lists. There was an absolutely new voters' list being prepared, and so we commenced with a clean sheet and every one had to register. I can say that had twice as many voters come forward to register, ample time was given to enable them to do so. Contrast that with the Greenway system under which in the local constituency of Turtle Mountain there was only one man to register, and he was located at Boissevain, to which town every voter had to come to register, or else he had to take the oath and comply with certain other requirements. Under the Greenway system I am prepared to assert that in my constituency a number of names were handed in and added to the lists after the legal hours. Another good test as to which was the fairer system is to be found in the fact that in the court of revision hundreds and even thousands of names were removed from the original lists prepared under the Greenway government, and the Conservatives were put to great expense at these revision courts; whereas, in the case of the lists made by the Roblin government comparatively few names were stricken off by the court of revision. Had I known that this discussion would be on to-day I could have given the actual figures, but at all events the fact proves that the Greenway system was not so righteous as its author would make out. The hon. member for Lisgar spoke about the Liberals not adding names to the voters' lists in 1904, but I will state the reason for that, and I will quote not from a Conservative source, but from the mouth of one John Smith, a gentleman well known to the late Minister of the Interior, as well as to the member for Lisgar. Mr. John Smith was laughing up his sleeve and poking fun at us because we were honestly endeavouring to add names to the list before the last Dominion election. It happened to be a very rainy day and any one who lives in the west knows that it can rain very hard there when it wants to. We had started out at daylight and continued work until after dark, and the rain poured down perhaps providentially, because it was of great benefit to the crops at that particular season. We endeavoured to get our men to go before the registration clerk and register their names and this John Smith and some of the other good Liberals were present and I said to them: How is it you fellows are not working to-day; it is not like the Liberals in this constituency to be lacking in effort. Mr. Smith told me to go—not to the good place, and he said: Are we fools enough to fight a general election on your lists? Well I said: I do not know whether you are fools enough to do that or not, but there is nothing to be lost in making an effort to place every man who is qualified on the list, and Mr. Smith replied: The Hon. Mr. Sifton tells us we are going to have an opportunity to make up a list for ourselves and that the government will not have a Dominion election upon your lists.

Well, why didn't they have the list? Perhaps the whole history of that would be interesting. No doubt members on the other side know more about this than I do, but we believe in Manitoba, and I believe to-night, that the hon. member for Brandon, then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), intended to make up a list, but his friend, whom I am told loves him, the Minister of Justice, refused to sanction that outrage, for it cer-

tainly would have been an outrage had they been allowed to make an exception in the province of Manitoba and make up a list different from that in any other place. So they did vote on the list which was made up at that time. When it came to the court of revision, they did their utmost to get many off the list, but because of the fair manner in which these names are added they had very little success in removing names from the list at the court of revision. The hon. member for Lisgar referred to Emerson. He said that part of Emerson came into his Dominion constituency, and in order to get a list of Emerson, or of that part of Emerson which came into his constituency, he was obliged to get a list of the whole constituency of Emerson. I am surprised that the hon. member for Lisgar made that statement, because I want to show you, and can show you beyond any doubt, that the Liberal party is to blame for his having to do that, and that is the reason why I refer to this. I think the principle laid down by the Liberal party when making a redistribution of seats was that they would, as far as possible, make the lines correspond to county lines. I understand that Dominion constituencies in other provinces, as in ours, contain more than one local constituency, and the principle was to make the county line a division line, which certainly would have been a fair and very convenient way of dividing up the country. The line between the constituency of Lisgar and my own lies between range 12 and range 13, but that was not a local division. As it was, West Manitou, which was then called Mountain, took in a row of townships in Mountain, so that I had a range of townships in Mountain constituency, and when I wanted to get my list, a list made up by the local legislature, in order to get a list for range 13 on the eastern boundary of my constituency, I had to get all of the voters' lists for Lisgar or Mountain. That was not our fault, that was the fault of the Liberal party. Had they made this division as they should have done the hon. member for Lisgar would not have had to get all the lists for Emerson ; he would simply have had the voters' list in the different local constituencies which the Dominion constituency contained, so I think it was in very bad taste and of worse effect for the hon. member for Lisgar to make that statement.

I would like to know where the gross outrage is that the hon. member took so much pains to bring before this House in the way those two lists were made up, and I want to go further and say this, that when the Roblin government appointed their registration clerks, they absolutely did not confine the appointment to Conservatives, and I say that without fear of contradiction. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they know of the Liberals ever using a strong party man of the party opposed to them to make up their list ? I want to say that in my own constituency the gentleman whom the Roblin government appointed as registration clerk was a Liberal. He was not only a Liberal, but, with all due respect, he was what I might call a very strong Scotch Grit, who absolutely never gave a Conservative vote in his life. Yet this gentleman conducted the registration of the voters' list in the local district of Turtle Mountain, so I think that was another indication of the desire of the Roblin government to give the people a fair and honest list. I think the hon. member for Lisgar went a little out of his way this afternoon, it was not necessary for him to make the references to some members of the government of Manitoba which he made in this House to-day. Outside of politics, the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) and I are the best of friends. We are neighbours, we have always been friendly, we are friendly to-day, but the hon. member this afternoon threw down the glove, and it will be necessary for me to show that a man who lives politically in the glass house that he does in the province of Manitoba should be a little more careful, as to his statement, even although he gave us no warning of this and no way of preparing for the discussion, in undertaking to talk about members of the government and men who are supporting the Conservative party in Manitoba to-day. He referred to Mr. Richardson as a man who had changed his views and spoke of him, as is the custom of Liberal papers and Liberals, disrespectfully. I think Mr. Richardson will be known to some members who sat with him in this House as an ardent Liberal. He has seen fit to change his views. I am surprised that a man with the history of the hon. member for Lisgar would leave himself open to what might be said of himself in that respect. The hon. member sat in this House once before, not for a Manitoba, but for an Ontario constituency, and I wonder if his own history is absolutely favourable to him in connection with that one point ; I wonder if the hon. gentleman —since he wants to talk about political men who have tried to deceive the people—remembers the time up in our province when in one constituency he promised the French electors that he would not disturb their separate schools or their dual language ? I wonder if he has forgotten that ? I wonder if he forgets a little later in history when he absolutely promised the Protestants of that country that he would not move one jot from the stand and the position he had taken upon this school question in Manitoba ? I want to go a little further, and I do not think I am going outside the question after the glove the hon. gentleman threw down this afternoon, and to refer to another transaction which the hon. gentleman will perhaps not want to hear of, but I am perfectly justified in stating the case to this House to-night. We had in that country at that time two railways—the Canadian

Pacific Railway, which came in first, and the Northern Pacific, which is now known as the Canadian Northern. We had an election coming on in 1899. We wanted competition in railways. The Northern Pacific was not extended to any great extent in the province of Manitoba at that time. There was a line from Waskada, a town south of Deloraine, and the people wanted to have that line extended. The question was whether this line was to be extended by the Canadian Pacific Railway or by the Northern Pacific. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) seems at that time to have been in favour of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He went through the country stating—as I shall be ready to prove—that the Canadian Pacific Railway were willing to build that road without one cent of bonus. I was not a candidate then, but I was taking some little interest in politics. And I remember well that in my own town, with the Northern Pacific running about thirteen miles to the north of us, I stated that notwithstanding the Canadian Pacific Railway was willing to build a line through that country without a bonus, we had better, for the sake of compensation, pay the Northern Pacific $1,750 per mile than to have the Canadian Pacific Railway, without competition, for nothing. The hon. gentleman and his supporters gave the people of Manitoba the impression that the Canadian Pacific Railway would build that line without a bonus. I say that without fear of contradiction. It has never been contradicted. More than that, I intend to show, even from the camp of the enemy that that was the intention. And when the hon. member (Mr. Greenway) attacks Mr. Richardson and other men for trying to deceive the people, it would be well for him to remember his own record. I regret to be obliged to bring this matter up ; I would not have done it had I not been forced to it by the hon. gentleman. There is in that province a Mr. Charles Young, who is well known at least to the members of this government. They have made him one of the commissioners of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. He was appointed to that commission, I suppose, because he was a grain buyer. They have appointed men from rather peculiar walks of life on that commission and no doubt they thought Mr. Young would know all about grades—and besides he was a solid Grit. I will have a word to quote from Mr. Young in a few moments. In the meantime, I wish to refer to what was stated by the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) when speaking in behalf of Mr. Dickey, the local Liberal candidate in Souris :

At a meeting held in Harn Hartney by Mr. Greenway, on behalf of Mr. Dickey, on the night of the 24th November, he emphatically stated that the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Deloraine to Waskada was not costing the country one cent. And he dwelt at considerable length on this subject and further stated that the Canadian Pacific Railway were building the road without the aid of a five cent piece from his government.

Now, that is pretty plain. After the election some correspondence took place between Mr. Wm. Whyte, manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Mr. Baker and Mr. Greenway. It came out that Mr. Greenway had absolutely promised to the Canadian Pacific Railway that they should have their bonus—the usual bonus—for the extension of this road. I shall read a little of the correspondence between Mr. Whyte and Mr. Greenway. I am obliged to read it to show that Mr. Young, the Liberal candidate for Deloraine, was deceived by Mr. Greenway, in order to show what he said about it. Mr. Whyte wrote :

Canadian Pacific Railway.
Office of the manager,
Winnipeg, Manitoba, 13th November, 1899.

Hon. Thomas Greenway,
Premier, Winnipeg.

Dear Mr. Greenway,—In reply to your letter of the 11th instant, in which you urge the importance of an extension of our Waskada branch, I desire to remind you of the repeated promises that have been made on behalf of your government that the usual aid of $1,750 per mile would be granted for the construction of a line of railway into this district ; that with these promises before it, my company has already completed about seventeen miles of its branch line from Deloraine, and I now beg to say that upon receipt of an assurance from you that the promises referred to will be given full effect, both as regards the line already constructed and the extension desired, my company will undertake to complete this line to the western boundary of range 26, township 2, during the ensuing season.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) WM. WHYTE,
Manager.

In reply Mr. Greenway wrote as follows :

Winnipeg, Manitoba, 16th December, 1899.

Wm. Whyte, Esq.,
Manager Canadian Pacific Railway Company,
City.

Dear Mr. Whyte,—I regret that your letter of the 13th of last month in answer to mine of a day or two before has remained unanswered so long.

I beg now to repeat what I stated to you recently, when I had the pleasure of a conversation with you upon the subject of the extension of your Waskada branch. It was my intention in view of the promises to which you refer, and my desire to see the line extended to the point mentioned in your letter, to have recommended the usual assistance of $1,750 per mile for the entire branch, and I am still willing to do anything I can to assist in completing such an arrangement.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) THOMAS GREENWAY.

It has been stated by friends of the Greenway government that Mr. Greenway did not mean this, did not intend to convey the impression he did. But he tries, I may say,

to put the onus upon the Attorney General of the province.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) what the building of railways has to do with the Franchise Act ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I want to show that when the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) rises in this House to cast slurs upon Mr. Richardson and other men, his own history is not such as to entitle him to adopt such a tone. I know that hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to hear this, but I shall make this point unless I am prevented by the Speaker. I have read the correspondence. Now, any one who knows Mr. Charles Young, knows that he is a man not very easily deceived. After the elections it came out that Mr. Greenway had deceived his own co-workers in the elections. Mr. Young, the Liberal member for Deloraine, wrote this letter to the Deloraine 'Times':

I take this early opportunity of informing my supporters, through your paper, of my surprise and disappointment on learning that Mr. Greenway has (notwithstanding my statements to the contrary) promised aid to the Waskada extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I can assure you that when making the statements I was telling what I thought to be the truth and knew nothing to the contrary till I saw the correspondence published in the 'Telegram' of the 16th instant. I am writing the president of the Liberal Association asking him to take such steps as may be necessary to afford my supporters an opportunity, at as early a date as can conveniently be arranged, for dealing with the matter as may seem to them best.

The letter addressed to John Renton, president of the Deloraine Liberal Association, reads :

As I told you, when in the city, the promise made by Mr. Greenway re granting assistance to the Waskada railway, has placed me in an awkward position with my constituents. At the time of my election I distinctly stated that no aid was to be given this road, and at that time, and till I saw the letters published in the 'Telegram,' I believed such was the case. Consequently I feel that I secured my election under false pretenses, and notwithstanding my having done so innocently, I feel it my duty to tender my supporters my resignation.

Now I think that shows pretty conclusively the point I stated. After attempting to deceive the people of Manitoba as he did, it was not in very good form for the hon. gentleman to get up in this House and try to throw blame upon the men who had given that province such an honest and just list on which to vote as the Roblin government has given. Now I have said all that I wish to say on this question. I understand fairly well the lists up there, I believe they are honest lists. I have tried to show how those lists are prepared ; I have tried to show that while it took six days the first year, the next year it took only one day with nine clerks, and to-day we have only one clerk and one day. I believe we have such a fair list in the province of Manitoba to-day that when the eastern provinces come to understand it, as they will understand if they read the 'Hansard,' that every one of them will be sending delegations up to Manitoba to get a copy of the very righteous and just law which we have placed on the statute books in order to carry on honest and just elections in that province.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON (Selkirk). I really do not understand what the remarks made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schaffner) for the last half hour have to do with the revision of the Manitoba voters' lists. I have listened with a great deal of attention this afternoon to the remarks made by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) and the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche). I may say that the division I have the honour to represent is a very large one, comprising nearly all the northeastern portion of the province of Manitoba. We have in that division something like 21,000 square miles, and an area of over 13,000,000 acres. In the county of Selkirk we have four complete local divisions, and portions of three others. Now in the district of St. Andrew's one of the largest local divisions, the people have to travel from a poll called Berens River 260 miles to the town of Selkirk to get on that list. From the Badthroat river they have to travel about 100 miles to get to Selkirk. There are a large number of new settlers who will have to travel 100 miles to get on that list. From Black island where Icelanders are settled, some of whom have been there for years and who have been naturalized, they will also have to travel to Selkirk to get on the list. Take the division of Springfield, another large division. The place of holding the registration is Dugald, in the southeastern portion of the division. Now that division of Springfield takes in the eastern portion of the province of Manitoba. and goes out to Ontario. They have to travel to Winnipeg about 100 miles and then drive 16 miles to Dougald to get on that list. I say it is impossible for these people to get on that list. When it is understood here that we have to hold our Dominion elections on a list of that kind, I say it is the duty of this government to come to the rescue and to see that the people in that district have a fair opportunity to get on the voters' list. Now it is a physical impossibility to do it. In the district of Springfield there is just one place, for registration, and how are the people going to get there ? For the last Dominion elections we had a revision last year, and there were only five or six places in that district where the people could register, and I found out in the canvass I made last October and November when I took particular pains to inquire, that there were between 500 and 600 Liberals who were not on that list. Now I think it was an outrage that these people should be deprived

of their rights. Many of them were foreigners, still they were naturalized by this Dominion government, they were three years in the province, and they were entitled to be on the list, and I say they should have been on it. But owing to the Act that we have now in the province of Manitoba it was physically impossible for them to get on the list. I know there were 56 men who were sent out at an expense of $2 each that they might be registered, the only people in one particular district that could be got to go the distance necessary to register.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How is it possible for these men to go that distance and register? In the election previous to the last one how did some of these men get to the polls unless they were taken in some conveyance like the 'Minnie M?'

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I would like to know what that has got to do with it. The hon. gentleman shows that he knows very little about this matter when he asks a question like that. There is only one place to-day where these people can register, when an election is going on. They have polls fairly convenient, where they only have to travel 10 or 15 miles. I have here the voters' list of the municipality of Rockwood. In the northern portion of that district there are something like 250 Galicians. Now how many do you think were on the last Dominion voters' list? There were only 70, whereas there should have been 250. Now if they want to get on the list in that particular division they will have to go down 36 miles. I may say that the electoral division comprises 7 townships north and south, it is 39 miles by 42 miles. Now these people have to register at the town of Stonewall, within 5 miles of the southern boundary in that district, they all have to go down there to register, some of them 36 miles away in a straight line. Now these people will be left off the list. Now why is this done? There are 11 protested elections in that province, and every one in this House knows that the Roblin government does not want these names to be put on that list in view of possible by-elections. I am not at all astonished that the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) and the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) are in favour of the Roblin government list, because that list was badly loaded at the last election in their favour and they know it. The hon. member for Marquette was elected the last time by a very small majority, and if it had not been for some sharp practice on the part of his friends in the Roblin government, he would not be sitting in this House today.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Tell us what it is.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I will tell you what it is. You had the officials in the local government arrest Mr. Harvey, who was working against you in that district, and you had him taken into Winnipeg and kept in durance vile to prevent him working among a population that would have voted against you.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Was he not a government officer?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That does not make any difference.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Did he not have $700 in his pocket when he was arrested?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That man was a British subject and just as much entitled to vote as the hon. member for Marquette is. He was made a British subject by this parliament. He had been over three years in the country, he was a naturalized British subject and he was entitled to go out and do any business that he wanted to do. But, you had him arrested on false pretenses and kept him in durance vile until he could not go back to that county. The Attorney General of Manitoba withdrew the charge against that gentleman just as soon as there was no chance of him going back to the county.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. No, the Attorney General did not withdraw the charge, but the witnesses who had been bribed were spirited away and were not on the scene. They were brought up and sent away out of the country entirely.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman cannot give any proof of what he is saying. That gentleman was an honest farmer in my district. He was working as he had a perfect right to do in any part of Manitoba. There was nothing to hinder him. He was not receiving pay from the Dominion government at the time that he was engaged in this work.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I brought this case up in the House last year and I drew the attention of the then Minister of the Interior to the fact that a government official, naming him, Mr. Harvey, was engaged in a House to House canvass in my constituency. The then Minister of the Interior promised that he would at once issue instructions to that official, which would apply to all other officials, telling him that he must desist from such work, that it was against the regulations of the government.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Then the hon. gentleman could not have brought this matter up in the House because this was a matter that only happened last October before the election which was held in November.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If the hon. gentleman turns up 'Hansard' he will find that I brought up the case of this very same official.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. The hon. gentleman is talking about some other matter. I am talking about the matter that took place in October and you were a party to it because you had that gentleman arrested

when there was no charge to be made against him. They withdrew proceedings just as soon as the election was over and he could not go back to work in that division.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the hon. gentleman say that I had him arrested ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Your friends of the Roblin government had this gentleman arrested.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. On what charge ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. On the charge of having advanced money in my riding for the purpose of influencing the election in that district.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Or had it anything to do with my riding ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes, they had him arrested in your riding and they took him down and prevented him from going to any riding. This is just a sample of what your friends of the Roblin government will do in any election. I have had a great deal of experience with the Tory party in running my elections in Manitoba. In 1886 I ran against Mr. Hagel. You talk about the fairness of the Roblin government. The former Conservative government started out with the same claims to fairness that the Roblin government made at the outset. The Norquay government adopted a franchise Act under which, in the first election which I ran in 1886, 44 votes were illegally added to the voters' list. Even then I was not defeated. I had a majority of 15 in 1886 notwithstanding the fact that they burned the ballot boxes. We have had a large experience in Manitoba of the way in which Conservatives will run elections. It is a most unjust law that we have at the present time on the statute-book of Manitoba. It is the most unjust law that we have in the Dominion of Canada and how these hon. gentlemen can justify it is something that it is difficult to understand. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) spoke about an hour this afternoon and evening and what did he say ? He went on and spoke about a fair law. The Roblin government passed a fair law in 1902 when they first came in. The judges looked after it then and we had a fair list, but how long did they leave the judges in charge ? Only a very short time. The judges then had everything to do with the preparation of the lists. The judges mapped out the districts and appointed the men to revise the lists. Things are altogether different now. They have revising barristers and they select very illiterate men to collect the votes. In the county of Rockwood, that I have particular knowledge of, they have a farmer who can barely sign his own name who sat for two hours at three different places in the county and yet he pretended to make the list. I am personally aware of that matter and I do not see how hon. gentlemen of the intelligence of the hon. member for Souris and of the hon. member for Marquette can get up in this House and justify one place and one day in the large counties we have in Manitoba, or assert that under that system it is possible for us to have any kind of a fair list. Now, we come to the thin red line. The other day I sent to the King's Printer, asking him to send me the voters' list for Selkirk, the county which I have the honour to represent. What was the outcome ? He sent me a list containing the names of 9,000 voters. That was sent to the returning officer of the county of Selkirk. There are the names of 9,000 voters on this list, while in the constituency of Selkirk there are 4,824 voters, so you will see that the thin red line had to be worked all over that list. There is the red line. It does not make any difference whether it is red, blue or black. Part of this list belongs to the constituency of my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) and part to myself. There had to be a copy sent to the returning officer in Selkirk and also the returning officer in Macdonald. The returning officers, as a rule, are not all business men. We will appoint some good honest farmer in a county as the returning officer. This man had to score out the names of the voters who did not vote in Selkirk. It would not be possible to leave some 58 names on the list for one polling subdivision which belonged to the county of Macdonald, because otherwise these voters might vote in Selkirk. Four thousand and odd names had to be taken off that list before it was a proper list to be used in Selkirk. I see where this government is to blame in some respects for sending up that list. It comes from the King's Printer to me as the voters' list for Selkirk. That was sent to the returning officer in my county who is now under arrest charged with having erased names. He had to erase names. He had to score these names out. He was provided with a list containing 9,000 names when only 4,800 voters were entitled to vote. It is a list containing the names of voters partly in other counties and partly in Selkirk. I may say that the Roblin government laid out each electoral division into polling subdivisions. We did not take the same polling subdivisions that the Roblin government did in the local elections. What was the consequence of that ? These red lines had to be put in again. In the township of Grassmere, Stonewall is up in the northeast corner of the township and there are 346 names on the list. That list was sent to the deputy returning officer. For 14 years, while I represented that county in the local legislature, I had a polling subdivision in the centre of the township so as to enable the farmers to vote close to their homes, but the new arrangement made by the Roblin government necessitated a

great many of these farmers travelling ten miles from their homes to poll their votes. We had to change that. I laid out the district containing the names of those who had voted at Grassmere and the district containing the names of those who had voted at Stonewall. Ninety-six had voted in the township and 250 in Stonewall. That necessitated two copies of the list and there would be 250 red lines on the list which was handed to the gentleman who was the deputy returning officer for that part of the township outside of Stonewall and 96 red lines would have to be drawn through the list for the deputy returning officer who acted at Stonewall. That is plain. The red lines had to go in. You could not work it in any other way. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he can point to one man in that district, where I had the personal supervision myself, who came up and was not on that list, and in that district there were about 1,500 votes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You say you did not make polling subdivisions to correspond with those in the local constituencies ? Do you not think that the latter would have been a far better division, and you would thereby have avoided all this temptation put in your way when you changed your polling subdivisions.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Why should we adopt the Tory subdivisions for polling ?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is not an answer to my question. You asked me why you should adopt ours, and I say because it was a just and righteous division and would have saved a good deal of trouble.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. How would you do with one polling subdivision where part of the district was in two or three counties ? You say that you made them for the convenience of the people. Well, I remember a few years ago, when a subdivision was made for the province of Manitoba, the voters' had in some cases to go 60 miles to vote just because they happened to be supporters of mine. And they had to go by a dog train in the winter. The red line had to be adopted when we were sent a list by the King's Printer. We will have to have a revision of the lists in that country because they are not fair to the public. When the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) interrupted me, I was asking him to point out—and he ought to be able to do it now because the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) has all the evidence in the trial and read a lot of it this afternoon—I was asking him to point out one man in the whole electoral division of Selkirk who was left off the lists, out of 1,500 votes. There was only one weak spot in the whole county, as far as the management is concerned, and that was a polling subdivision called Beausejour, where there were 14 names left off. But those voted all the same, their ballots all went in, and they were not all Conservatives either—there was quite a proportion Liberal—and if there had been anything like a close election they would have counted.

An hon. MEMBER. How many were Liberals ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Two out of 14, but it just shows that these were taken off in some way we have not been able to get at. I do not justify anything of the kind myself, because I have always found that one name left off the list would hurt you more than half a dozen of the other side put on. As far as I am concerned, every voter, both Liberal and Tory, should be on the list. Under the Greenway law which the hon. gentleman denounces, every man entitled to vote was on the list. None were left off in my part of the country. I have been in politics a number of years and have met politicians of both sides, and I have never heard any objections to that list as far as putting the names on was concerned. But in Manitoba to-day we have thousands of good British subjects, who will not be on the list, and the blame lies at the door of hon. gentlemen opposite from that province who are supporting the Roblin government and its present iniquitous law. It is physically impossible for many of these men to get on the list. There is one thing more I want to mention. We had enumerators who compiled the lists when the late Greenway government was in power. It was the duty of those gentlemen to take the municipal lists as a basis. That is what they did ; and if we had an election law anything like the election law you have in Ontario, I would be perfectly satisfied to accept it. Take any list as a basis. Take the municipal lists. Then let the manhood suffrage voters be put on by the judge at the court of revision. There is great objection to this personal registration. Take old timers who have been on the lists some twenty-five or thirty years, they have to come and register. During this campaign, I met one of the prominent residents of Winnipeg, who is living in the district of Kildona, which is a suburb of Winnipeg, but is in the division of Selkirk. He was a Conservative too. I went in to see if I could get his vote, and he said he would be very happy to vote for me but he had not registered, and that the present Roblin government list was an outrage. That Roblin law compels men who have owned property in the country for years and who have been on the lists some twenty or thirty years to go and register, and hundreds of them said : We are entitled to be on the list, why should we travel ten or twenty miles to register ? We had enumerators in Manitoba who went around and took all the voters they could, and I may tell you what we did in our part of the country. I held a series of meetings, just meetings for the purpose of getting

everybody to attend and register and have his name on the list. I wanted their names put on regardless of politics, but the people have to come and register, and they do not know to-day what the law is and are in doubt whether they will be on the list. The hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) said that the law is only there for the purpose of adding to the list, but when did they change the law? As far as I understand the law, it requires personal registration in every case. It is just optional to-day with the registration clerk to put names on the list or leave them off, and the clerk is there for the purpose of registering. I am not aware that the law has been changed so as to enable those men who are now on the list to stay on.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The law absolutely states that only those who have become qualified since last year, who have become British subjects, or have been in the province long enough to vote, need register this year.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. What about the thousands who were qualified before last year and who are not on?

Mr. LALOR. Is it not their fault if they do not get on?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. No, because they may have to travel fifty, sixty and sometimes 260 miles in the county of Selkirk to register. From Fisher river they have to travel 150 miles, from Black Island, 100 miles, from Bad Throats, 100 miles, from Gimli sixty miles, and that is the only way by which they can be put on the list. They have to travel by team and by water, with no regular boats running. There is one thing which the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) brought up this afternoon and which I do not think he was justified in bringing up. He tried to leave the impression on this House that the returning officer for the county of Selkirk during the last election was a bartender. I do not know whether he meant it or not, but he said it. I might just point out that when I was asked to name a returning officer, I settled that the proper place from which to select that official was the town of Selkirk because it was in the centre of the county. I was not there at the time myself, but I sent word to the Liberal Association to appoint a returning officer. They appointed a gentleman called Lawrence Duggan. His appointment was perfectly satisfactory to me.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes, I have known him for some five or six years. He is not bartender; his half brother Martin O'Donohoe is the local member for the same county and he owned the hotel where this gentleman acted as clerk, and I dare say he may have gone behind the bar and sold a drink although I do not know that I ever bought one from him. However, he is as respectable a man as any gentleman in this House. I have known him for years, he does not drink himself and he is a good young man. I may also say that he has been out of the business for over two years. At the time of the election he was a clerk in a store in Selkirk, and I defy any gentleman in this House to say that before he was appointed returning officer or since, Mr. Lawrence Duggan was not a man of excellent character. The federal division of Selkirk comprises the whole of four local divisions and the local divisions returned three Conservatives by majorities of over 100 each, while I carried each of these divisions by about 125 majority. The Roblin government wanted to put some courage into their supporters and so they made charges against certain Liberals that these gentlemen were not guilty of. It is needless to say that these indictments were thrown out by the grand jury. They have now instituted proceedings against Mr. Duggan and Mr. Leach but they are not able to prove anything against them, and will not be able to prove anything because I am satisfied that everything is as straight as it possibly could be so far as Mr. Duggan is concerned. The Liberals thought of course that the county of Selkirk was stolen from them, because they had the lists so loaded in their favour that they believed they were certain of carrying the constituency. But, Sir, it was the policy of the Laurier government that was so popular in that country that carried the election, and it secured for me hundreds of Conservative votes, and these Conservatives would vote for me again if there was an election tomorrow. Indeed, if the lists were fair it would not be a majority of 500 that I would have, but a majority of at least double that. I can tell these gentlemen opposite that the policy of the Liberal government is so popular in the west, that if there was an election there now, the Liberals would carry ten seats.

Mr. LALOR. Why did'nt you carry Mountain?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. That is easily explained. I can give you a little information about that if you want to know. The five members of the Roblin cabinet were up there and they had every civil servant working for them, and three or four surveying parties were laying out ditches and offering $1,000 here and $1,000 there if certain districts gave good majorities for the government. In one particular municipality where there is a local option, the people wanted a license and the friends of the Roblin government told them that if there was a good majority for their candidate they would put them into a new municipality so that they could get a license. I can tell my hon. friends that the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bill, or the boundary question did not figure in that election.

For the benefit of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) I wish to read the Manitoba electoral law which says :

21. Lists of electors shall hereafter only be made and revised at such times as is hereinafter provided :
(a) Provided that a new list shall be made and revised in the case of every general election ;
(b) Provided also, in the case of a by-election, the list last revised under this or any previous Act may be used if not over one year old. If over one year old, a new list of electors shall be prepared for the electoral division affected.

This law says that a new list shall be made.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. What is the date of that statute ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. 1901.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That has been changed.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. There is no amendment to that so far as I am aware, and there is nothing to hinder the Roblin government striking us all off the lists if we do not appear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The hon. member knows that is not correct.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I do not. I have read the law for you.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is the law of 1901.

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Then point out any changes that have been made. I think the hon. member for Marquette should apologize to Mr. Duggan ; he is not a bartender ; he has had nothing to do with a bar for a year and a half, and he was never in the real sense of the word a bartender at all. I have a number of very warm friends who have been in that business, and I dare say hon. gentlemen opposite are in the same position. I think it has been clearly proven that we have an iniquitous election law at present in Manitoba. I want a fair list ; I want to see justice done to voters irrespective of politics, and I say that it is the duty of this government to give us a revision of the lists, taking the local lists as a basis and having a revision by impartial judges. I do not want any partisan revising barristers. I want to see the lists prepared by impartial judges. When we have a government such as that now in power in Manitoba who will not give us fair voters' lists, but who have loaded up the lists in their favour and are trying to keep them in that shape, then it is the duty of this government to remedy that even if we have to stay here till the snow flies. It is the duty of this government to see that every voter in the Dominion of Canada who is entitled to vote should be put on the voters' list regardless of politics, and even though we have to stay here till Christmas or January next, justice should be done.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he wants an exception made of Manitoba in this respect ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. It may be necessary to extend it to the province of Ontario in a short time if the Conservative government there do not render justice. We may not be alone in the time to come, but I do say that in view of the government we have in power in Manitoba to-day, an exception should be made for that province. If the Manitoba government would give us a voters' list similar to that in Ontario I would be satisfied, but if they adopt the partisan system under which they can favour themselves if they have a clerk that is any way crooked, then that should be prevented. In the town in which I registered I have myself seen dozens of men to whom the oath was never administered and who were put on the lists, while dozens of other men were sworn. As I understand it the law says that a man can not be entered on the lists unless the man who proposes to put him on swears that he was unable to be present or was away from the country or something of that kind, but names were put on the list right along in my town without that precaution having been taken. This shows how loose the system is. It is the duty of this government as soon as possible to introduce an Act making an exception for the province of Manitoba, and giving us what we consider would be a fair list ; let the judges do it.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman has stated that in some cases people lived so far away that it is impossible for them to register. Is that not as fair for one party as the other ; do not Conservatives live as far away from the polls as Liberals ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. I have always been in favour of making it convenient for the people, whether Conservatives or Liberals and I think we should not compel even Conservatives to come down 260 miles to register their votes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Do they travel any further under this system than under the other ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. We had an enumerator who went around and put their names on, and there were very few put on at the court of revision. There were lots to strike off, as the hon. member for Souris said this afternoon, but very few to put on, for the list as a basis, there were always men on and there was only the cleaning of the lists to be done.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Why were there so many to strike off ?

Mr. S. J. JACKSON. With the municipal list as a basis, there were always men on the list who were dead or who had moved away, because they are marked residents

for certain purposes of statute labour. There used to be trouble about that when we took the municipal lists as a basis, and in that way we had to clean up the list.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). I am sure anything I may have to say, coming from an ordinary farmer like myself, cannot be so interesting as remarks would be coming from an hon. gentleman like the hon. member for Selkirk. That hon. member went up to Manitoba only a few weeks ago, and by hanging a map on the wall, taking a pointer and making a few scientific flourishes with it, he solved the whole boundary question that has been troubling the people of Manitoba. If he was so effective in solving the boundary question, I think we can afford to have the solution of the Franchise Act of Manitoba put in his hands. His solution would be about as effective as his solution of the boundary question of Manitoba. The hon. gentleman has been finding fault all afternoon with the registration that is taking place in the province of Manitoba, that is the annual registration. If we were under the Franchise Act of the Greenway government we would have no registration at all this year, because it was not annual as at present, and those men who are desirous of getting on the list would not have an opportunity of doing so if we were under the Greenway Act. All they have to do now is to go to the registration booth and, as has been pointed out to-night, it is as fair for one as for another. The hon. gentleman went on to say that if the lists had not been stuffed, instead of there being seven representatives here supporting the government to-day there would be ten. I want to say that if it had not been for the mutilation of the lists for Selkirk, if it had not been for the thin red line and other things of the same nature, he would not be here to-day, and I would say further that if he has a spark of principle, knowing the conditions and the methods which were adopted in order to secure his election, if he is the gentleman I think he should be, he would resign his seat and say: I did not win that election fairly and I wish to contest it over again. Talk about how he got here, about the striking out of names; there were forty-two Conservative electors struck off at one division, and he took good care that he did not mention that there were a number of polling booths in that constituency where the Conservatives went in numbers asking for ballots and were refused, and were told that there was a red line through their names and they could not vote. The hon. gentleman knows that, and he also knows that in several polling subdivisions where they asked for ballots and could not get them, they became boisterous, forced the doors, demanded a ballot and made the deputy returning officer give them a ballot and take back the ballot. As a matter of fact, what did he do? He would not allow them to deposit the ballots in the ballot box, but he put them in an envelope, and, if I am rightly informed, they again went into the booth after reconsidering what he had done with the ballots and forced the deputy returning officer to tear the end off the envelope and drop the ballots one by one into the ballot box. You talk about your ballot stuffing, your ballot switching and your bogus ballot boxes, but there is nothing to my mind, or to the mind of any fair elector, equal to the thin red line. A more effective scheme could not be thought of, and this scheme I have mentioned has been utilized, and what does the hon. gentleman ask to-day? They know they cannot go back and practise the same device, and come here asking this government to pass a special Franchise Act for Manitoba, whereby they would be able to exercise other schemes in order to be elected. It has been explained how our lists are compiled, and I have yet to find a Liberal in Manitoba who will not say that the present list there is the most fair and just that has ever existed in the province. Ask any Liberal in my own constituency, and he will tell you this. The gentlemen who have spoken this afternoon know full well that this subject has been debated on the floors of the local legislature, and the leader of the opposition there has stated that it is a fair compilation of the list, but that it is too expensive; that is the only fault he has to find with it. The hon. gentlemen say that the red line had to be used. Admitting that the red line had to be used, although I do not think it was necessary to use it, had this government taken hold of these lists at the proper time and compiled them here, then it would not be necessary to use the red line. The red line is all right if it had not been abused, but up go the lists, and where do those lists go to? Before going to the deputy returning officers throughout Manitoba, the lists went into the hands of one Mr. Leach, who sat in the Liberal committee room in Winnipeg and drew the red line just where it suited his own will. Where is this gentleman, Mr. Leach, to-day? He is under the employment of this government, as some one has well said, receiving his reward the same as many others. The hon. gentlemen who have spoken on the other side have evidently been preparing this subject. Each came here with a long brief and a pile of papers. I had secured and gathered together a number of papers relating to this subject which I have handed over to another hon. member on this side who is unfortunately away from the House this evening, and I have not the information and the facts with me that I might have presented to you to-night. I know the subject will come up later on, and then there will be plenty of time for stating facts. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. S. J. Jackson), who was in the constituency of Mountain in the campaign which recently took place has ven-

tured the statement that the school question was not made an issue there. If the hon. gentleman will go through the archives of this country and search the papers printed and speeches made in that constituency, he will find that the school question and the boundary question were the two issues upon which the constituency of Mountain was won by the Liberal Conservative candidate.

I am glad that we have at last heard from the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). He has sat here through this entire session which has lasted almost five months, and not a word have we heard him utter until this afternoon. But I venture to say that when the newspapers appear in Manitoba to-morrow they will contain some expressions of surprise that he has waited all this time to deal with such a question as this after having missed so many opportunities to deal with a question of more importance—though this one is important too. Why have we not heard from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway) on the school question, a question on which he was returned to power time and again and upon which this government rode into office? The people of Manitoba, I venture to say, would much prefer to hear him talk on that question than on the question which he has made the subject of his first speech in this parliament.

Now, I wish to call attention for a moment to the way that this 'thin red line' did its work in the constituency of Macdonald. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) seemed anxious to draw attention to me and spoke of the little town of Miami. I wish to call attention to one incident that occurred there. On the 4th of November last, there were thirteen Conservatives went to the poll there and asked for ballots that they might vote for the Conservative candidate. Did they get them? They were coolly told that there was a red line through their names and that they were disfranchised. The statement has been made that they were probably on the list in some other division. They were not on the list in any other division, and I defy the hon. gentleman to prove to the contrary. But Miami is not the only place in which such things occurred. Take the polling subdivision at Poplar Point, and there the names of fifteen men had the red line drawn through them, men who had lived in that polling subdivision for years. Of these men every one was a Conservative. The same was true at Miami—every one of the eleven who were disfranchised was a Conservative. I have gone to considerable trouble to ascertain how many men were disfranchised in the different polling subdivisions of Macdonald, and I find that close upon 300 Liberal-Conservatives who went to the polls and asked for ballots, found that their names has been erased. I may also cite the case of a Liberal who, just before the election, meeting a Conservative in my town, said: 'Well we have got Staples trimmed.' My friends replied: 'It is not possible. .' But the answer was: 'You will find out that what I say is right, and when the polls are closed you will see the basis on which I make the assertion.' It was on the 'thin red line' that this man based his prediction. They went it pretty strong; they went it to the extent of nearly three hundred; but they did not go it quite strong enough. Now, just one other point with regard to my own town Treherne. This is a matter that came under my own observation. On the day of the election, two electors went to the poll and asked for ballots. They were told that there was a red line through their names. They came to me and asked how it was. I told them that possibly they were outside the limits indicated by the proclamation. I went to the polling booth expecting to find a copy of the proclamation, but there was none though the law requires that one shall be hung in the polling booth. After a little time I succeeded in getting a copy which I took to the deputy returning officer and told him that these men lived within the bounds of the polling subdivision and that he could not legally refuse them a ballot. Though, for a time he refused, I must admit that these were fair men—about the average of Liberals after considerable argument, I succeeded in getting ballots for the voters who had been refused them. And they voted, I suppose that had the case arisen in some other polling subdivision I could not have succeeded for in all these polls I had good scrutineers who asked the officer to allow the electors to use their franchise, but they refused.

Now, I am satisfied that this question will come up later on and I have something to say about it, for I have plenty of information on the subject. But before I take my seat I wish to call the attention of the House and country to what one Liberal newspaper has said as to the fairness and justice of the method of compiling the voters' list in use in Manitoba. I quote from the 'Eye Witness,' of Birtle, a newspaper which, I understand, is edited by a good Liberal:

> The Winnipeg 'Free Press' is working overtime endeavouring to make a mare's nest of the Manitoba Franchise Act. Had it expended half the energy during the twelve years its friends were in power urging them to give the province something better than the cemetery voters' lists that were used until Roblin's government enacted the present personal registration Bill which, while not perfect, is without doubt the best franchise law anywhere in Canada, the Liberal party would now have something in this line creditable to look back to. The 'Free Press' present harping is so out of place that every Liberal paper in the province, except its couple of echoes, are discreetly silent. A few columns on red line disfranchisement would be more to the point.

I do not think for a moment that, when all the facts are known as to the method of compiling the lists in Manitoba this House will think of enacting a special law

for that province. As this newspaper states, we have the fairest method of compiling these lists used anywhere in Canada. It is a credit to Manitoba to have such a system. At the same time, I am satisfied, that as time goes on, it will be made even more perfect.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not rise for the purpose of participating in the discussion in regard to what has occurred in the province of Manitoba, for, like many other hon. members of the House, I have no knowledge of the facts except as they have been presented in this discussion. I wish to say that I think the principle upon which the Dominion Franchise Act is framed is one in the interest of public economy and public convenience. The preparation of a second list for Dominion elections throughout the whole Dominion would involve a considerable expense. But that to my mind is not the most serious side of the question. Everybody who has anything to do with political organization must know that the preparation of an electoral list involves a great deal of labour and time to many of the best citizens of our country, and I count among those all who take an active and intelligent interest in public affairs on either side of politics. The time that is spent and the labour that is involved in getting up electoral lists are therefore considerable, and I think we could all agree that if we can minimize that labour and sacrifice throughout the Dominion, by having one list instead of two, such a condition is very desirable. Whether we have attained perfection in that respect under our present system, may be a matter of debate. While I would contend that the present system on the whole has a good purpose and works well, if it could be shown that the system is abused in any province, by any government, Liberal or Conservative, and that the intention of this parliament respecting the free exercise of the franchise by every elector of this Dominion is not being carried out, but that there is a deliberate and systematic abuse of the system with a view of disfranchising any portion of the electors, then I think we would all agree, irrespective of politics, that a remedy should be provided. Whether that condition has been disclosed in the province of Manitoba, I confess I have not sufficient knowledge to express an opinion. I can only say that in view of what has been presented to the House this afternoon, the matter is one of great gravity, and I feel that the principal law officer of the government, the Minister of Justice, should give the matter full consideration, and I have no doubt he will do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I was not able to follow very well the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) this afternoon in the somewhat rambling speech which he made on this occasion; but the impression that he conveyed to my mind was this, that an insufficient opportunity is given to the people of Manitoba to be registered on the electoral lists. I was not at all aware until he was corrected by my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) that the opportunity which he says is insufficient is one which was not afforded at all by the government of which he was a member. So the situation as I understand it is this: Under the administration of which he was the Prime Minister in Manitoba, the lists were made up once in every four years. If any by-election occurred during the four years it was run on the old lists, and the lists were made up by partisan officers appointed by the government itself. Under the administration of Mr. Roblin the lists are made up for each general election. In addition to that, there is an opportunity given for the revision of these lists every year in order that they may be brought up to date for any by-election that occurs in the meantime; and natural opportunities for registration are not required to be so great when you are making merely a revision involving a few names, as when you are preparing in the first instance list. Now I do not understand from the hon. member for Lisgar what really he wanted. It seems to me there is no middle course. You must either adopt that which was the policy of the Conservative party from 1878 to 1896 and have the lists made up under the control of and by officers appointed by this government, or you must adopt the course upon which the hon. gentlemen entered when they came into office and make no lists at all, but simply adopt the lists of each province prepared for their local elections. The hon. member for Lisgar, so far as I was able to understand him, was perfectly willing to adopt lists in any province where there is a Liberal administration and where it is probable that lists will be favourable; but he is absolutely opposed to adopting lists in any province where there is a Conservative administration, and where he might think the lists were not quite so favourable. So far as one is able to gather from the somewhat extraordinary speech which he delivered to the House this afternoon, that was his policy, and the principle which I understood him to advocate.

Now, I do not agree with my hon. friend the Minister of Finance; I do not agree that when you have once adopted the principle of leaving these matters to the provincial administrations, you are to interfere and sit in judgment upon them simply because certain gentlemen who are partisans in any particular province see fit to complain to the central administration that the lists are not quite suited to their requirements. I was astonished when the hon. member for Lisgar and some other gentlemen who spoke here to-day, very frankly

acknowledged, what some of their friends denied here last session, namely, that it was proposed to pass by the lists so made up, with an appeal to judges, as I understand is the case in Manitoba—to pass by those lists and have other lists made up in that province by partisan officers, in order that a certain advantage might accrue to their political friends. We had the intimation also later on that there were certain members of the cabinet for whom a proposition of that kind was a little too strong. The hon. gentleman for Lisgar and his friends to-day spoke somewhat tearfully and regretfully of the circumstance that their proposal was not adopted by the government. I am glad for the credit of some members of the administration at least, that they found a proposal of that kind a little too strong; I am glad of it for the sake of public life in Canada, and for the credit of some members of this administration in that regard. Here were lists that could be revised by independent officers, lists as to which there was an appeal to judges in the province of Manitoba. And I may say in passing that we vainly fought in this House for similar appeals in respect to provincial lists in the province of Nova Scotia, and members of the administration would not permit us to have even that. But here were lists that were revised by independent officers, in respect of which an appeal would lie to the judges; and the proposal coolly admitted by the gentlemen who have spoken on that side of the House, was that these lists made up by independent men, subject to revision by judges were to be passed over in order that lists might be manufactured by partisan officers. Well, if that is what my hon. friend the Minister of Finance says is under consideration by the government—I do not know whether I am to interpret his remarks in any other way—I venture to say that if he brings down a proposal of that kind, after once having committed himself and his government to the principle of leaving these matters to provincial legislation, any measure of that kind will be before this House of Commons for a very long time before it will pass.

There are many things which the opposition has to concede to the majority in this House. The rights of the minority in this House are not always regarded as absolutely sacred, but when highway robbery of that kind is suggested, because that is what it amounts to, I venture to think that the hon. member of Lisgar will find that they have attempted one of the most stubborn and difficult propositions that they ever endeavoured to put into force, and it is just as well that this should be understood before the government are committed to any proposal of this kind. We took our stand upon the principle which has been advocated by the Conservative party. We made no factious opposition to the proposition which was brought in by this administration when they changed the method of making up the lists; but when it is said that you shall have one principle for making up the lists in a province which happens to have a Liberal administration and another principle for a province which happens to have a Conservative administration and that there shall be one principle applied to provinces like Manitoba and Ontario in respect, and an altogether different principle to Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and other provinces where there is a Liberal administration—to say that we are to have anything like that in this country is going a little bit too far, and I venture to think that the administration upon reflection will think twice before they accede to the proposition which has been coolly and unblushingly made by the hon. member for Lisgar and by his friends from Manitoba to the House to-day. There has been no complaint that the revising officers are unfair or partial. Every one admits that the lists in Manitoba are prepared by non-partisan officers whose decisions are subject to an appeal to the judges of the county court. The judges hold courts of revision and independent officers deal with these lists, a privilege which we have not to-day under the Liberal legislation of the province of Nova Scotia, although we have sought it many times. It has always been denied us both by the Liberal government of the province of Nova Scotia and by this government in respect to the Dominion lists in that province. To say that these lists, revised by judges of the land are to be passed over in Manitoba, and that the lists of Nova Scotia has, to which we have no right of appeal to any independent officers, are to be taken and accepted as absolutely fair and impartial does seem to me to be a proposition that would not commend itself to the judgment of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House for whose fairness subject to certain partisan bias which we must always expect, I have every possible respect.

I do not think this discussion has been wasted to-day. Probably before the end of the session we may hear, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has said, a little more about that thin red line. We have some pretty full information about the way in which that line was utilized, and I do not think that everything has been said on this subject to-day which might be said in regard to it. For the present it is enough to say that I trust my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, does not intend to suggest to the House that there is to be one principle applied to the province of Manitoba because it happens to have a Conservative government or because its lists do not happen to be made out to the liking of some hon. gentlemen on the other

side of the House and another principle applied to other provinces.

Let me say before I sit down what I forgot to say before and it is this: The hon. member for Lisgar spoke of the lists made up in 1904 in the province of Manitoba as if they were designedly unfair lists to the Liberals of that province. He knows very well, every hon. gentleman from Manitoba knows very well, that the reason why these lists were not favourable to the Liberals was the simple reason that they took no part in the revision upon the promise of the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), then Minister of the Interior, that these lists were not to be the lists upon which the general election was to be run. That is the reason why the lists were not favourable to the Liberals; they took no part in the revision. It is not denied that a promise was made by the hon. member for Brandon that these lists would be disregarded, and that new partisan lists would be made up for the purposes of the Dominion elections. Then, Conservatives naturally said the Liberals had made a mistake in expecting that their party friends would go so far as was prophesied. Undoubtedly the lists were not originally as favourable to the Liberals of Manitoba as they would have been if they had attended to the revision in the ordinary way. But that which was not accomplished by the Liberals by means of attending to the revision, which they would have done under ordinary circumstances, was accomplished, I know not whether at the suggestion of the hon. member for Brandon—I hope not—by this thin red line which has been spoken of this afternoon. They did not do it by means of legislature because they dare not bring that legislation before this House, but their party organizers and their party heelers did it by means of this thin red line that has been spoken of. That is the only difference. The end was accomplished after all. The lists were dealt with. They were not dealt with by legislation brought down and openly and fairly discussed in this House, but the end was accomplished by having every one of these lists placed in the hands of the Liberal organizer for Manitoba who carved them according to his own sweet will receiving them for that purpose out of the hands of the returning officers who are the servants of this parliament. I am not speaking of matters of hearsay. I am speaking of matters that were deposed to on oath by these returning officers in more than one case in the province of Manitoba. So that the thing was accomplished very well after all, not by legislation which some members of the administration shrank from bringing down, shrank from taking the responsibility of, but the thing was accomplished by having every one of these deputy returning officers hand in his list to a gentleman named Leach, the Liberal organizer for Manitoba, and Mr. Leach arranged these by means of his thin red line so that a majority of Liberals was returned at the election held in November last. The hon. member for Lisgar and two or three other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have the audacity and hardihood in the face of these facts to stand up in this House and complain of these lists in Manitoba. I do not wonder that the hon. member for Lisgar, after he had spoken, and after he had heard a portion only of the speech of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) left this House and showed the extraordinary interest which he takes in this subject, introduced by himself this afternoon without notice, by not putting in an appearance during the remainder of the day. This is all we have to say for the moment on the subject. That hon. gentleman, an old parliamentary hand, did not even have the courtesy to let us know on this side of the House that he proposed to bring up this important subject although we hear very often suggestions of lack of courtesy if any hon. gentleman on this side of the House introduces a much less important subject without giving notice to the Prime Minister or to the proper minister of the Crown. However, he has seen fit to pursue his own course and I venture to say in conclusion that he will hear something more on this subject before the session closes.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). This is the first time I have had the honour of hearing the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), and I must say he has chosen a very unfortunate subject for his maiden speech and also a very unfortunate province in which to deliver such an address. The province of Ontario had some little knowledge of Liberal fairness in the preparation of lists, and we from Ontario can speak feelingly on that question. But I understand that the hon. gentleman has lately come down from the mountain, not like the prophet of old with radiant smiles, but with a scowl on his visage, because forsooth he met defeat in that constituency. Smarting under a keen sense of his discomfiture, he opens out the vials of his wrath on the Conservative government in Manitoba because that government did not satisisfy him in its preparation of the lists; and to-day, in conjunction with the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Jackson), he coolly proposes that this House shall make a difference when it comes to deal with provinces which return a Conservative majority as compared with those which have Liberal administrations. This surely is a very strange doctrine. When the Conservative party was in power, it had a franchise that was fair to all throughout the Dominion, but these gentlemen opposite, in their wisdom, saw fit to abrogate that law and disfranchise citizens who had enjoyed the right to vote for many years, many of whom, I may say, reside in my own county. These hon. gentlemen cancelled this franchise

law, and they did so because there were Liberal governments in every province of the Dominion at that time. But now it appears that the province of Manitoba, having elected to return a Liberal Conservative administration, is ripe for a change, and we are told that the province of Ontario is nearly ripe for a similar change. Why is this ? Simply because the province of Ontario, by a majority of 38,000 at the last election, showed the Liberal party that the people of that province had had enough of their fairness. We know something in Ontario about the preparation of lists. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) waxes eloquent about the great disability the people of Manitoba are labouring under in going to register. Let me tell him that in Ontario that was the least difficulty we had to contend with. Our difficulties only began when we got to the registration office. It was then quite a feat to get a vote on the list. Who was the revising officer ? In every case he was a political appointee—an official appointed for political purposes—and who was bound to pay the debt of gratitude he owed those who put him in office, by keeping every possible Conservative off the list. That is what was done in Ontario for twenty-five years. Whenever we wanted to get a man on, we had to have lawyers to fight his case inch by inch ; and after he got on the list, were his troubles over ? Not by a long way. They were only beginning. He had to run the gauntlet of those who were offering money for his vote ; and if he had sufficient backbone to resist and got as far as the polls, what happened ? He was very possibly sworn, if it did not happen that his vote had already been presented by some one supporting these gentlemen. And when he did succeed in putting his ballot into the box, it sometimes happened that it was not a real box. Sometimes his ballot was put to one side and another ballot, marked for the man he did not vote for, put in its place. After that there was a good deal in the counting. We know that in some polling subdivisions, not 100 miles from the constituency I represent, where eighty-two voters swore they had voted for a certain candidate, only forty-two ballots for that candidate were found in the box. The warning of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who seemed to be somewhat carried away, was very timely. That hon. minister will find that there will be a considerable amount of indignation excited if he endeavours to apply to Manitoba or Ontario a rule he does not apply to the rest of the Dominion. We have had trouble enough fighting for our rights in the province of Ontario ; and having obtained them by a popular majority of 38,000, we shall not submit to their being taken from us. We can speak feelingly on this subject, because we have been groaning under the load for years. Year after year we have met defeat at the polls in that province —and why ? Not because the people were against us, but because we were smitten by an unseen hand, because we were robbed of our franchise, because we were deprived of our rights as citizens. That is no invention of my own. It has been told in the public glare of the courts to the disgrace of the Liberal party. These things have been revealed in our courts and condemned by our judges from one end of the province to the other. And after our ballots had been cast, and were likely to be called for in court, we know that in some cases they were burned by mistake. These gentlemen, who have raised this question to-day, have struck a very sore spot. Those gentlemen who have given us such broad hints that they are going to make a law which will apply to certain provinces because they are Conservative and will not apply to others because they are Liberal, will find they have struck a snag which this country will not stand. We are all willing to play the game and play it fairly. If we stay in opposition as long as our lives last, we are ready to do it so long as our elections are clean and free from reproach; but when the majority of the people say they want a certain man or party in power, we think it is time that man and party were put in power. These gentlemen talk of the grievance in Manitoba but they have not shown that the Conservative party has any advantage over the Liberals. If a Conservative has to travel 260 miles to get his franchise, why should not a Liberal do the same ? There is no difference in that respect between the two, but this thin red line makes a difference. It strikes the Conservatives only and the Liberals escape. How is it that the thin red line is applied to one party and not to the other ? If you have to apply it at all, apply it in fairness, and we will make no complaint. We are a comparatively small band on this side—not as big as we should be according to the wishes of the country, not representatives of the number of people who voted Conservative by any means—but that comparatively small band is not going to have its rights lightly trodden upon. The hon. gentleman has evinced a great desire to propitiate minorities, but only minorities of a certain kind. When the Conservative party was in a minority, did they show any such desire ? Not a bit of it. Every unfair advantage that could be taken was taken for 25 years in the province of Ontario by these gentlemen ; but I am thankful to say that at last we have there an upright, straight government. What was the very first act of that government ? It was to strike out that marked ballot, which hon. gentlemen held up for twenty-five years as a whip over their party friends and non-party friends to keep them in line. Mr. Whitney, however, has done away with it. He has said : Gentlemen, whether you are for us or against us, we do not wish to

know ; your vote is your own ; poll it like a man ; and if you do we shall count it for the man for whom it was cast. These gentlemen who come down to this House to preach about Liberal fairness in elections little know what the province of Ontario has had to endure for the last twenty-five years and how it has had to fight for its rights.

The very first act of the Conservative government has been to say : Gentlemen, we will not take any unfair advantage through that marked ballot ; that marked ballot goes ; no matter which party you belong to you can vote by secret ballot, and you can put it into a proper ballot box, and it will be counted for the candidate you intended it for. I am sorry to say that system did not exist in Ontario under the Liberal regime. My hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter) can tell a tale of what happened in some constituencies last election ; he can tell what was meant by the Liberal boast, that no power on earth could defeat the Liberal party. I leave you, Mr. Speaker, to judge where the power would come from that could defeat the Liberal party. That hon. gentleman from Hastings can show the ballot box that was falsely made for the purpose of destroying the freeman's franchise. Surely the member for Lisgar is out of touch with the province in which he at present is, and if he has returned sorely disappointed from Mountain, why should he pour out his vials of wrath in this House against the people of Manitoba because their Franchise Law does not happen to please him ? He had his way for a time. His government did wrong, and they are out of power, and they are suffering for doing wrong. Under our constitution governments come and governments go if there is fair-play, and I presume that if this government is disappointed in North Oxford and London, you will hear some of these gentlemen opposite doing as the member for Selkirk does, and asking for a special law making an exception of Ontario, so far as the Franchise Act is concerned. Mr. Speaker, the snow will certainly fly before the House prorogues if any such outrage as that is attempted.

Mr. A. CAMPBELL (Centre York). I am sure the government will be glad to know now what their duty is, and that before they attempt to pass any law they will have to go to the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) and to the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and ask them to please be allowed to pass it. A government with seventy-five or eighty majority in this House must go to these gentlemen and ask them, forsooth, if it pleases their mightyness and their holiness to be allowed to pass a law. I would like to know who is running this country. Is it this little outfit over there, this small little band that the people of Canada rejected ; these men who were told by the people from the Atlantic to the Pacific, told that their policy was wrong and that they were not fit to govern ? Is it these men who are going to hold the House up until the snow flies ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Two can play at that game. We can stay here as long as they can, and we will do it, too. What this government undertakes to do they are going to do, and they are not going to ask the opposition whether they can do it or not. It is a nice thing if the minority, a small minority, that is discredited by the people, that the people have spewed out of their mouths ; it is a nice thing if they can hold this parliament in session until the snow flies. The leader of the opposition has given us warning ; he has threatened us in plain terms : You cannot pass this law unless it pleases us. Who is 'us' I would like to know ? A little discredited band over there who, if they went back to the country to-day, small as they are, they would come back with scarcely a baker's dozen ; a miserable outfit. And the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), he has not been long in this House, and when he is in the House a few years longer, he will not be so bold and so bumptious as he has been to-night. He talks about the province of Ontario. What have we suffered from in the province of Ontario ?

Mr. BENNETT. Ross.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Ross ! Ross and his party ruled this country for thirty-three years, and I venture to say you will not rule it for thirty-three years or half that period. You were going to reform everything ; you said that the departments were reeking with corruption ; you have failed to show it, and the only thing Mr. Whitney has done is to repeal the marked ballot. That is a ballot that has been in force in England for generations, and which the people of England believe is a good ballot, and I do not care whether the Whitney government repeals it or not. He was going to repeal the Conmee Act and the Succession Duties Act, but instead of that he increased the succession duties. He has not been able to show one single thing that the Ross government has done that has not been to the credit of the province of Ontario. There never was a province governed so wisely or so well as the province of Ontario under the Liberal government, whose record will go down to generations as a wise and an honest government. There have been no complaints about the election law in the province of Ontario. The list is taken from the assessment roll and an appeal lies to the county judge, a court of revision is held, and Liberals and Conservatives have fair-play before that court. Everything is fairly and honestly conducted, and there are no complaints. There were complaints of the

Dominion Franchise Act in the old days, when the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and his friends got 200 Indians put on the voters' lists to vote for him. We all remember how Dr. Montague appealed to the Indians in Haldimand to vote for him because the Queen wanted them to do so. That is the way these gentlemen opposite conducted elections. And the member for Brantford has the audacity and the cheek to rise in this House and to denounce the system now in force in the province of Ontario. I venture to say you cannot improve on the way the voters' lists are made up in that province. It was not so under the old Franchise Act. I remember in the county of Kent when there were 1,100 appeals sent in, and the judge—he was a revising barrister then and not a judge—refused to hear these appeals at all, and we had to go to the courts in Toronto to get a mandamus to compel him to hear them. That is the way things were then conducted in the county of Kent, as I know to my sorrow, and in various other places in the province of Ontario the lists were made up in the most outrageous and partisan manner. To-day the hon. member for Selkirk has shown that men have to go 200 miles to get their names on the list. Is that not a monstrous thing ? I do not care whether it is against the Conservatives or the Liberals ; I think it most unfair, and never ought to be allowed to exist.

What sense of fairness or justice is there in that ? Sixty or seventy miles and then only allowing 13 hours of one day for each municipality. Why Sir, it is utterly impossible that they should get all the names on in that time. I remember in the town of Toronto Junction last year there were no less than 1,200 appeals for names to be added and struck off and the list is made up every year. I suppose there is one-half that number in Manitoba in any constituency, it would be utterly impossible in 13 hours to answer all the questions asked there and get the names put on or off, and so I say if such a state of affairs exists there, as has been described here to-day it is the bounden duty of the government to look into the matter and rectify any wrong that may exist. When the Tories get into power in any province they always follow their own way and conduct things in a partisan manner. They did it in the 18 years they were in power in the Dominion when we had that iniquitous franchise law, that was expensive, that put the people to a great deal of trouble and expense and which when this government came into power they properly repealed and placed the franchise as it is to-day. If they are going to repeat these tactics in Manitoba and in Ontario—in Ontario they have not done anything yet—but we will see what they will do in a year or two and I say if they are going to follow out these tactics then it is time for this government to interfere and repair that wrong. No case could be stronger than that made out by the hon. member for Lisgar and those who have spoken from this side of the House, and have stated that men have to go 60, 70 and even 200 miles to register their votes. I say it is an outrage upon the people that should not be allowed to exist any longer than it takes to repeal it, and if the case is as made out by these gentlemen then I say it is the bounden duty of the government to interfere and rectify that wrong.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). From the sadness in the tone of the hon. member for Centre York it is quite plain he has met with a fatal blow.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, he has not.

Mr. BENNETT. Every one in this House, particularly members from Toronto, know the fatal blow he got in the last few days and what made it doubly bad is that it has come from Mr. Whitney. The hon. gentleman has in his constituency a place called Toronto Junction, which under the guidance care of the Ross administration has been the resort of all the toughs and thieves who used it for the purpose of gambling.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is not in my constituency at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Toronto Junction ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. No.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to give the hon. member for Centre York credit for one thing and that is gratitude. The kindly acts that were performed for him in past elections by this gang when in Centre York and when Toronto Junction was in Centre York are not forgotten by him and that is the reason he is wailing to-night that that gang of iniquity is broken up.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It never was in Centre York.

Mr. BENNETT. It was in the riding the hon. gentleman represented and he got the benefit of their influence, and that influence was fostered by the Ross government by reason of the fact that it got very great benefits from keeping that gang there. It is rather hard that what has happened in Ontario has happened, that for the first time in 30 years the criminal law has been administered. That is what galls these hon. gentlemen and the member for Centre York knows it better than any one. Is it not galling to think that on the 13th in London there will be no more pluggers ? Mr. Quinn is now serving a year in the Central Prison ; he voted five times for Hyman in the last election. Mr. Whitney has not done anything ? The criminal law in Ontario was paralysed and Quinn walked around the streets of London boasting of what he had done. That has all been changed and Quinn is now in prison. Where are the forms that used to go about the corridors here. Geo. B. Grey and Shipley and Lott, where are they? Under this awful man Whitney they are on the other

side now, in the United States, and the member for Centre York no longer grasps the hand and sees the burly form of Lott as he walks dropping a pointer as to the ballot boxes that were going to be used and stating that it is out of the power of Providence to defeat them when these boxes were used. Mr. Whitney has broken up the junction pool room and he started the criminal law in motion. Messrs. Lott and Shipley regret it and he is making it so hot that even 'Cap.' Sullivan will not be at the station to wish the member for Centre York good luck in his trip to Ottawa and the 'Minnie M' has gone out of service as well. The member for Centre York must not say that Mr. Whitney has done nothing; he has certainly done something, he has started the criminal law in motion and we give you fair notice that in the election in London the criminal law will be enforced and the gang you have had floating from one province to another who were in Brockville, in a wonderful election, and in West Elgin and all over Ontario are not to be found now. The ringleaders Lott and Shipley have disappeared. Let the government make their appeals in London on the 13th and they will have to go with the Ross government. There is no danger of this gang being in London. My hon. friends opposite are to lose the benefit of that beautiful entourage which followed them throughout the province. I think my hon. friend had better say less about Whitney. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that there are some very uneasy friends of hon. gentlemen opposite who have had large dealings with the Crown Lands Department. It takes time always to stir up these things but you will hear of them later, they are coming and they are not coming the way of some Grit lumbermen who for years have been living on the fat of the land through the Crown Lands Department of Ontario. We have heard the old story about the infamous Dominion voters' list in Ontario. What was the fact in reference to that? My hon. friend says there were 1,100 appeals. All who know him know that everything he says has to be discounted. He was wrong in saying that there were 2,000 Indian electors in South Brant. Every one knew that this is untrue and I suppose we will have to take the same discount off his statement as to the number of appeals in a certain election. As there are about 200 Indian electors, so I presume there were about 110 appeals and there are equally as many appeals under the local law as there were formerly, the same judges hold the courts. The main and the greatest difficulty about that is that under the old Act the Indians had votes but under the present Act they have not. How many constituencies does that affect in Ontario or the whole Dominion? The Minister of Customs could be elected in the riding of Brant when there were Indian voters but he got licked in that riding and he is afraid to go back to it when there are no Indian voters there, so the Minister of Customs must have got the benefit of the Indian vote. We are not going to be threatened, we can stay here as long as hon. gentlemen can. Goodness knows the hon. gentleman is a patient waiter. The hon. gentleman has been waiting since 1896 to be taken into this cabinet. The newspapers from time to time announce that he is going in as the minister of this or the minister of that. But he is never going in as the minister of anything, as a matter of fact, and for the simple reason that he could not be re-elected for Centre York if he were taken into the cabinet.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How do you know?

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman is afraid to try it. But, after London is disposed of, he may have a chance, that is, unless the hon. member for London (Mr. Hyman) is to have another chance in Prescott or in Russell where there may be some reasonable prospect of his being re-elected.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. He will be re-elected in London.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr Derbyshire) said the other night that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) would be elected. And he undertook to prove it in a way peculiarly his own—he was prepared to bet any amount of money on it. Now, I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Derbyshire) will go up to London in this campaign; because as soon as his burly form is pointed out and people are told that he is the man who wishes to bet money on the success of the government party in this election, they will come about him like flies around honey. And, if he will follow Mr. Hyman in the house-to-house canvass that he is making, the people may think that they can have a nickel dropped in the slot. But I warn him that the Londoners will not be satisfied with nickels in this election. They know that the government is playing for its last stake and that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) must be elected at all hazards, and so one-dollar or two-dollar bills will be utterly useless. In proportion to the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Derbyshire's) dimensions, the bill should be correspondingly large. I do not know whether this government intends to bring in a special Bill for the benefit of the demoralized Grit party in Manitoba or not. If they do, we shall examine that Bill and see what it contains. Of course, according to the old saying, desperate diseases require desperate remedies, and the condition of the Liberal party in Manitoba is such that one hardly knows whether to speak of it as a party at all or not. They had a by-election in Mountain the other day, and every one knows the result. I think there are three or four opponents of the Roblin government in the legislature, and they have been tumbling over one another, since the last election,

to get in with the government side. What is the complaint that has been voiced here this afternoon ? It is that they are not going to have a thorough revision of the lists in Manitoba this year. Why, there will be no revision of the lists in Ontario this year. Hon. gentlemen on either side do not care to spend their time and money fixing up the lists in Ontario. And I will tell you why : It is because we know there will be no election. There will be no Dominion election—that is a certainty. Every man who sits in this House can console himself with the reflection that this government is not going to meet the people until the last moment. And, as to the Ontario legislature, there is not a possibility of there being an election there for four years. You could not even galvanize the parties into preparing to have an election this year. For you cannot have an election unless there is an opposition, and there is no opposition in the Ontario legislature to-day. The opposition did not challenge a vote in the House last session.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They did—on the Gamey matter. They challenged a vote on the white-wash and it was a big coat of white-wash too.

Mr. BENNETT. True ; I had forgotten about the Gamey business. But I should thought that after the knock out that Mr. Gamey gave the Liberal government in Ontario we would never have heard his name from a Liberal again.

Mr. FINLAY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) ought to be ashamed to mention his name.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not wonder that my hon. friend from East Peterborough (Mr. Finlay) is roused to some kind of protest when the name of Mr. Gamey is mentioned. Why, the hon. gentleman's political godfather was Jimmy Stratton. And I am here to-night to acknowledge that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Finlay) has one good quality the quality of gratitude. He cannot but feel a sympathetic pang when he hears mentioned the name of the man who struck Jimmy Stratton in the vital parts, the man who placed Mr. James Stratton where he is to-day—outside the pale of Ontario politics, outside the pale even of the Liberal party, for in that party to-day there are none so poor to do him reverence.

If the government bring in this Bill, we will be here to see what it contains. But so long as the people of Manitoba are almost unanimous in favour of the present government, this House should hesitate to say that a law passed at the instance of a government so firmly entrenched in the approval of the people of Manitoba is a bad law. We will wait and see what the government do. And we must be prepared to wait, for this government seems to be a waiting government. For, what is the government doing to-day ? It is delaying the session to prevent business being done. They will not let business go on. They have here this coercion Bill, but they do not move an inch forward, but they put up these tricks to delay. One after another their supporters fire their guns and retire. Was it not a pathetic sight to see the burly form of the hon. member for Lisgar, after he had emptied the vials of his wrath upon this side, retiring from the chamber while the sympathetic onlookers could almost hear the refrain of that beautiful and touching song 'Don't you go Tommy, Don't go.' They are delaying the business of the House. Let them give us this coercion Bill that we may get on with it, finish our business and go home. Let the people of London and North Oxford know what the government's policy is. Let them know whether this is a Bill, as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) says it is, with little or nothing in it, or a Bill as the hon. member from Centre York (Mr. Campbell) says it is, so harmless that the system of separate schools will die out in a little time, or a Bill as some other hon. gentlemen on that side say it is, that will place on the statute-book and establish for all time the strongest system of separate schools ever known in the Dominion.

In conclusion, let me commiserate my hon. friend from Centre York on his dwindling and vanishing majority. His speech reminded me of that grand old hymn :

> Hark ! From the tombs a doleful sound
> That bids my soul arise.

I know the hon. gentleman's deep feeling of sympathy for his old friends in Toronto Junction, who, by the prompt and stern action of Premier Whitney have been wiped out, their pool-room closed up and the hon. gentleman's band of tried and trusty followers scattered to the four winds of Heaven.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Commutation in lieu of remission of duties on articles imported for the use of the army and navy—further amount required, $500.

Mr. PATERSON. The leader of the opposition asked for an explanation of this matter. There is a sum of $2,250 in the main estimates, that will be $500 short, and we are asking for this supplementary vote. He asked the reason for a vote of this kind, seeing that under the Tariff Act articles for the use of the army and navy are free. That is true with reference to officers that belong to the mess, but there are a certain number of officers who do not belong to the mess, and who purchase their supplies from Halifax merchants, it may be, or import them ; but in either case they pay the duty. This vote is to re-imburse these officers who do not belong to the mess for the estimated amount of duties that they pay. The money is not paid

to the officers until there has been a certificate from the commanding officer that these officers do not belong to the mess but have purchased the goods which have paid the duty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason for restricting the free importations to the mess, I suppose, is in order to keep some control ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And doing it by means of a refund is for the sake of the revenue ?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, these officers that do not belong to the mess have to buy their own supplies, and whether they buy them in Halifax, or in Victoria, for the Esquimalt portion of the garrison, or whether they import them from the old country, they have to pay duty. They are not allowed to get them in free, even if they import them themselves.

New Brunswick—Richibucto public building—balance due contractor, &c., $1,600.

Mr. FIELDING. Last evening a statement was asked for as to the expenditure on this building. I gave the total amount but I did not have all the details which I now present in these tables :

Richibucto, New Brunswick, Post Office, &c.

Statement of expenditure to date—		
Site, purchase price	$ 808 50	
Site, legal services and survey	107 00	
	$	915 50
Right of way for drain		105 00
Construction of building	10,613 00	
Heating apparatus and boiler	1,049 36	
Fittings (on account)	1,300 00	
Safes (2)	679 10	
Box fronts and grilles	594 25	
Grading and fencing	259 00	
Clerk of works	1,242 50	
Furniture	214 70	
		15,951 91
Printing, advertising, travelling expenses, &c.		594 63
Total		17,567 04
Still to be paid—		
Balance fittings	$ 700 00	
Electric installation	559 52	
Clerk of works	112 50	
Legal services re drain	96 10	
Furniture	112 00	
		$1,580 12

Schedule of Tenders for Post Office, &c., Richibucto, New Brunswick.

		Cheque.
A—James Reid, Sydney, N.S.	$ 9,716 00	$1,000 00
B—John McDonald & Co., Chatham, N.B.	11,587 00	1,158 70
C—Joseph Green, North Sydney, N.S.	11,900 00	1,190 00
D—Viau & Lachance, Hull, P.Q.	13,996 00	1,400 00
E—Dussault & Pageau, Quebec	15,345 75	1,535 00

Mr. DANIEL. Why is this chargeable to income instead of capital ?

Mr. FIELDING. Public buildings of this character are not charged to capital. Public buildings at Ottawa relating to the government are charged to capital, but other public buildings throughout the country are not.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this the only public building for the whole province of New Brunswick ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is not an estimate for the future, it is closing up the current year's accounts. Estimates are coming in that have to be dealt with separately.

Mr. AMES. By the application of what principle does the hon. gentleman charge a building to income, and a dredge to capital ?

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose my hon. friend is referring to dredging the St. Lawrence. It has been the custom to charge certain dredging, especially a channel like the St. Lawrence to capital. It might be difficult to give a logical reason for charging that to capital and not to income ; but the Englishman's reason for these things is : That is always the way we have been accustomed to do it.

Mr. AMES. Is the present government satisfied to accept precedents in all such matters without making any change ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; but there is something to be said in favour of this practice. Dredging the St. Lawrence is part of a great national undertaking, which should be distinct from an ordinary small building. At all events, that is the rule which we have adopted in the past. I have not had my attention drawn to the necessity for a change, but I do not think, at first blush, it follows that a change should be made.

Mr. AMES. I am willing to admit that the result of the work of a dredge is properly chargeable to capital account ; I question whether the instrument or tool that performs the work can be rightly so charged.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a very fine distinction.

Ottawa public buildings—telephone service, $4,600.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much does the telephone service cost altogether ? This is in addition to what was granted in the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. The total amount required for telephones at Ottawa is $9,738.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the vote in the main estimates ?

Mr. FIELDING. $10,000 was the appropriation up to 31st December. Since that

time there have been some additional telephones put in.

Mr. TAYLOR. $10,000 was the appropriation which was asked for in the main estimates last year. Surely the telephone service can be pretty nearly estimated ?

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it is increasing all the time. It is just that class of service that increases with increasing business ; $10,000 was the appropriation voted last year.

Mr. TAYLOR. It has overrun that by about 50 per cent. That is a very poor estimate, knowing what each instrument costs and knowing how many you require.

Mr. FIELDING. There is an explanation of it which we have to give regarding one or two other items, and it is a reason that is not entirely satisfactory to myself. It is that there has grown up in the department the practice of allowing some of the accounts of one year to run over into another year, with the result that they have had to take from this year's appropriation to meet the balance due from the previous year. I think the system is a bad one ; I think it should be changed as far as possible, and I am glad to see the hon. minister is asking for a sufficient amount to close up the accounts for the current year. In that case $10,000 would be enough to pay the accounts for the current year, but if the accounts are passed over into the next year there is a difficulty in making the calculations.

Mr. TAYLOR. In 1896-97, when the government brought down their estimates, they found fault with the previous government for having pursued that practice, and in nearly every case they asked for money enough to wipe off old debts.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the right way.

Mr. TAYLOR. They did that, and it was never going to happen again ; but now with nearly every item that comes up the money is required to pay overlapping accounts.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree with my hon. friend that it is the better way to take a sufficient sum to close up the accounts for the current year rather than that they should be carried over. I would rather, as Minister of Finance, give a sufficient sum to close up the accounts for the year than have these accounts hanging over. That is what we are proposing to do in this case.

Ottawa public buildings—including repairs, ventilation and lighting, furniture, &c., $40,000.

Mr. FIELDING. There was an appropriation in the main estimates of $125,000. We are asking for $40,000, which will make it $165,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why are you asking for this large sum ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a similar case. There was as much as $28,000 paid out of this year's appropriation for accounts that had accumulated. The vote proposed is intended to cover all the accounts for the current year, and we are asking for the coming year $140,000.

Mr. OSLER. Have you the amount expended on rented buildings ?

Mr. FIELDING. We are coming to an item in a few moments when I will give that information to the hon. gentleman.

Ottawa public buildings—heating, including salaries of engineers, firemen and watchmen, $18,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation in the main estimates was $87,000. With the additional amount we now propose it will make it $105,000. The chief item in this is for coal supplied by the contractors, Messrs. John Heney & Son, Ottawa. We paid last year $6.90 per ton. The general amount consumed for some years was 6,000 tons, but last year it was necessary to order an additional 1,000 tons.

Mr. DANIEL. What kind of coal ?

Mr. FIELDING. Anthracite.

Mr. DANIEL. That does not include all the coal ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is for the Ottawa buildings.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the coal that was burnt in this building included ?

Mr. FIELDING. All the furnace coal is hard coal, but for grate purposes some soft coal is used.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the rate at which that is purchased ?

Mr. FIELDING. For the grates they use Cannel coal, which is purchased at $8.45 per ton.

Ottawa public buildings—elevator attendants, $1,900.

Mr. FIELDING. This is asked to supplement a vote of $10,000 which was made by parliament last year to cover the cost of running the elevators in the public buildings, the parliament building, the east and west departmental buildings, the Langevin block and the Woods' building.

Ottawa public buildings—gas and electric light, $4,250.

Mr. FIELDING. We had an appropriation in the main estimates of $24,000. This is another case of arrears. The appropriation will probably be sufficient for the year's service, but there were considerable arrears, and it is proposed to take a sufficient vote to cover them. The appropriation proposed for the coming year is $24,000. We are not increasing the amount. We are asking for

a sufficient appropriation to pay these arrears.

Ottawa public buildings—grounds, $1,250.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this on account of the heavy snow ?

Mr. FIELDING. This $1,250 is to be obtained for the purpose of covering arrears accumulated during the past few years in keeping the grounds on Parliament Hill and the Lovers' Walk in proper condition. I think in consideration of the Lovers' Walk, it should be passed without objection.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I notice that the hon. acting Minister of Public Works says that this is to cover arrears. I think when he tells us about these arrears, he should be able to tell us the amount of the arrears overlapping in each of these cases.

Mr. FIELDING. It is really the amount we are asking—about $1,250. Actually it is $1,249.70. Of course, that would be paid in the early part of the season out of the general vote, and in the latter part of the season they would be short just that amount to pay current expenses.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is not the way I understand the hon. minister is putting it.

Mr. FIELDING. Then in that case I am afraid I have been misleading my hon. friend. At the beginning of the year, out of the appropriation the balance of last year's account will be paid, and at the end of the year we will be short just that amount.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I want to know what these amounts were for ?

Mr. FIELDING. $747 will be applied to the payment of gardeners' and labourers' wages. $445.74 is for plants, manure, &c., and $56.98 for sundries. Total, $1,249.70.

Ottawa public buildings—Major's Hill park, $1,500.

Mr. FIELDING. The details are as follows : Manure and earth, $283.98 ; plants, $171.41 ; sundries, $63.65; gardener's wages, &c., $871.78.

Dominion public buildings—furniture, $5,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The number of these buildings is increasing and consequently this item increases.

Mr. TAYLOR. The government are lavish in buying furniture both for Dominion buildings and Ottawa buildings.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think that any of the furniture in these apartments is too luxurious for the parliament of Canada or in any way extravagant.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice a large quantity of steel shelves going to the different departments.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a special vote for that. It is not covered by this vote.

Dominion public buildings—rents, $10,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This to provide the balance required to pay all rents up to the close of the current fiscal year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely the government knew, when they brought in the main estimates, the rent they would have to pay and should not ask an additional $10,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is on account of buildings acquired during the year in all parts of the country. At St. John, New Brunswick, the immigrant building was rented at $950. It was rented from the city council. In the Corry building on Rideau street, two floors and a basement, were rented for the purposes of the Georgian Bay Canal survey. The rent is for nine months at the rate of $5,285 per annum. The term of rental is two years or a little less, so that it shall end the 1st May.

Mr. OSLER. How many clerks are employed in the offices ?

Mr. FIELDING. My deputy thinks 20 to 25.

Mr. OSLER. In Toronto you could rent office accommodation for 150 to 200 clerks for that rental. This is simply an outrage. If this building is rented for that purpose alone, you cannot spend that money without having some sort of a job.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think my hon. friend should rush to that assumption.

Mr. OSLER. In Toronto or Montreal, to pay $5,000 for the purposes of an office connected with the survey would be simply an outrage.

Mr. TAYLOR. I draw attention to the fact that this vote is for Dominion public buildings, and you are including in it an Ottawa public building for the Public Works department. The government are paying at the rate of about 25 per cent in money for rentals. Surely the government would do better to borrow at 3 or 4 per cent and put up the buildings we require and not rent from party friends at exorbitant rates. We are paying nearly $3,000 a year for improvements on a building down on Sparks street that was rented for the taking of the census and which it was supposed, would not be required after that work was done. It was continued on at $6,000 a year and the government spent $15,000 or $20,000 in putting in an elevator and refitting the whole place. Why should the government pay these exorbitant rentals ?

Mr. FIELDING. In coming to a conclusion as to the fairness of the rental one must take each individual case and investigate it. I quite agree that these rented buildings are not the most convenient and for my part I think we should accept the responsibility

of putting up a new departmental building and concentrating our offices there. But these things cannot be done in a day and for the present we have not been able to do it. I know that the Minister of Public Works has been giving his attention to this matter, but how far he has succeeded I am not prepared to say. I have not sufficient knowledge of the character of the building to contradict my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) but I cannot imagine that the department would pay a grossly extravagant price. I am afraid that nearly every one thinks the government ought to pay more than a private individual pay a grossly extravagant price. I am afraid it applies to nearly all transactions unless we look very closely after them. If there is any reason to believe that there is anything wrong about the renting of this building I would be glad to have the matter inquired into.

Mr. OSLER. This matter has been before the House for a good many sessions and each year the excuse is put forward that the matter is being looked into, and yet as the Minister of Finance says, they continue to pay extravagant rents.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say that.

Mr. OSLER. I quite agree with the Minister of Finance that the government has to pay more than a private individual has to pay, and I entirely agree with his suggestion that the government should without any delay erect proper buildings of their own. If for the accommodation of twenty or twenty-five clerks engaged in the survey of that canal we are paying over $5,000 for that floor space, it is almost a criminal act to pay it. It is an outrageous price.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is this building ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is the tall building immediately across the canal on the right-hand side. I have just been told that the Hydrographic Survey of the Marine Department and the Ottawa River Works have offices in this building also. However, that would not enter into the consideration whether or not the rent is fair, and in view of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has said we ought to make some inquiry into it.

Mr. OSLER. My criticism was based on the first statement that it was for the accommodation of the survey staff of the canal which would require twenty-five clerks. If there are more clerks it might be that the rent is reasonable.

Mr. FIELDING. I have just been told that there are other branches included. The question is as to whether that is a fair rent to pay for that amount of floor space, and in that light the number of clerks would not affect the question.

Mr. OSLER. If you rent two floors for twenty or twenty-five clerks you may have twice the room you require.

Mr. FIELDING. That would concern the amount of space but not the rent.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much are we paying for the rent of buildings in Ottawa altogether ? I cannot understand why this government will go to a party friend and tell him they will enter into a lease for a number of years if he will erect a building for them. I understand that was done in the case of the Militia building. Surely the government can get money cheaper than a private individual and erect its own buildings. In the same way, for the accommodation of the Surveyor General the government went to a political friend and asked him to put up a building promising to take a lease for so many years and paying an exorbitant rent equal to about 20 per cent on the capital invested. In 1896 the public officials were housed in buildings owned by the government, but every year you are paying higher rentals to accommodate a larger staff and doing very little more work. What rents were paid in 1896 and what rents are paid in Ottawa to-day ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not the figures for 1896. The total rents paid in Ottawa now amount to $47,111. I myself favour the idea of the government owning its buildings, but while it might be an unfortunate thing to rent buildings all over the city it would be more unfortunate for the government to own buildings all over the city. I think we should select a suitable place, possibly one or two suitable places, and put up sufficient buildings to accommodate our officials. The moment the government try to buy land anywhere they immediately find it is very expensive, and the probability is that nothing is lost by delay, because if we push a transaction of that kind we may have to pay an extravagant price. It is one thing to pay an extravagant rent, if it is extravagant, for a year or two and it is another thing to pay an extravagant price for land. The Minister of Public Works is giving the subject his attention with every desire to carry out the policy that the government should own its own buildings, which I think is best all round in the public interest. At no distant date an important move in that direction will perhaps be made, but in view of the difficulty of purchasing land at a moderate price hon. gentlemen should not urge that it should be done too quickly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Capitalized at 3½ per cent the rental we are paying would represent $1,250,000, and that amount spent on buildings would give us double the accommodation for which we are now paying rent, and besides it would prevent us having public offices in shacks here and there throughout the city. Surely no business man, not to speak of the combined wisdom of fifteen or sixteen ministers, would conduct his private business in the way the government are conducting their business in this respect ? They

are spending I presume on these buildings $5,000 a year rental. The government had to do a lot of fitting at its own expense. It is the same in every building we have rented.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a new building with very little additional cost in that case.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much has been spent in fitting it up for the use of the government for repairs and furniture and permanent works ?

Mr. FIELDING. The chief architect tells me in respect to that that there has been nothing on the building itself. There is the furniture and fittings but no alteration to the building.

Mr. MILLER. In any of these cases does the rent of the building include the cost of heating ?

Mr. FIELDING. We take an appropriation for heating. In the case of the Corry building the heat is supplied, but we do not in all cases have the heat furnished. I do not think my hon. friend is correct in saying that for that amount of money we would have twice the accommodation. For instance we have more accommodation in private buildngs than in a building like the Langevin block. That cost $800,000 and is a very fine building. I am not arguing that the present method is economical or convenient, and I would favour having a very fine and good departmental building erected where these could be concentrated.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost of the Corry building ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have no knowledge of that.

Mr. BLAIN. It occupies a very small portion of land and I am informed the building was constructed very cheaply.

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give the information at present.

Mr. OSLER. In the item for buildings Ottawa, including repairs how much of that amount was included for repairs on rented buildings ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am told it is not the practice to repair rented buildings. We have to put our own fittings into the buildings but not to repair them.

Mr. TAYLOR. A session or two ago a considerable amount was spent on the Seybold building.

Mr. FIELDING. It was not for repairs but to be fitted up to suit the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister read a list of the owners of the buildings that have been rented and the price ?

Mr. FIELDING. I began to read a list of the buildings but not of the owners. In some places the buildings bear the owner's name, for instance, the Corry building and the Orme building, which I understand is owned by Mr. Orme. In most cases the owners are not given. We rent from the Slater estate five rooms for $550, in the Orme building two rooms at $250, from the Great North Western Telegraph Company, five rooms at $500 per annum. These are all the Ottawa buildings.

Mr. TAYLOR. That are included in this vote?

Mr. FIELDING. These are the new buildings, the supplementaries that are in consequence of new buildings.

Mr. MORIN. The minister said that it was no use to be in a great hurry to erect buildings in Ottawa. That is a fact, but the cost will not be growing any less next year or in two years. It has always been the case that property owners are glad to sell to the government at a high price and if you have to pay a high price it is as well to pay it this year as next. The buildings now are very much crowded, in the printing office especially you will find in a room fit for four men, six, seven or eight, and in the departmental blocks and the House of Commons every room seems to be much crowded. It is no use trying to be so stingy about it, you may as well go and put up a building if it costs a couple of millions to do it, and then the men who work in the buildings will have some comfort. They are all crowded and many of them cannot work ; they have so many machines there that they cannot hear themselves talking and cannot turn around and it is disagreeable in every way. You might as well do it first as last.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the rental of the building on Metcalfe street occupied by the Survey Department ?

Mr. FIELDING. $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there a lease ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was leased about four years ago for ten years.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was leased before it was built. It was run up in a hurry at a cost of not more than $15,000. I am satisfied I could build it in our town for less and the government are paying $3,000 a year.

Dominion public buildings—fuel, &c., $13,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does that include Ottawa the same as others ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. OSLER. Is it bought by tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the coal is purchased by tender.

Dominion public buildings—salaries, engineers, firemen, caretakers, &c., $19,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. The minister will explain this surely.

Mr. FIELDING. This applies to buildings throughout the Dominion. The provision in the main estimates was $110,000. This will make our total appropriation $129,000, and we are asking $127,000 for the coming year. The number of the employees necessarily increases as we go on. The number of buildings increased from 195 to 210.

Mr. TAYLOR. That would be 15 additional buildings, and it costs $19,000 for the salaries of the engineers, firemen and caretakers, of these fifteen extra buildings. Has there been an overlapping of the account from last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. This item is made up of the following : New appointments unprovided for last session, $8,584 ; increases in salaries, $2,878 ; temporary cleaners, jobbers, &c., $7,873 ; total, $19,385.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Who supplies the fuel for the Toronto public buildings ?

Mr. FIELDING. The hard coal for last winter was supplied by the Milnes Co., of Toronto. I am not sure who supplied the soft coal.

Ottawa public buildings, including Rideau Hall—removal of snow, $2,500.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the hon. minister please tell us what Rideau Hall cost us this year ?

Mr. FIELDING. This does not apply to Rideau Hall only, but to the removal of snow from about the public buildings in Ottawa generally.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But we should have it divided so that we should know what Rideau Hall costs. I have a distinct recollection of criticisms that were made by hon. gentlemen opposite of expenditures on Rideau Hall when we were in power.

Mr. FIELDING. But, cannot my hon. friend (Mr. U. Wilson) forget some things ? I cannot give the expenditure for Rideau Hall separately.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But we should be allowed to know what Rideau Hall costs.

Mr. FIELDING. As respects the removal of snow ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. As respects the whole thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. That will come up on the next vote.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot divide the expenditure under this item in relation to the different buildings. But I will promise my hon. friend (Mr. U. Wilson) that, if it is available in the department, I will give him the statement at another time.

Rideau Hall, including grounds—renewals, improvements, furniture and maintenance, additional amount, $8,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Under this item, perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) can tell us the cost of Rideau Hall ?

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation for the current year was $22,000. For next year we are asking $25,000. Then there is this additional appropriation for the current year of $8,000. The appropriation became exhausted in March last and there are works of renewal, repairs and maintenance to about the amount of this estimate.

Mr. TAYLOR. That means a total of $30,000 this year ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The expenditure for 1904 was $17,000, for 1903, $21,700, for 1902, $24,350.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The Auditor General has here an item showing that Rideau Hall cost $25,056.38 besides $8,000 for fuel and light.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps the Auditor General groups a number of items together.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The items as given by the Auditor General for Rideau Hall are : Maintenance, $17,017 ; repairs and improvements, $5,093.43 ; removal of snow, $1,230.34 ; charged to 1904-5, $1,710.51; total, $25,056.38 Besides that, the Earl of Minto was allowed for fuel and light for twelve months $8,000. And the estimate for this year is about $44,000 as I have it.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt the Auditor General's figures are correct for the grouping of items that he gives. But we confine ourselves to this one item, so that the figures I give are correct in relation to this.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But the minister has not given me the cost of maintaining Rideau Hall for the year ending June 30 next.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the figures prepared in that way. But I can give it at another stage if he desires it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the hon. gentleman do it ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I will do it as well as I can.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In the main estimates there is a vote of $22,000. Then there is the removal of snow for Ottawa public buildings, including Rideau Hall, $2,500. Then there is this supplementary vote : Rideau Hall, including grounds, renewals, improvements, furniture and maintenance, additional amount, $8,000.' I think there ought to be some explanation as to why this increased expenditure is necessary.

Mr. FIELDING. As some of these items are not confined to Rideau Hall, but include others, it would be necessary to separate

them, and I will endeavour to do that at a later stage. The Auditor General groups a number of things together, and we will endeavour to do the same.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would like to have some particular day fixed, because I would like to be here.

Mr. FIELDING. I want to make this suggestion generally, that as respects all these supplementary estimates, I would be glad if hon. gentlemen would, with as little discussion as may be necessary, assist to pass them, because until we can get a Supply Bill there is a little embarrassment. But there will be ample opportunity of discussing every question that hon. gentlemen may wish to discuss. There will be another item in the supplementaries for the coming year in regard to Rideau Hall.

Ottawa departmental buildings—additional fittings for treasury vault, $3,000.

Mr. OSLER. Are these vaults up-to-date and modern ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think our vaults generally are up-to-date. We have, so far as I can learn, everything that is possible in the way of security.

Some resolutions reported.

ASCENSION DAY ADJOURNMENT.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). At an earlier stage I called attention to the motion standing in the name of the Prime Minister to the effect that when the House adjourns on Wednesday it shall stand adjourned until Friday, and being informed by some hon. gentlemen that there was a desire not to meet on Friday, I agreed to hold the matter over long enough to afford an opportunity for consultation. I have since been advised that a consultation has taken place, and that on both sides of the House there is a feeling that as Thursday is a holiday, and as Friday is not usually a very busy day, we should not ask the members to come back on Friday, but to adjourn until Monday. On the information that that is agreeable to both sides of the House, I will now amend the Prime Minister's motion to make it read that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, the 31st instant, it stand adjourned until Monday, the 5th of June next.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will be taken up tomorrow, and what will be done with regard to the subject mentioned by the leader of the opposition ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the estimates. After the inquiry to-day I sent a note to the Prime Minister, who replied, and I sent his reply to the leader of the opposition, that he will be in the House tomorrow and will confer with the leader of the opposition about it.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, May 31, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ST. MAURICE VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers) moved for leave to present a petition praying for the passing of a Bill to amend the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company. He said : The object of the amendment is to allow the railroad to cross the St. Maurice river at a point three miles east of the point mentioned in the charter. The company are very anxious to go on with that road, and find that to do it they must cross the river three miles below the point mentioned. That is the object of the amendment desired to be made to the Bill. Unless this is done we cannot go on with our railway this year.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of Canadian Archives for 1904.—Mr. Fisher.

QUESTIONS.

PRINTING OF DOMINION NOTES

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Do any grave reasons of state exist that might prevent the Minister of Finance from having the Dominion one and two dollar notes or all other bank notes, printed simultaneously in English and French ?

2. Are they unaware in the Finance Department that the two languages are official in Canada ?

3. Is it the intention of the Minister of Finance to rectify in the future this state of things by ordering that those bank notes be printed in the both languages, English and French ?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There is nothing in the British North America Act or in any Act of the parliament of Canada which requires or contemplates the printing of Dominion notes in two languages. The Finance Department has not contemplated the advisability of any departure from the practice which has existed under all governments from the beginning of confederation down to the present time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TIME TABLES.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Why are not the time tables of the government railways printed in English and in French, since both languages are official in Canada ?

2. Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways and Canals to rectify the present state of things by having such time tables printed in the two languages ?

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

1 and 2. It has not been the practice in Canada to print the time tables in French, only as advertised in papers printed in the French language. Time tables published for use of the employees have always been in English, but the employees are all conversant with that language.

The non-publication in French has not been found to cause any inconvenience.

If it be found that there is any necessity for such publication, the department will arrange accordingly.

SALE OF KINGSTON CORDAGE.

Mr. CLARE—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the cordage manufactured by the government at Kingston, between June, 1904, and March, 1905, amounting to 58 tons, been sold ?

2. What tenders were received for the purchase of the same ?

3. What tender was accepted, what was the price, and was it the lowest tender ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Justice) :

1. A tender has been accepted, but the goods have not yet been delivered.

2 and 3. The highest tender was accepted. It is not in the public interest, however, that the names of those who tendered or the prices offered should be made public until the transaction is completed and the purchaser has had reasonable time to dispose of the goods if he desires to do so.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TIME TABLE.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John City). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the attention of the Minister of Railways to the new time table which is to be put into effect on the Intercolonial Railway, I think, on the 4th or 5th of this month. At the present time the express from St. John leaves that city in the morning at 7 o'clock. Under the new time table that time has been advanced one hour, so that the train leaves at 6 o'clock in the morning. I am advised that there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with regard to this change, and that it will be a very considerable trouble to the travelling public, and there is dissatisfaction among that class of people on that account. I would like to ask from the Minister of Railways if it is not possible for him to continue the running of that train leaving St. John at 7 o'clock as at present. I believe the change will be a very unsatisfactory one. I understand it relates to the Halifax express alone, and I cannot see what advantage there would be in the change. I hope the Minister of Railways will reconsider that change and, in the interest of the travelling public, allow the train to leave at 7 o'clock in the morning and not change it to 6 o'clock.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is absolutely impossible to arrange a time table that will suit the convenience of every section of the Intercolonial Railway without entailing unwarranted expense. Last season there were a number of trains following each other on the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and St. John. The train referred to by my hon. friend is known as No. 2 train. There has been at the same hour a train known as No. 1 leaving Halifax for St. John. In the consideration of the time tables during the present season the great aim that I had was to suit as far as possible the convenience of the people and to minimize the cost of running trains. Nos. 1 and 2 cross each other at Amherst. I found that it was possible to discontinue No. 2 train as a through train from St. John to Halifax and also to discontinue No. 1 train as a through train from Halifax to St. John.

At the same time, we would meet the convenience of the people and the requirements of the traffic by having No. 2 train run from St. John to Moncton, connecting with the maritime express from Montreal in the morning; and the maritime express could do the whole business between Moncton and Truro. Last year the maritime express reached Moncton in the vicinity of 10 o'clock and went through to Truro. Then, 15 minutes after, No. 2 train from St. John followed, without passengers, without traffic, but not, of course, without very great expense. By the arrangement we have made, this difficulty is overcome. It is true that it necessitates the St. John passengers getting up at an earlier hour, but it meets the convenience of the travelling public along the line, because it is a local train ; it is not designed to do through passenger traffic between St. John and Halifax. As a matter of fact No. 2 train has not done that traffic for years. Originally it was a train started out with that object, and for a number of years, when the Intercolonial was a mere by-way it served that purpose. But, now that we have trains going every few hours, the Canadian Pacific Railway and other trains, this through train from St. John is no longer a necessity; it is only a bill of expense. Having regard to the necessities of the traffic, I felt that No. 2 train should leave St. John at an earlier hour and run to Moncton coming back in the evening at six o'clock and meet-

ing the requirements of the people between these points both going and coming, and that train No. 1 should leave Halifax and run to Amherst, returning in the afternoon and meeting the requirements of the people between these points. This will obviate the necessity of running a through express between St. John and Halifax. As a matter of fact, that train has been going out at seven o'clock in the morning without passengers, without traffic. And, in the interests of the railway, and, I think, quite agreeably to the convenience of the people, there should be a change; and I have ordered accordingly. There is no great amount of traffic from St. John to local points by this through train. They have the local trains to depend upon. The suburban train service at St. John is unexceptional—they have trains at almost all hours. As to through traffic, they have a night train leaving St. John about eleven o'clock. This takes the through traffic. The Canadian Pacific Railway train, during the summer season reaches St. John about 11.30 a.m.—certainly not later than 12. The Boston train reaches St. John at 11 o'clock. The Intercolonial train connecting with that train and also with the train for Montreal leaves between 11 and 12.

Mr. DANIEL. It leaves at 11.40.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think I was sufficiently accurate in saying between 11 and 12. But, at 11.40, to be precise, that train leaves for Halifax. That takes practically the whole day business between St. John and Halifax. Recognizing that fact, I thought the country should be saved the expense of running No. 2 train which existed simply because it had been started at the time of the initiation of the Intercolonial service, and which has continued for years without any pressing necessity for it. Of course, I regret that, in order to connect with the maritime express from Montreal to Halifax we are obliged to start earlier from St. John. These are the facts, and I think the facts are sufficient justification for the action decided upon.

Mr. DANIEL. I was a little surprised to hear the minister——

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the hon. member (Mr. Daniel) to the fact that there is no motion before the chair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House will be moved at once into Committee of Supply, and my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) will then have his opportunity.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY TIME-TABLE.

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

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John city). I was rather surprised to hear the Minister of Railways intimate that there were so many trains leaving St. John. He said there was one out every hour I think.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said one every few hours.

Mr. DANIEL. As a matter of fact after this train leaves at six o'clock in the morning, there is no train until 11.40. This train is booked to leave the city of St. John so early that it will be a great inconvenience. The mail must close so very much earlier that even the morning papers will hardly be able to be sent out by it. I cannot see, from the statement of the minister, why the hour must necessarily be changed.

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me tell my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) that that was with a view to meeting the maritime express which runs through from Montreal to Halifax and reaches Moncton somewhere about 10 a.m. When that maritime express reaches Moncton it can take the St. John traffic, or the traffic gathered up between St. John and Moncton on to Halifax if there be any. As a usual thing there is none. It only means a little inconvenience to the St. John people to get up a little earlier. But there are few people who get up to take the early morning train. They take the 11.40 train. Ordinarily—and I speak from personal experience—No. 2 train going out hitherto at 7 a.m., goes out absolutely without passengers and it is dependent for its earnings upon the traffic which it gathers between St. John and Moncton. I think the reasons which I have stated are good and sufficient. They are substantial. They are in the interest of economy and the arrangement, as I think, does not very greatly inconvenience the travelling public excepting a few who may wish to leave St. John in the morning for some intermediate point between St. John and Moncton. They have to get up an hour earlier. I am sorry for them, but it is impossible, as I stated at the very inception of my remarks, to contrive a time-table that will suit every point. Somebody has to be inconvenienced and I do not know of any people who should be more self-sacrificing that those of St. John.

Mr. DANIEL. At the same time I think that the hon. minister is making this change at the wrong time in the year because he must be aware of the fact that the amount of travel in that district is not as great in the winter time as it is in the summer time. People naturally in the summer time prefer to travel by day rather than by night.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have a night train. They have a train at six o'clock in the morning, they have a train at 11.40 in

the forenoon, and they have a train in the afternoon.

Mr. DANIEL. I still hope the hon. minister will reconsider his position in the matter and allow the time-table to remain as it was before.

Mr. J. B. MORIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it will be possible for him to arrange the running of the trains on the Intercolonial Railway in such a way as to connect with the Canada Atlantic Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal so that people coming from the east to Ottawa may arrive at their destination on the same day. The way the train has been running for years we are compelled to stay in Montreal over night. There is no train for Ottawa connecting with the train from the east. If that could be arranged it would be very handy for us.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to say in reply to my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) that I recognize the very great inconvenience that has resulted to passenger traffic from the east to Montreal and Ottawa. This has not been the fault of the Intercolonial Railway. I have repeatedly called the attention of the Grand Trunk Railway authorities to the matter since I have been in office, and the invariable reply has been that in consequence of there being two lines interested, that is the Canada Atlantic Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, they could not make an arrangement such as we desired and for which we had asked, but I have the assurance not only of Mr. Wainwright, but also of Mr. Hays, that immediately on the acquisition of the Canada Atlantic Railway by the Grand Trunk Railway, which will occur, as I understand it, within a few weeks, if not within a few days, a train will leave Montreal at seven o'clock in the evening whereby passengers coming up by the Intercolonial Railway on the maritime express and reaching there at 5.30 will be enabled to reach Ottawa before ten o'clock at night, or at least not later than ten o'clock.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE (Montmagny). Mr. Speaker, whilst I have the opportunity, may I call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to the fact that there is a most serious inconvenience for people travelling from Ottawa on the Intercolonial Railway on Saturdays and Mondays? There is no maritime express.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a maritime express on Monday.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Coming up ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Going down.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. There is none on Monday coming up. A man who leaves Ottawa at the end of the week has to miss the sitting on Friday night if he wants to be home on Sunday or on Saturday evening, and if he wants to be here for the sitting on Monday he has to leave his home on Sunday night. I wonder if the hon. gentleman could afford any remedy for this most serious inconvenience suffered by people travelling to and from that part of Quebec.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. In addition to what my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) has just said, I would beg to remind my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) that last year I drew his attention to that fact. It is a great inconvenience to us in our district that we cannot have the ordinary express on Saturday to go down upon and on Monday to come up by. Every one suffers by this arrangement because we have either to leave one day sooner or come back one day later if we want to visit our homes. If a remedy could be provided it would be of very great service to us.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John city and county.) I recognize the fact that it is somewhat difficult to arrange a time-table to suit all the people along the line of the Intercolonial Railway, but yet I am satisfied from the representations that have been made to my colleague and myself from the city of St. John that there will be general dissatisfaction and general inconvenience by the change proposed by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson). Under the proposed change the first train going out will be, as the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has said, at six o'clock in the morning and there will be no other train going out from St. John after that until 11.40 a.m.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a freight train.

Mr. STOCKTON. Oh, a freight train ! People do not travel on freight trains.

Mr. EMMERSON. Between local points they do. It has passenger accommodation.

Mr. STOCKTON. We have got over the day of corduroy roads and freight trains. People travel by Pullman passenger cars in these days. These are growing times. It will be very inconvenient for the people of St. John and the travelling public generally and there will be another inconvenience. It is too early for the despatch of mails and of newspapers. They will close at five o'clock, an hour before the mail goes. The representations that have been made to my colleague and myself have pointed out very strongly that there will be very great inconvenience indeed. At all events I hope, having brought it to the notice of the hon. minister, that he will see if some change cannot be made. I recognize the fact that we ought to be economical in the running of the Intercolonial Railway, but

not too much so at the expense of the convenience of the travelling public generally and the people in our own community in whom I am more particularly interested.

NEW POST OFFICE AT TORONTO.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer to a matter of considerable importance to the city of Toronto; that is, the proposed erection of the new post office. I notice the absence of the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock). I understand that his absence will be somewhat prolonged, but notwithstanding that fact I think the city of Toronto is entitled to some answer from the government regarding the present condition of the burnt area where it is proposed to erect this new post office. That disastrous fire occurred in Toronto considerably over a year ago and there are still acres of the burnt district remaining in the same condition in which they were on the day after the fire. Nothing has been done there. Owners and lessees are greatly prejudiced by the inaction of the government regarding the selection of the post office site and also by the delay of the Railway Commission in stating whether or not the balance of the area is to be expropriated for station purposes. The matter has been called to my attention recently by an article in the 'Globe' of Monday last which states :

> The Dominion government will expropriate all or a portion of the property on Front street between Bay and Yonge streets for the new post office when the surveyors have decided just how much of the land will be required. Mayor Urquhart obtained this information from the Postmaster General during his visit to Ottawa.

No information of that nature has been given to the House or the country as far as I am aware and I would like to know if that statement is authentic. The article proceeds :

> Mr. Alexander Asher and a number of other lessees of the property complained to the mayor that the uncertainty as to what the government would do was seriously interfering with their plans.

I personally know that to be the case. Several industries have left the city of Toronto because of the inaction of the government and the uncertainty as to what is to be done regarding that burnt area. It comes under two headings: first, that portion of the area that would be required for post office purposes; and second, the balance of that area which is now under the consideration of the Railway Commission as to whether it shall be expropriated for station purposes. Information as to either or both of these matters would be gratefully received by the people of Toronto and particularly by those who are interested as owners or lessees of this land.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). So far as proceedings before the Railway Commission are concerned we are not in a position to give any information ; that will have to pursue the ordinary course before the commission, and of course we cannot say as to what the determination may be. With respect to the post office site I am aware that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Public Works have had some conferences on the subject, but I think no final decision has been come to. I would not like to say that the property in question is not to be taken, although officially I think the matter is not yet determined. That is under the consideration of the two ministers. It may be that the Minister of Public Works and the Postmaster General have had an understanding but in the absence of both ministers I would not like to give a more definite answer to my hon. friends' question.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The people of Toronto certainly think that the government should take some immediate action. The fact as to whether or not they are going to expropriate for post office purposes and the extent of the expropriation for that purpose should be decided on by the government at once. This is intimately connected with the other question as to the balance of the land which is now before the Railway Commission, and it is reasonable to ask that the government should help to advance the matter by deciding one way or another with reference to the post office site. We think that the government should do something and can do something to expedite the proceedings before the Railway Commission. The matter has been standing for many months and people are abandoning their property in that area and are actually removing their industries to other cities.

POST OFFICE REGULATIONS.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter which has been sent to postmasters by the post office inspector at Toronto, and which I think to a certain extent infringes upon the franking privilege of members of the House. The letter is as follows :

> Post Office Inspector's Office,
> Toronto, May, 18th, 1905.
>
> Dear Sir,—The department is informed that under date 20th April last a package of government publications addressed to you was posted from the House of Commons, the contents of which were apparently intended for distribution by you at your office, contrary to instructions contained in departmental circular of the 15th April last.
>
> Be so good as to let me know precisely what this package contained and what disposition was made of the contents by you.
>
> (Sgd.) J. HENDERSON,
> Post Office Inspector.

I may say that this package was sent out by me to a postmaster in the county of Dufferin and signed by my frank. In re-

ference to government publications such as the reports on agriculture and other reports which are of importance to the agricultural community but which are scarcely important enough to send in separate envelopes, it has been my practice and the practice of many other members of this House to have an understanding with the postmasters in the rural districts by which they would place these documents on the counters of their stores, so that the farmers coming to the post office could take copies if they desired. The postmasters were quite willing to do this, and it was a great convenience to the members of the House as well as to the agricultural community. The circular of the 15th of April referred to in the letter which I have read appears to have contained instructions that postmasters must not continue this practice. I made an effort to see this latter circular and I telephoned to the Deputy Postmaster General—the Postmaster General being absent—and he informed me that the circular being a departmental matter it could not be seen. For this reason I am unaware of its actual contents. We know that the corridors of this House are piled up with reports that involve too much work for the members to send out in separate envelopes, and it would seem to me that the practice to which I have referred of distributing them through the medium of the rural postmasters, is a practice that ought to be encouraged rather than prevented. At all events I am unable to see what right the inspector had to ask the postmaster to find out what was in the mail parcel that I forwarded from this House. I presume he may have been looking for such infringements as hon. gentlemen are said to have been guilty of in the past in sending out advertisements, &c., but there should be other ways of finding that out without violating the secrecy of the mails. It seems to me that this letter should not have been sent out by the post office inspector. I draw the attention of the government to the matter with the expectation that some explanation will be given. I may say that we do not hold the postmasters responsible for the distribution of mail matter sent in this way ; we merely send each postmaster a private letter asking him to place this departmental literature on the counter of his store if he has no objection, and I cannot see what harm there can be in that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry the Postmaster General is not in his seat to-day, but he is expected to-morrow or the day after when I shall make it my duty to call his attention to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Barr). I hope that at next sitting we will be able to give my hon. friend the information he asks ; I do not know whether he will be satisfied with it or not, but at all events he is entitled to it.

Mr. BARR.

CROW'S NEST PASS RAILWAY—PASSENGER RATES.

Mr. J. HERRON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to inform the right hon. Prime Minister that I have had several communications from gentlemen who reside in the district through which the Crow's Nest Pass Railway runs, complaining of the high passenger rates charged on that railway which I understand amount to four cents per mile. These gentlemen consider this rate very high and they have requested me to bring it to the attention of the government and to inquire if it is not one of those matters which might be brought before the Railway Commission for investigaion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a matter which ought to be referred to the Railway Commission. I do not think the government can have anything to do with it. I shall look into it and have it investigated by the Railway Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government has undoubtedly the right to interfere if it sees fit.

THE AUTONOMY BILL.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to mention what has already been discussed between the First Minister and myself and that is the date at which we shall take up the remaining clauses of the Autonomy Bill. I understand that, owing to the indisposition of the Minister of Justice we cannot take them up to-day nor before Tuesday or Wednesday of next week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some time next week.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend is not able to fix the exact date ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the subject was last discussed, I think the Minister of Justice informed us that the clauses would be taken up in the order suggested from this side. Is that the understanding of the right hon. gentleman, or will he give us an idea as to the order ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not considered that at all. If the Minister of Justice agreed upon any order, I have no objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My understanding was that he would consult the wishes of hon. gentlemen on this side and follow the order we suggested.

Mr. PATERSON. I think he said he would leave the schedules to the last.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, he desired to have the redistribution clauses left until the end ; but apart from that, he was willing to leave the order to us.

SUPREME COURT, NOVA SCOTIA—VACANT JUDGESHIP.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some time ago, when the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Justice were both here, I said I would bring up again the question of the continued delay in filling the vacancy upon the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. The answer I then received was of a very indefinite and unsatisfactory character, and I am bringing the matter up again, not for the purpose of discussing it, but for the purpose of stating that I would like more definite and satisfactory answers when the Minister of Justice and I are next in the House together. I reminded the right hon. gentleman in the first instance that there are now only six judges instead of seven, as required by law, upon the bench of the Supreme Court of the province, and that has been the condition since the month of February, 1904—nearly eighteen months ago. I do not wish to discuss the subject in the absence of the Minister of Justice, but I would like the right hon. gentleman or his colleague to be prepared to discuss that question just as soon as the Minister of Justice, whose indisposition I very much regret, is able again to take his seat in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question of my hon. friend is quite reasonable, and I shall make it my duty to accede to it. I am sorry that at this moment I cannot indicate at what time my hon. colleague will be able to resume his seat in the House. But if he finds himself unable to do so next week, the public business will not suffer, and we shall proceed in his absence. If by the middle of next week, he cannot be here, I shall ask my hon. friend to bring up this question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not urging that the Minister of Justice should come here before he is quite able to attend to business, but merely desired to bring to the right hon. gentleman's notice that this is a subject which in my opinion demands discussion and which I trust the government will be prepared to discuss at an early date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Port Hawkesbury wharf—additional amount, $700.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a balance due on the purchase of a wharf at Hawkesbury, N.S. The price was $2,950, legal expenses $250, total $3,200. We paid by cheque $2,500, leaving a balance of $700. The wharf was purchased from Mrs. Paint.

Mr. BERGERON. Is not $250 rather high for legal expenses ?

Mr. TAYLOR. Who was the legal gentleman who got that plum ?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give the name. It was for the legal expenses in connection with the transfer of the property, but there may be more in the item than is expressed here. All these items are passed upon by the Department of Justice and no doubt the charge is reasonable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The legal expenses in the case of an ordinary transfer of a piece of property would not amount to $250 or anything like it. For $25 to $50 would be about a reasonable charge. If the Minister of Finance will consult his hon. colleague, the Solicitor General, that hon. gentleman will tell him what would be a fair charge.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Ordinarily the amount might appear rather large; but it happens sometimes that there are many negotiations in connection with the sale and transfer of property. Lately we had a transaction in Montreal in which it appeared at first sight that the amount for the transfer was large, but we found that we had to take proceedings through our agent, which increased the expense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In very special circumstances the cost might be easily run up to $1,000 ; but I am speaking of an ordinary transfer of property where you examine a title and prepare a conveyance. From $25 to $50 would be ample for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Why cannot the account be brought down ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no objection to that.

Mr. FIELDING. I will undertake to see that the account will be brought down when the main estimates for Nova Scotia are under consideration.

Fort Lawrence landing pier—to complete payments, $2,800.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to complete payments to contractors for the construction of the pier. It is built in Cumberland basin at the head of the Bay of Fundy. The main object of the construction of the pier is to afford accommodation to the thriving town of Amherst.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What depth of water do you get ?

Mr. FIELDING. At low water about 17 feet. It is a place of high tides.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the amount of the whole thing ?

Mr. FIELDING. The contract, cost of superintendence, &c., amounted to $16,-541.25. This vote will finish the work.

L'Ardoise—extension of breakwater up to shore, $750.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a small balance remaining to close up the transaction. The contract, inspection, contingencies, &c., amounted to $26,350. This completes the work.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, all of these are to complete works for which money was voted before ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, in most of these cases ; but there may be some works still going on which may require future appropriations.

Quebec—Rivière du Lièvre—reconstruction of dam at Little Rapids, $3,800.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a balance necessary to complete a dam. Hon. gentlemen familiar with works of this character know that unless you finish the work you may lose all that has been done.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the whole amount ?

Mr. FIELDING. $20,000 has already been expended, and this balance completes the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it done by contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I am informed that it was a class of work that could not well be done by contract.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What are the conditions under which the Dominion government build dams across rivers? I would like to know their general policy in that regard. In our section the party that wants a dam builds it.

Mr. FIELDING. This was a Dominion work for the improvement of navigation, constructed some years ago at a time when there was a prospect of considerable trade in that region. The work having been constructed as a Dominion work, when disaster came to it, it was necessary for the Dominion to restore it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What interest had the Dominion in it ?

Mr. FIELDING. The interests of navigation.

Mr. BERGERON. What navigation is there on that river ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is practically a small canal. There is a lock there. The work was built as far back as 1886.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. minister has not given us the principle on which this kind of work is done on the different rivers. There ought to be some principle governing such works. When the government takes the responsibility of damming a river in one locality, I can see no reason why it should not do the same in an another, unless there be some particular reason for the first work.

Mr. FIELDING. I might have some difficulty in explaining our own principles, but would have much more difficulty in explaining the principles of my predecessor in 1886, by whom this work was constructed. But hon. gentlemen will admit that when the Dominion has spent much money in constructing a public work and then it is damaged, the Dominion should repair it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am not talking of this particular work, but generally.

Mr. FIELDING. We are not voting works generally, but this particular one.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think that is at all satisfactory. When public works are carried on by the government, there ought to be some general principle on which they proceed, and the government ought to be able to explain it.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the improvement of a river in the interests of navigation would be a wise expenditure ; and while I am not personally acquainted with the work in question, no doubt my predecessor in the late Conservative government believed it would assist trade and commerce in that neighbourhood.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am glad to see the confidence which the hon. gentleman has in his predecessor.

Mr. FIELDING. Even if my predecessor put up a work of debatable propriety, we would be expected, when that work is damaged, to repair it. We might have some doubt as to the wisdom of building the Langevin block, but if we found the roof leaking we would consider ourselves bound to repair it.

Mr. BLAIN. Does this work serve any good purpose ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was originally constructed because of the probability of considerable traffic in connection with the phosphate trade. At present there is very considerable lumber traffic on that river, there are no railways in its vicinity, there is a considerable settlement in its neighbourhood, and this is the only means the people have of getting access to the market.

Mr. BERGERON. No doubt many lumbermen use the river for bringing down logs, do they pay anything to the government ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are no rates charged for the passing of logs, but the use of the lock has been subject to rates.

Mr. BERGERON. The policy of the government in the old days was to help to dam rivers, but they made the lumbermen pay tolls sufficient to cover the interest on the expenditure and the cost of keeping the dams.

Mr. FIELDING. There are slides and dams from which we still get revenue, but this does not come under the same head.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been money expended every year for some years on that work.

Mr. FIELDING. There has been some expended on its maintenance.

Sorel, Quebec—Ice piers in River St. Lawrence on west side of mouth of River Richelieu—re-vote of $750 lapsed, $3,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The vote of $3,000 in the first instance was insufficient and it was represented that unless further work was ordered the repairs would be carried away by the pressure. This vote of $3,000 makes the whole amount $6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Has not part of it been carried off by the ice already ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not this season but there was danger of that happening.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When was the original estimate made ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was made before this flood occurred. It was made in the latter part of 1903 for the year 1904-5.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is rather strange that the engineer should not have recognized the possibility of such a thing happening and made his estimates one-half what it should have been.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend has ever undertaken to repair an old house, he must know how difficult it is to estimate the work to be done. As soon as you begin repairing it, you find that other repairs, not originally foreseen, have to be made.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this an old job ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not say an old job but an old work.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the line of demarcation between the Department of Public Works and the Department of Marine in some of these items ? The shops at Sorel are in the Marine Department and also a part of the channel, is there not danger of a conflict of jurisdiction ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think an understanding was come to on that point. The shops at Sorel are connected chiefly with the dredging of the ship channel, which is under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. These piers and breakwater have always been under the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. In Sorel they are also building a beautiful dredge called the 'W. S. Fielding' for the maritime provinces, which has nothing at all to do with the ship channel.

Mr. FIELDING. The shops were originally established for the ship channel; but if they have facilities for work of that character, there is no reason why they should not employ men doing work for any part of the Dominion. The dredge is being built for the Department of Public Works, and will be transferred to it and operated in the same way as other dredges in the maritime provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. The fact is that the government have been changing their minds too often. Those works were put up at Sorel by the ex-Minister of Public Works, Mr. Tarte. His object was to build dredges which would be used all over the Dominion. It is only since his departure and the advent of the present Minister of Marine, that there has been a change, and the government have since followed a different policy altogether. That is why this government are continuing the work of building dredges there for the maritime provinces. We would have avoided a good deal of the discussion we had the other day concerning dredges in Fort William and Port Arthur, if we had dredges of our own and had not to hire dredges. It was to avoid having to hire dredges that the ex-Minister of Public Works wanted to build them for the government. And his theory was that the government could, by using their own dredges, have the dredging done for three or four cents per yard instead of forty cents which they have to pay when they hire other dredges. There seems to be a scarcity of dredges in the country or if there are any dredges they are in the hands of the government and it is no use for any one else to tender. It was to avoid that, as I remember the explanation given by Mr. Tarte in this House, that he wanted to build dredges belonging to the government that could do the work for which we pay 40 cents or 50 cents for 3 cents or 4 cents. It was accepted at that time by the government as good policy, but now it has been abandoned and that is why we are informed that the shops at Sorel are to build dredges only for the ship channel.

River Maskinonge—dredging, $3,800.

Mr. BARR. Does the government own this dredge ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, this is being done by a private dredge owned by Mr. St. Pierre. This dredge was employed at $7 per hour, the rate established some years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. Have they lots of work to do there yet ?

Mr. FIELDING. This I understand, closes up the contract for the arrangement, it was not a contract, with this gentleman and tenders are being taken for the work on the basis of so much a yard.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it navigable ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I am so informed.

Mr. BARR. Is it cheaper to give so much per yard or to pay $7 an hour ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is always a matter of debate in the House. The department is no longer following the system of hiring dredges by the hour, but are fixing a price per cubic yard.

Mr. BARR. It is to be hoped that is the case, because it is a well known fact that some of these dredges in Ontario are making $700 a day.

Mr. LALOR. I am glad to hear the department are going to drop the system of hiring dredges by the hour, that is if they have a proper system of measuring the number of yards of earth taken out. I know that from an experience that took place in my own country where a dredge was hired during 1903-4. One stipulation was that the dredge was to take out at least 1,000 yards of earth for 12 hours so that the dredge when it took out 1,000 yards stopped its work for the day, although it is a notorious fact that it could take out 3,000 yards as easily as 1,000. It seems to me to be ridiculous to hire a dredge stipulating to take out 1,000 yards knowing that that same dredge has a capacity of three times that amount per day.

Mr. FIELDING. The officers inform me it is the practice of the department in hiring by the hour to stipulate that the dredges shall take out a certain quantity a day, and if they take out that quantity they presume their day's work is ended.

Mr. LALOR. I have affidavits in my possession, and I shall probably take up the matter again, showing that in the case of a dredge employed in the Grand river at Dunnville, the contract with the government stipulated that it should take out 1,000 yards a day, and I have affidavits that the captain informed the men on the dredge and the tug men to take it easy and not hurry, because all they had to do was to take out 1,000 yards, whereas it is a notorious fact that the dredge has taken out 1,000 yards before noon and done nothing more for the rest of the day. I think the payment should be regulated by the kind of dredging and where they can take out more than 1,000 yards, I cannot see why it should be stopped at a thousand.

Mr. FIELDING. In such a case I suppose we would have to pay a larger rate per hour, but if the contract stipulated that they should perform 1,000 yards of dredging a day and the dredge did that amount I suppose we could hardly expect the dredging contractor to do a lot more work for nothing. Whether or not $7 an hour is a fair price is another matter. The contract only called for 1,000 yards a day. There is nothing wrong then in the dredge only doing 1,000 yards a day.

Mr. LALOR. I do not quite agree with the minister. As I stated there are different kinds of dredging. Where the excavating is easy and the dredge is being paid $12 an hour and they can take out 3,000 in place of 1,000 I do not see why they should not be compelled to work for the 12 hours at their full capacity and take out as much as possible. I do not see why they should be allowed to drag the job along week after week, when they could by working at their full capacity do it in one-third the time.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do I understand they pay for the $12 ?

Mr. LALOR. Yes.

Mr. STOCKTON. And they stop when the 1,000 yards is done ? I would think that is very poor business management. I could readily understand that an arrangement might be made so that a dredge should take out at least so much per day, but to say that a dredge is to be hired at so much an hour for 12 hours and be paid for 12 hours even if it works only half that time, seems to me is not very good business management.

Mr. FIELDING. The limitation being placed on the contract that he must do so much per day, when he has done that quantity of work he has complied with his contract. The price per hour was estimated on the basis of producing a certain result per cubic yard. It may be a fair price and if you take out the agreed quantity it gives a fair value for the day's work. Whether it is wise to go on and pay a great deal more with a view of hastening the work is another question. There is something in that, but if the stipulation was that the dredge was to work 12 hours and in that time to excavate 1,000 yards for which it should be paid at the rate of $7 an hour, then the excavation of the 1,000 yards would comply with the contract. The only criticism would be that in the case where the dredge was able to do more work she should be allowed to do more and be paid accordingly.

Mr. STOCKTON. The difficulty I see is that if you have a dredge by the hour and you have an inspector to see that the dredge is not loafing and you put in a stipulation that you are to pay them by the hour for 12 hours a day if they take out a certain quantity, although they may do it in 2 hours they are paid for the 12 hours.

Mr. FIELDING. Does not my hon. friend see that if there was no such regulation the dredge might put in the time loafing and take out much less ? The stipulation of 1,000 yards is in the public interest, that they should at all events give a fair day's work. The only possible room for criticism is that the dredge might have been able to do more work and should be allowed to get more pay.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does not the minister see that is the minimum amount of dredg-

ing to be done under the most disadvantageous circumstances and they must do that under any circumstances. That would be a reasonable business proposition it seems to me. But, to say that after they have taken out a certan quantity, payment goes on whether they work or not, does not seem to me to be a good arrangement to make with the owners of the dredges.

Mr. FIELDING. The method of dealing with these matters is changed now, so that in discussing this we are discussing a matter of the past. But I cannot see that if the quantity stipulated has been taken out, the sum stipulated should not be paid. My own observation is that men working either for the government or for private employers are not disposed to do more than they are paid for.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then it seems to me that the better plan would be to pay so much per cubic yard.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what is being done.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There is another point. Every one knows that the quantity of material a dredge can take out depends upon the character of that material. I understand that the limit fixed is simply the minimum quantity that they are to take out, whatever the character of the material. But to say that because they happen to have easy work they should stop when they have taken out the quantity fixed as a minimum is an entire misconstruction of the understanding.

Mr. LALOR. If I understand it correctly, the dredge is paid according to her capacity —the more work she can do the higher the pay. To say that a dredge could get $12 per hour is all right. But that should mean that in the hardest kind of dredging they could encounter they should be able to take out at least 1,000 yards. What I cannot understand is fixing the minimum at 1,000 yards where the material is such that the dredge could do three times that amount. The dredge is hired to work for twelve hours a day, and she should work to her capacity for twelve hours under proper inspection to earn a day's pay, regardless of how great a quantity she takes out.

Mr. FIELDING. As the system now adopted is to pay by the cubic yard, we are really discussing a past transaction. But if the quantity taken out is fixed at 1,000 yards, the price might be satisfactory ; but, on that basis, if the dredge were obliged to take out more, the price would not be satisfactory. This was practically a system of piece work, and the sum paid per hour was the result of a calculation of a certain number of cents per cubic yard, which was regarded as a fair price for the work. That being the case, if a dredge took up more, her owners would expect to be paid accordingly. It all comes to a question of what is a fair price for removing the material.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. minister does not intend to say that for all kinds of dredging the dredge will do the same amount of work ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This minimum was fixed, as I understand it, on the basis of the hardest digging—the dredge must not do less, but if the material were favourable it might do more.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed by the officers of the department that this minimum did not contemplate the hardest kind of digging, but ordinary digging. But this has been done away with. The system adopted is that of paying by the cubic yard, which is a better system.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the same price apply to all ? I see that the price paid in Ontario is $8 per hour.

Mr. FIELDING. The price varies according to the capacity of the dredge.

Mr. BLAIN. There seems to be quite a uniformity of price all over Canada. Am I to understand that it runs from $7 to $12 an hour ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes ; that is correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is on the basis of 1,000 yards ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; the value of the dredge would depend upon her capacity.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the limit where you pay $7 or $8 ?

Mr. FIELDING. The quality was not the same for all dredges. It was based upon a fair price per cubic yard.

Mr. STOCKTON. That is, the maximum would be 1,000 yards a day, no matter how long it took to move the earth. In the report of the Minister of Public Works dealing with the different dredges, I find that the minister gives the cost per cubic yard as 5½ cents, 4 cents and as low as 3 cents per cubic yard. This dredge was given $84 per day when the contract could probably have been made for $40 or $50 based upon the amount of work.

Mr. FIELDING. No ; the very favourable rates the hon. gentleman quotes are those of the powerful dredges of the government. But ordinary dredges do not do the work at that price. It all shows the wisdom of getting more government dredges.

Mr. LALOR. That is the proper policy for this government—to build its own dredges. I understand that Hon. Mr. Tarte, when Minister of Public Works, stated that the work could be done with government

dredges for from 3 cents to 4 cents per cubic yard. I cannot understand, then, why Mr. Conmee, Mr. Boone, Mr. Bowman and others should get these enormous prices when the government, with their command of capital, can build dredges that will do the work so much cheaper.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree that the construction of government dredges is the best policy, and the hon. gentleman will see that the government is making progress along that line. As to the maritime provinces, I shall be very glad to find some one there with dredges, no matter what his politics, to do the work waiting to be done. My hon. friends from Ontario are fortunate in having private dredges that can do the work. When we try to get dredges for work in the maritime provinces we are told that the dredges are busy and we cannot have them.

Mr. LALOR. If the minister will not regard politics, but will give contracts in the maritime provinces on the same basis as these contracts are given to Mr. Conmee and Mr. Bowman and some others, I do not doubt that we can quickly form a company to build a dredge and take a contract. But we will want assurance that we shall not be required to change our politics to get fair-play.

Mr. FIELDING. I will promise my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) that if he will tender for a contract in the maritime provinces any where that comes within what I may call my sphere of influence, the lowest tenderer will get the contract no matter what his politics.

Mr. LALOR. But if there were any chance of some of us tendering, I suppose the hon. minister would insert the advertisement on Saturday and provide that tenders were to be in on Monday morning.

Mr. FIELDING. No; we will give you a fair chance.

Public Works—chargeable to income—River Chateauguay — dredging, revote of lapsed amount, $1,850.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is doing that work?

Mr. FIELDING. The Canadian Construction Company. This is work in Chateauguay basin, in the mouth of the Chateauguay river. This is money that was designed to be spent on that work, but they were not able to spend it in 1903-4. This is needed to complete the contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that dredge working by the hour or by the yard?

Mr. FIELDING. This dredge was at that time working by the hour. There is no work going on now at all. The work is done. The work upon which she has been engaged is stopped and tenders are being called for further work of the same class.

Mr. BERGERON. I want to call the attention of the hon. Acting Minister of Public Works to this work. I do not object at all to this work; in fact, if I remember well I asked for the work some years ago. But, the money that is being spent there to-day is being uselessly spent. The engineer, I am sure, will bear me out when I say that they are working in what is called quicksand. They have been working there for the last fifteen or sixteen years and the channel is filling up all the time. I have seen the dredge there myself very often and I have no doubt they will have to keep up the same work every year and with no good result. The pilot on one of the boats that passes there told me that in order to establish a permanent work which would stand for a long time, it would be necessary to construct crib-work to protect the channel and keep the sand from filling in. That has been done at Ste. Anne's for the same purpose, the material there being quicksand. It may cost a little more at the outset but the work would be of a permanent character. The department are spending $5,000 or $6,000 a year in dredging the river Chateauguay and no good result is being accomplished. The work will have to be done year after year because the channel will fill up, on account of the nature of the material. I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Finance, who is the custodian of our money, to the condition of this work and I also call the attention of the department to it. I am sure the engineer must know that part of the river. He was there himself years ago and he knows that what I am speaking of should be done if he wants to put a stop to the expense, which is not objectionable in itself, but which is not producing the desired result on account of the unwise policy which has been pursued in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend has been misinformed and that he is confusing some other class of work with this, because I find by the memorandum which has been supplied to me that this dredging is described as being for the purpose of removing hard-pan, boulders and clay.

Mr. BERGERON. There are two places where they have been working. One of these is in the River Chateauguay where they have taken away stones. The other place that I am talking of is at the mouth of the River Chateauguay or just above the river where a channel is being made for boats coming from the lake into the river.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend will probably find on inquiry that he is mistaken, and that there is no work being done at the place he indicates. This work is for the removal of hard-pan, boulders and clay. There is sand in the river but these operations are not in the sand district at all.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year there was a dredge at the mouth of the river working

in the sand and there was another one down the river. They have been working at three or four places in the river.

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that the sand is not at the mouth of the river.

Mr. BERGERON. Well it is. I am very sorry that the engineer does not remember. There is a sand bank at the head of the River Chateauguay. Steamers passing there have to go around nearly a mile to avoid that bank. The government years ago commenced work in the channel. They have been working at that since. They were working at that last summer. I have seen the dredge at work there. It is that gap that is filling up all the time.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no question that the dredge has been working during the past season at the mouth of the river, not at the head of the river. I am told that the sand to which my hon. friend refers is not at this point.

Mr. BERGERON. It is at two places.

Mr. FIELDING. There has been work done at both places undoubtedly, but the work to which this appropriation refers was not in the sand but in the harder material at the mouth of the river.

Mr. BERGERON. That may be, because they were working at the lower end of the river and they were working also at the entrance to the river or above Nun's Island. Whether this amount of money is specially for that work or not I want to call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that in order to make a good work at the entrance to the river it should be done in a different way from that in which it is being carried out now.

Doucet's Landing—dredging, $8,000.

Mr. BARR. Is this done by tender or in what way ? It is a very large item.

Mr. FIELDING. This was done by the old system of per hour.

Mr. BLAIN. What is this ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is in the county of Nicolet. It is opposite Three Rivers. It is the terminus of the Grand Trunk branch line from Athabaska to Doucet's Landing and there are two boats plying between Three Rivers and Doucet's Landing. It is a very important terminus ; in fact it is the only important connection between the north and south shores at that point.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount of money voted last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. $12,000 was appropriated in the estimates for the current year. That has all been expended and this further sum is needed.

Mr. BERGERON. That will make $20,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the capacity of the dredge there ?

Mr. FIELDING. The cost of removing the material is 13 8-10 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that there is so much difference between the appropriation and the actual amount ? You have $12,000 and $8,000, making altogether $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, they found that the amount was insufficient to make the work effective and they require to make a further expenditure. This is practically a portion of the harbour of Three Rivers.

Mr. BERGERON. No, it is on the other side from Three Rivers.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it is the approach to the harbour of Three Rivers and it has proved of great value to the commerce of Three Rivers.

Mr. BERGERON. It is on the south side of the river. When a department comes to council and asks for some money is the hon. Minister of Finance not anxious to know why these appropriations should not be made in a better way than that ? Who makes the valuation of such a work ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is made by the engineers of the Public Works Department.

Mr. BERGERON. They make a valuation at $12,000 and spend $20,000. That should strike the mind of my hon. friend when the department come to him for money and when he comes to parliament and asks for a vote.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was told by the owner of the dredges which worked there last year that the bottom of the river is very sandy, and that the new harbour work at Three Rivers had caused the sand to silt over on to the other side. The river is narrow there and there are battures. The people were threatened by the navigation company that if the work was not done the boat service would cease.

Mr. AMES. The proposal is to excavate 800 feet in length and 400 feet in width. How much of that work has been done and how much is there to complete ?

Mr. FIELDING. The quantity already removed as covered by this appropriation is 144,456 cubic yards and about 100,000 yards remain to be done.

Mr. AMES. Then, about two-fifths of the work has been done at an expense of about $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not a contract for any specific amount of work.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand that new tenders are to be called for the balance of the work ?

Mr. FIELDING. Tenders have been called for the dredging.

Mr. BERGERON. Under the old arrangement $20,000 were expended and now you propose to continue the same work ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. At what cost ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are $15,000 in the main estimates for the coming year.

Mr. BERGERON. Have tenders been received ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but the contract has not yet been awarded.

Mr. BERGERON. When you have expended this $35,000 in all, will the sand continue to silt in there and will you have to renew the dredging every year ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is expected that the work will be good in the main.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the sand not continue to drift over from the Three Rivers side ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. According to the report prepared by the resident engineer at my request that will be provided against. The plan is to deepen the channel for the boats that ply between Three Rivers and Doucet's Landing, and they will build a wharf on the south east of the existing wharf which is the property of the Grand Trunk and which at present is in a complete state of decay.

River St. Maurice—dredging, $11,200.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation taken for this work was only $6,000, but strong pressure was brought to make provision for more expensive work and an additional appropriation is being asked. Considering that the appropriation was only $6,000 originally the additional sum is out of reasonable proportion, but the department informs me that the reasons were very urgent and the public opinion in the district pressed the department to do a larger amount of work.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that river navigable at that point ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are very large saw mill operations going on there.

Mr. BERGERON. Do the lumbermen contribute anything to this work ?

Mr. FIELDING. The lumbermen pay fees on slides and booms which are a considerable source of revenue.

Mr. BERGERON. That is another matter altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. Dredging and work of that character would not be done by the lumbermen.

Mr. LEMIEUX. During the last five years two large lumber companies have established themselves at the mouth of the river and employ about 1,000 people.

Mr. BERGERON. I am merely asking for information as to why this money should be voted, and the statement of my hon. friend leads me to believe that the river there is navigated by tugs and barges carrying pulp wood.

Mr. BLAIN. This river has been on the pay roll for many years ; are we to continue year after year dredging it out ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is one of the three largest rivers in the Dominion and it is the river par excellence of the lumber trade in the province of Quebec. Within the last few years large limits have been sold by the Quebec government and several American firms have established themselves there.

Montmorency—wharf improvements, $2,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this a new work ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a new work, and this balance of $2,500 will finish it.

Mr. BERGERON. It is described here as improving a wharf ; if it is a new wharf what do you want improving it for ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed there was an old wharf there, but this is practically a new work.

Mr. BERGERON. There were a great many promises made there last election ; are you redeeming your promises now ?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend mean in the county of Montmorency ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes, Sir.

Mr. FIELDING. But this is in the county of Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. Be that as it may, I know that last October a great many of these public works were promised to the electors of Montmorency, and more than that $6,000 was spent during the election to macadamize some roads leading to wharfs. Perhaps this work was done in advance, and you are now making provision to pay for it. I ask that as a matter of information, to make sure that the men who were promised these works shall get them. It may be that my hon. friend should be complimented for fulfilling the promises made during the elections, though they caused the defeat of a good man.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This place is in the county of Quebec, not in Montmorency. It is between Chateau Richard and Beauport.

Mr. MORIN. It must be at the Falls, and I do not think there is any need of a wharf there.

Mr. FIELDING. It is near the Falls, and the word 'Falls' should be inserted.

Mr. BLAIN. What will the total cost of this work be ?

Mr. FIELDING. About $12,300.

Mr. BLAIN. Will it be completed this year ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was the work let by tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was done during election time by day labour.

Mr. FIELDING. There was no election in the summer, when this was done.

Mr. BLAIN. How is it that the government are departing from the policy they are supposed to have of letting these works by tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. This was done by day labour for reasons which the department felt were good.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the committee are entitled to know what those reasons were.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may inform my hon. friend that in my experience in the county of Gaspé many wharfs and breakwaters have been built in recent years by day's work at much less than they were tendered for. Although the government have adopted the policy of giving contracts where the amount exceeds $5,000, yet nothing prevents the department from proceeding by day's work. In the present instance, they proceeded by day's work before this law was passed. I can cite cases in the county of Gaspé where the amount estimated by the department was doubled and trebled when tenders were called for, and they had to revert to day's work.

Mr. BLAIN. Surely some one would be responsible for that. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that after an engineer has made an estimate and the department has then received tenders, they doubled and trebled the estimate ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and the department in those cases have refused to give the contract.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In cases where they have refused to give a contract and have done the work by day's work, has it cost less or more than the estimate made by the engineer ? A competent engineer ought to know pretty nearly what a work will cost.

Mr. LEMIEUX. To my knowledge the cost by day's work has not exceeded the estimate of the engineer, while in some cases work done by contract has exceeded the estimate.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Do I understand that the cost of work done by day's work has come within the estimate of the engineer, while in many cases the tenders have been away above the estimate ? That seems extraordinary.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It has happened many a time.

Mr. FIELDING. That may be accounted for by the works not having been sufficiently advertised. If you have allowed only a few days, anticipating that certain men would tender, they might easily go away above the estimate, hoping to get the work without competition ; but in ordinary cases, I do not think there would be that difference.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could cite cases in the county of Gaspé. As to the notices of tenders, my hon. friend may find them every day in the papers, and he will see that some thirty days are allowed.

Mr. BERGERON. The examples given by my hon. friend from Nicolet cannot be got everywhere. The county of Gaspé is far away, and the contractors cannot very well take their plant down there. The case under discussion is near Quebec, and the circumstances are quite different. It seems to me that when we have a law on this point, the government should observe it, and that every work costing over $5,000 should be done by contract. I have seen a good many works done by the day, and they are always very costly ; and it seems to me that it would be a great deal better for the government to observe the law. This $2,500 we are now voting has been spent and the amount in the main estimates to be voted is $6,000, so the total will be nearly $9,000.

Mr. FIELDING. $12,300.

Mr. BERGERON. That is another reason why the work should be given by tender. It is near the city of Quebec and there are contractors in Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are very busy now.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What was the saving effected between the amount of the lowest tender and the actual cost ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let me give an example to my hon. friend. Last year we called for tenders to build a breakwater in Malbaie in the county of Gaspé. There were five or six tenders, the lowest of which was $40,000, while the estimate of the chief engineer was only $20,000. The minister did not feel justified in giving the contract to the lowest tenderer, so the work was started by day labour and the resident engineer says he will be able to keep within the chief engineer's estimate. I could give many other examples, speaking of my own county. No doubt the contractors are afraid of the distance and the cost of transport of the plant and men, and that is why they

raise their prices; but it has been the invariable experience I have had in connection with those works in my county, that the system of doing the work by day labour, without contract, is the cheaper.

Mr. MORIN. Will the hon. minister tell us why Conservatives are never employed on these works? This system of having the government work done without contract is but another way of evading the election law, because they employ nobody but Grits.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can tell my hon. friend that whenever work is done in the county of Gaspé the resident engineer appoints a local inspector, and I have invariably told the local inspector to employ both parties because it is public expenditure and both parties should be given work.

Mr. LALOR. Let me draw attention to the condition of affairs in my county. We have there a Welland canal feeder, and the men who work on it are not engaged by either the superintendent or the deputy superintendent of the canal. If a labouring man wants employment on any government work there, he must run the gauntlet of the Liberal Association. His name is brought before the association; and if acceptable, he is given an order on the deputy superintendent, which entitles him to be employed. Recently a most respectable man, who had been working on the Welland canal feeder for the last 25 years, and who has raised a fine family very much respected in the community, was suspected of having voted for me at the last election, and consequently, when the work was opened as usual, was refused employment. A friend of his called the attention of the president of the Liberal Association to the fact, and the reply was: He voted for Lalor; he had better go to Lalor to get work. That man has not got one hours' work in Dunnville this year simply because he is suspected of having voted for me. It is most disgraceful that a labouring man should not be able to get work at $1.25 a day shovelling stone or earth for the government without having to run the gauntlet of the Liberal Association or committee and getting its approval. I am a large employer of labour. I have a number of factories and other institutions where I employ labour to a large extent, but there never was a time when I would stoop to compel an ordinary working man to vote for me in order that he might get work. We have, however, the government setting this example to the employers of labour and inducing them to take means to make the labouring man vote their ticket. That is certainly a disgraceful state of affairs. It is all very well to use political influence, but it is disgraceful, on the part of any government to stoop so low as to compel labouring men to vote for it in order that they may obtain work.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. minister has stated that this work is going to cost $11,000 when finished. He asked $3,000 in the main estimates last year, this supplementary vote of $2,500 is to complete last year's work, and he will ask $6,000 next year. What does he propose to do with the Act respecting Public Works?

Mr. FIELDING. The Act will have to be obeyed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It has been the law since 1886 that any new work involving an expenditure exceeding $5,000 can only be let after calling for tenders.

Mr. FIELDING. When the appropriation was taken, there was only to be an expenditure of $4,000 so that that work would not come within the rule.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend knew before starting the work that it was going to cost more than $4,000, because he has already spent more than $5,500 this year.

Mr. FIELDING. There was an estimate originally for the work, but when this appropriation was taken the department could only make its contract for the $4,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is not the way. Hon. gentlemen come down here with an estimate say to start a post office, to buy a site, get the plans and let the tenders and get say $4,000 to pay during the first year no matter whether the cost is to be $30,000 or $50,000.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the usual practice.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why was it not carried out here? There was evidently a job as my hon. friend beside me suggests; a lot of promises were made and they were carried out at election time and this $2,500 is to pay a balance not provided for.

Mr. FIELDING. It is nice to have my hon. friend say that promises were carried out. Generally the complaint is the other way. As to why the minister of the day did not treat this as a matter of contract, I cannot definitely answer, but this I can say that the engineers assure me the work performed has been well done and we have fair value for the money. There is no job, no extravagance and we have good value for the money.

Mr. PERLEY. I wish to say a word in support of what my hon. friend from Haldimand has said with regard to men employed by the government. I certainly think that if there is a vacant position of any great value it is only right and fair that the government should appoint a man with the same leanings as they have. That is a reasonable thing provided he is a good man. I take no exception to that what-

ever, but I certainly do not think that the ordinary labouring man should be employed or not employed by the government according to his political leanings. It seems to me that if we are going to have a free country here, men should be allowed to exercise their franchise as they see fit, and as long as they do not take an active part in politics and make themselves offensive, government employees should be allowed to vote as they like and that they should not be asked to which side they belong before they are employed for a day's work. Like the hon. member for Haldimand I am a large employer of labour myself, and I have never yet nor will I ask a man his politics before I employ him. It is a most unfair, unreasonable and unjust question to put to any man. I have here an affidavit which I shall read to the House :

Province of Quebec, County of Argentuil.

I, Hilaire Robillard, of the village of Carillon, in the electoral district of Argenteuil, do solemnly declare that for some time before, and up to the second day of November last, I had been in the employ of the federal government in charge of a gang of men working on a pier being built in the Ottawa river in the vicinity of the village of Carillon. On the day before polling, in November last, I was informed by Mr. Girard, who was supervising the construction of said pier, that my services were no longer required, no reason being assigned for such action, and I was replaced by another workman. Some time previous to my dismissal I was told by Mr. Girard that any person working for the government would be expected to vote for the party in power. I was at that time and am still a parliamentary elector, and I attended two political meetings in Carillon before the election. My political sympathies were suspected, as I did not give the assurances expected of me, and I heard divers rumours that I was going to be dismissed on account of my politics, or for political reasons. Beyond exercising my electoral franchise I took no part, nor did I participate in said election. Although I am a poor and illiterate man, I always understood that Canada was a free country, and did not exist in the exclusive interest of any political party. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing it to be of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

H. ROBILLARD.

Declared before me at the village of Carillon this 14th day of March, A.D. 1905.

D. MURPHY,
Justice of the Peace.

I think it is only fair and reasonable, as I said before, when there is a vacant postmastership or office of any kind in the Department of Public Works or of Railways and Canals that a person of the political stripe of the government in power should be employed, but beyond that it seems to me to be wrong for the government to go, and most unfair. I do not know which department this was in, Public Works or Railways and Canals, but it does not matter. This question has come up before and it seems to me a very important one. I certainly would like to get some assurance from the government that they do not expect or will not allow their officers to bring pressure on the ordinary servants and employees of the government to vote for the party in power as if the power in power were entitled to their votes simply because the government give them work.

Mr. FIELDING. I believe that the matters referred to both by my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) and my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) belong to the Department of Railways and Canals, and I have no desire to discuss the affairs of that department, but so far as the principles involved are concerned I have no hesitation in giving my opinion at once. I notice that this poor illiterate man has made somewhat of a political document of his affidavit and it strikes me if the man himself had no interest in politics somebody who framed the affidavit for him had a good deal of interest, because a poor illiterate man of his own motion would not make such an affidavit as that. If the affidavit says that any man, high or low, in the service of the government was dismissed from his labour because he exercised his franchise freely and independently, I do not hesitate to say that is wrong. Any attempt to interfere with the free exercise of the franchise by any officer or servant, I would condemn as strongly as my hon. friends. I would not encourage the idea of a Dominion official taking an active part in politics. If he takes no active part but exercises his franchise I say that whether he occupies the position of lieutenant governor or labourer, that is his right and should not be interfered with, and if any man was dismissed because of his vote, that I would condemn, but I would like to have the facts more clearly investigated. As to the general principle so long as we have the principle of party government in Canada, I fancy we will have the same discussion as we have had to-day. The party system seems to have its advantages and its disadvantages, but on the whole it seems to be the best way of working out constitutional government in the British empire. We must take the good and the evil together and one of the evils is that this question of political partisanship always comes up. Just how my hon. friend would draw the distinction between labouring men and men in higher ranks I do not understand. Are we to be told that a man who aspires to a high office can say : 'I am your friend, I have helped you, and I think when a vacancy occurs I should be considered.' But the poor labouring man who uses such an argument is told it is all wrong. If it is legitimate for a man who wants to be a judge or an engineer or to occupy any higher position to come and say : 'I have helped your party in an honourable way, I have supported you and as-

sisted you and want to be considered,' why should not that argument be equally good for the poor labouring man ? I cannot see any difference, such as my hon. friend would urge. I have no doubt hundreds of thousands of Conservatives have been employed all over the country on various public works. In my own province I know cases that have come within my own observation where the work was given indiscriminately. I would not desire otherwise, but if a choice is made, if there is to be a preference of A to B what ground of complaint is there so long as A is competent to do a good day's work ? Why should there not be as much liberty to give a preference to a poor labouring man as to a lawyer who wants to be a judge ? I cannot see the distinction. All the interest the public has is to see that a man is not dismissed for the free exercise of the franchise, and that no man is told he cannot vote one way or the other in order to hold his place, and lastly that the work is well done at a fair day's wage. What other interest have the public in the matter ? I cannot see any ground for my hon. friend's grievances.

Mr. PERLEY. It seems to me that most of the minister's remarks do not apply to the question under discussion. This man was in the employ of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I accept that. If he was dismissed on account of his vote, I say it was wrong.

Mr. PERLEY. But the minister will know how hard it is to prove a thing of that kind. It is a matter of common report in that section that not only this man, but six or seven others, were dismissed for that reason ; they went to a political meeting, and even had the audacity to applaud the Conservative candidate ; and, within the next few days, they were dismissed. Of course, it is hard to prove any connection between these two things. The hon. minister says something about the wording of the affidavit. No doubt the man went to a lawyer, as any of us would, and the lawyer drew up the affidavit according to the facts as stated. That affidavit, it seems to me, is as near proof as can be expected in a case of this kind. I believe the matter should be fully considered, and that the officers who have taken such action should be warned not to repeat it.

Mr. LALOR. I agree that when a government office of emolument is open it is only to be expected that the man who has worked for his party should be given the preference in the appointment. That is party government, and it is conceded to be the proper system for this country. But when it comes to employing ordinary labouring men, the position is entirely different. We should consider it a great hardship if ordinary employers of labour were to give or refuse employment according to a man's politics. I think it is very wrong for the government to set an example of that kind.

Mr. FIELDING. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) that even though an employee of the government votes against the government, to dismiss him on that account would be an outrage.

Mr. LALOR. But that is particularly true in the case of an honest, conscientious labouring man employed upon a public work. I can tell the hon. minister, and prove it beyond a doubt, that a man who wishes work on the Grand river feeder at Dunnville has to run the gauntlet of the Liberal Association committee before he can get work. He gets the order of that committee to the superintendent to engage him. But if he has voted for Lalor, or is even suspected of having done so, employment is refused him. I have in mind the case of one man, a worthy man, one who has raised a family that is respected by everybody. When he applied for employment he was told that he had voted for Lalor and so could not be given work. I say that principle is radically wrong, and the minister who is in charge of the department should issue a specific order to the officer in charge of this work stating that men are to be employed regardless of politics, so long as they are good men. The minister must know that it adds immensely to the difficulty of getting good men for these public works if the superintendent is not allowed to exercise his own judgment, but must consider politics in making his selection. I know that men who are almost worthless are engaged on public works because they are supposed to vote for the government. We do not get the worth of our money from the labour of these men.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) has confused two different things. I agree with him in one, but not in the other. One is the question of the dismissal of a public officer because of his vote, and the other is the question of exercising a political preference in filling a vacancy in the public service. If a man is in the public service, having got there under the Conservative regime, we assume that he got there honourably and is there by right, and there should be no interference with his right to vote as he pleases. In my own department I have men who were appointed before my day, and I never interfere with them, nor would I allow them to be interfered with, in voting as they please. But when it comes to the filling of a vacancy, I have a right to consider the politics of the applicant, provided always that I put in none but good men. But why the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) should draw a distinction between the employment by the government of a labouring man and any other man, I do not understand. A private employer would not make that distinction—whatever the position to be filled, he would not con-

sider the politics of the applicant. If he wished to engage a lawyer, he would not consider whether that lawyer was a Grit or a Tory. But is the labouring man who has done good service for his party to be put upon a different plane from any other? Why should he not be as much entitled to have a preference in a vacancy that he can fill as the lawyer who wishes to be a judge?

Mr. LALOR. With the minister's permission, I will correct him on that point. It is not a question of engaging a man, but a question whether a man must change his politics in order to get employment.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be the case in the highly paid offices as well as in any other, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lalor) sees nothing wrong in political patronage in an office that carries a good salary. I myself justify that, always provided that capable men are employed. The hon. gentleman says that in the case he refers to inefficient men are employed. I say that is wrong; no engineer should be asked to employ men on a public work who are not capable. I do not hesitate to say that this is a matter that I had hoped would not arise. I have endeavoured to see that the Conservatives as well as Liberals get a fair share of work. But if it were put to me: Here is a vacancy for a labouring man and here are two men applying, one a Grit and one a Tory, and both good men, I would support the Grit, just as my hon. friend would prefer the Tory.

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) did not put it in that way. My hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) referred to this work going on at Montmorency, for the performance of which the government asked $4,000. And they have spent $6,000 already and are asking for $5,000 to complete the work. They have done this work by day labour, yet a man who votes Conservative cannot get a dollar of that work. Is that fair?

Mr. FIELDING. I desire to be perfectly frank with my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor). If I were in Quebec and in that district, and twenty men were wanted on that work, and twenty Liberals and twenty Conservatives applied, all good men, I would give the preference to the Liberals, and I would not think I was doing wrong. And I frankly say that I would expect the hon. gentleman, if his party were in power and the matter were within his sphere of influence, to give his preference to the Conservatives.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then the hon. minister would not show himself a good business man. This government professes to be a business government; yet, if you take the employers of this country, I venture to say you cannot find one who, employing men to do labour, asks what the applicant's politics are. Here is work on which the government are spending over $11,000 contrary to the law, and yet no labouring man who happens to be a Conservative can get a day's work on that job, no matter how hard up he may be. No manufacturer would carry on his business in that way. I have men in my own employ who turn out and work against me at every election. They are good men, and they have a right to do as they please. I employ a large number of men, and I never inquire of any of them what side he voted for or what his religion was. And the government ought to do the same. I would like to ask the hon. minister how much the engineer's estimate for this work was when it was originally brought down?

Mr. FIELDING. The engineer informs me that it was $9,000, if he remembers correctly. I do not want to get involved in two distinct questions. As to the value of the work and whether too much money was expended on it or not, I think, that is a proper question. But we have for the last few minutes been discussing not that question but the general principle involved in giving a political preference to one's own political friends. In private affairs you do not do that because private affairs are not conducted on the party system, but I venture to say that my hon. friend's friends in the province of Ontario will give a political preference to their own friends, they will have a perfect right to do so, and if they are attacked for it I will be one to say that they have a perfect right to give a preference to their own friends whether it be a matter of day's labour or the appointment of a high officer, always provided they appoint a man capable of doing the work and of giving an honest day's work for an honest day's pay.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. Minister of Finance did not follow the instructions given to him and to the country by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Here in 1896 the right hon. leader of the government said that where men were working for the government it made no difference whether they were Grits or Tories they should not be removed. He said that all men would have the right to vote the way they chose and that they would not be interfered with. Contrast that with the example we had in 1900 when Mr. Blair wrote to the manager of the Soulanges canal and said to him: Have you any men in your employ who voted for Bergeron? If you have, turn them all out. This is the very man and that letter was read in this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This canal is not in the constituency of my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). It is on the other side of the river.

Mr. MORIN. What is the difference so long as they work on the canal?

Mr. BERGERON. Many of them work on both sides.

Mr. MORIN. Are those the instructions given by the leader of the government? Not

at all. I wish the hon. Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) were here to-day. I would give him another example. Last year I asked him for a post office to be granted at Detroit where 500 people would be served. But no, I was refused because I was a Tory. Since then he has opened up two new post offices and probably from ten to twenty people will be served by these post offices. That is the way the other side of the House carries out the instructions of the leader of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. Misery loves company. I am in very good company on that question. I applied to my hon. friend the Postmaster General a short time ago to put a post office in a certain place in my own province but I regret to say that he refused to do it. So, I can sympathize with my hon. friend (Mr. Morin). We are both in the same box. We have both been treated in the same way by this hard hearted gentleman.

Mr. LALOR. It was time to strike.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I suppose that what the hon. gentleman refers to was the bolt, but I believe that at the time of the bolt they were not able to do any business. As to the other question I think my hon. friend must be mistaken about that letter of Mr. Blair. I have no recollection of ever having heard a letter of the character which my hon. friend states from Mr. Blair read in this House. If there was such a letter it was a most extraordinary one. I would like to hear from Mr. Blair on the question, but I do not think that he ever wrote any such letter as that. Certainly I would not defend any such letter. I think there must be some mistake.

Mr. MILLER. I have a much worse complaint to make against the hon. Postmaster General than that of the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Morin) and the hon. Minister of Finance. In my riding a postmaster applied for an increase of his salary. I made application on his behalf. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) looked up to see what was the revenue of the office and he reduced his salary notwithstanding the fact that the postmaster was a good Grit.

Mr. FINLAY. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if it is not a fact that the Whitney government have been discharging officials in the province of Ontario right and left.

Mr. BARR. If the Whitney government follow the course pursued by hon. gentlemen oppposite during the last ten years there will be very few Grits left in office in the province of Ontario. We know that during the last ten years no government in the world has discharged as many officials on account of their political leanings as the present government has done. We have this going on all over. They are weeding them out every year by the hundreds, and I can assure you that there is only a very small remnant of Conservative officers left in the province of Ontario, and I presume that the state of affairs in other provinces is just as bad as it is in Ontario. As far as the Ontario government are concerned they have kept their hands off the officials unless there was cause. I challenge anybody to show where there has been a single official in the province of Ontario discharged by the Whitney government since they came into power without cause.

Mr. FIELDING. The same here.

Mr. BARR. I venture to say that there is a large number of officials in Ontario to-day, who, if they have not been discharged ought to have been. They took a very active part in the last campaign. They appeared on the platform and engaged in active politics in other ways. They adhered to the Reform government and did everything in their power to defeat the Conservative candidates. We have to-day for the first time in the Dominion of Canada the spectacle of the hon. Minister of Finance getting up in his place and openly and boldly declaring that to the victor belongs the spoils. That is the position he has taken and he has told us that if there are men to be found that will do the work it should be given to Grits and Conservatives should not be employed. I venture to say that the object of such a statement is to give notice to those who are employing men on public works throughout this Dominion that it is the wish of the present government that they shall employ Grits. I say it is an extraordinary course to pursue yet we have had this principle proclaimed here in this House I think probably for the first time, although it has been acted upon on every possible occasion. We do know that even away down to the working men, down to those employed on the public works they extend this principle, that they watch these men very closely that they choose their own political friends and that they dismiss men by the hundreds all over the Dominion where they find that at the last election they in any way showed their preference for the Conservative candidate. I think this is a very serious state of affairs, and I think that even Reformers for their own sake should pursue a somewhat milder course. The words uttered by the hon. Minister of Finance will echo and re-echo throughout this Dominion, and I have no doubt that the Conservative friends of Mr. Whitney will point to these words and will say : Here we have the announcement from the Minister of Finance that this government are carrying out the spoils system, and that where Tories are found to be employed on a government work in the most humble positions if they can obtain Reformers they will discharge them because they are not going to employ Conservatives. That is the position that has been taken here

to-day and I venture to say again that if the Reformers were to be treated in the province of Ontario the same as the Conservatives have been all through this Dominion it would be very much worse for them. Whatever justification the Whitney government may have I hope they will not follow the example of the present government to the extent they have in weeding out their opponents; in fact, I hope no man in Ontario will ever be disturbed in so far as the provincial government are concerned on account of his political leanings, and I hope the time will never come that they will get down to the position of asking a man what his political leanings are when he is asking for employment on a public work for which the people and not the government have to pay.

It seems to me that this is a declaration which is dangerous to the public weal and it will be acted upon as doubtless it was intended to be by the friends of the government. Notwithstanding that the strongest plank in the Liberal platform was that good officials would not be interfered with, and notwithstanding that they denounced the Conservatives, for ten years the Liberal government has been decapitating Conservative officials. Then, that safety valve which we supposed existed requiring that contracts over $5,000 should be let by public tender; that has disappeared under the present government. They must know from their engineers what a work will cost before they undertake it, but their policy is to come down to parliament the first year asking for a vote under $5,000, then let the work without competition, and then come back next session asking for another vote of several thousand dollars thus escaping the law which they themselves placed upon the statute books. That is an iniquitous policy. The policy which we have heard announced to-day, that to the victors belong the spoils is also a vicious system. It came to us from the American side of the line and it is practised in Canada just as strongly and just as openly as it is in the country of its origin.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend knows I did not lay down any such doctrine.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It is refreshing to hear the member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) protesting against the spoils system. He says this government has dismissed a great many officials, but let him look around the cities of Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal at the hundreds of officials in the Customs, the Inland Revenue, and Post Office, and he cannot point to a single man who has been dismissed except for cause. Offensive partisanship or inefficiency has been proved in each case after investigation. Let the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barr) take his advice to his friends in Toronto. Mr. Whitney does not hold a court of investigation and ask for evidence; he chops off the heads of Liberal officials. Every license commissioner in the whole province of Ontario almost has been dismissed without cause, and every license inspector has been dismissed.

Mr. BARR. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Nearly every one of them. In West York, East York, North York and in Kent these officials were dismissed and no investigation held.

Mr. LALOR. Will you say they were dismissed without cause? Will you say as the representative of Centre York that the license inspectors did their duty?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, I will. In East and West York the license inspectors were most efficient men and men who had not taken any part in politics since their appointment several years ago. Mr. Russel in East York is one of the most highly respected men in the county; he is a man who had studiously avoided taking part in politics and yet his head has been cut off without investigation or inquiry. In West York it is the same. For the few months Mr. Whitney has been in power he has dismissed hundreds of officials all over the province. The fishery overseers have gone also and all without an investigation. Mr. Whitney is fresh at the business yet; he is making good headway so far, and if he continues I venture to say there will be very few Liberal officials in Ontario in a short while. Are we squealing or whining about it? For the last ten years these gentlemen opposite have been whining and squealing because officials have been dismissed for offensive partisanship, but it is time they let up on that and turned their attention to their friends in Toronto who are doing ten times worse. Possibly there may be one official out of hundreds who has been dismissed, but I can tell you that the course pursued by this government in this respect reflects the highest credit on them. To these gentlemen opposite I say: go and talk to Mr. Whitney as you are talking here and it may do some good.

Mr. BARR. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to talk generally, but I challenge him to put his finger on a single license inspector who has been dismised without cause.

Mr. CAMPBELL. East and West York and Kent.

Mr. BARR. In East and West York they were bitter partisans and if they had not been dismissed it would have been a disgrace to the government. In the first place they did nothing to carry out the law. We all know that the license commissioners are only appointed from year to year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I refer to license inspectors.

Mr. BARR. Yes, they allowed the gambling hells to operate and they let the hotels

keep open at all hours in that part of the country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They did not.

Mr. BARR. I speak from what I know, and I say that they did nothing but draw their salaries. In Dufferin we have the same inspector, but the commissioners were changed and I can assure you that the change was a great improvement. The inspectors that have not been removed for cause now know that they have to do their duty, and that if they do not they will be dismissed. Every day there are cases brought up in this House where good officials have been dismissed for no reason whatever. I have myself pointed out that in my own county a postmaster after seven years service was dismissed without any cause except that he was a Conservative and exercised his franchise.

Mr. T. MARTIN. I am astonished to hear the member for Dufferin (Mr. Barr) make such statements in this House; I challenge him to give the name of one man in the large county of Wellington who has been dismissed by this government on account of politics. The hon. gentleman knows very well that we had a great many civil servants in Wellington who were strong partisans. It is astonishing to me that a man of as high standing as the hon. member for Dufferin would make such statements. In the province of Ontario there has scarcely been a man removed from the position he occupied in 1896 for such cause as the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I challenge him to name one man who has been removed for that cause in the large and populous county of Wellington, which contains the city of Guelph; but I can name several Conservatives who have been appointed or reappointed to good positions in that county.

Mr. LALOR. Give us the names of the ones reinstated.

Mr. T. MARTIN. I will give the hon. gentleman not only the names of those reinstated, but the names of those appointed. I will give him the names privately.

Mr. CHISHOLM. What we object to is that these men are breaking the law, which is that they must take tenders if the amount is over $5,000. They are breaking the law by doing such work by day's work, and they are using that day's work to make votes; that is the sum and substance of the whole thing; and after the announcement made by the minister to-day, we understand why they are breaking the law. If the law makers are to be law breakers, what is the country coming to?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend cannot understand why they are breaking the law, because as a matter of fact they are not breaking it.

Mr. MILLER. With reference to the dismissal of officials, the Toronto 'Telegram' a Conservative paper, some time ago urged the Whitney government not to dismiss Liberal officials from office, saying that the Laurier government in that respect had set a good example.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight a'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 149) respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Brown.

Bill (No. 150) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 153) for the relief of George Pearson.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 164) to incorporte the Monarch Bank of Canada.—Mr. Gordon.

Bill (No. 166) respecting certain Patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 167) for the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—Mr. Johnston (Lambton).

SUPPLY.

House in committee of supply.

Pierreville wharf, Quebec, $3,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation was $6,000 and a further expenditure of $3,000 is required. It is a pile structure 150 feet long by 148 feet wide, 30 feet high and 5 feet deep at low water. It was begun as soon as the appropriations were available after the close of last session and is now completed. This will pay for the balance due.

Harbours, rivers and bridges, Quebec—general repairs and improvements, $10,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation in the main estimates was $20,000. This is for general repairs to a number of works. The largest single item is $1,086.61 for work on Yamaska Lock.

Mr. TAYLOR. This will be required up to 30th June this year?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

St. Alphonse de Bagotville wharf—repairs, &c., $1,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to build dams in connection with the repairs to the wharf and to remove boulders from approaches to the same. There was $1,000 in the main estimates. The total cost is $2,000.

Point Edward, Ontario—dredging, $14,100.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation was $10,000, and we are asking an additional $14,100. There are $17,000 in the next year's estimates to be added, making altogether $41,000. It is expected that will complete the work. This is done by ordinary labour and not by contract, and it was performed with the view of hastening the completion of the projected channel 20 feet deep, extending in front of the Grand Trunk Railway sheds and the new elevator south of these sheds, thence in a southerly direction to deep water. It was done by the Sarnia Bay Towing and Salvage Company at so much per hour. It is expected this will complete the work.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Was this done without tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was done by the dredges at so much per hour. $15 per hour for a day's work of 1,200 yards of material.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It must be a much more powerful dredge.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it is a dredge capable of doing better work.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is inspector of a dredging plant of this kind ? When the government engages a plant at so much per hour or day, who has to give a report as to how much work is being done every day ?

Mr. FIELDING. The work comes in a general way under the supervision of the resident engineer at London, Mr. Ling, and there was a local inspector besides.

Mr. BLAIN. What would be the duty of the local inspector and how much would he be paid ?

Mr. FIELDING. The local inspector is paid at the rate of $3 per day. His duty is to see that the quantity represented is moved and carried away.

Mr. BLAIN. Who was the inspector ?

Mr. FIELDING. The name is not among the memoranda furnished me.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that $15 per hour was paid for this dredge, and that 1,200 yards was to be removed. Why do you pay more for this work than for the other work, where you pay $8 an hour and a thousand yards a day ?

Mr. FIELDING. The net result is the same. The price per hour varies in accordance with the quantity the dredge is able to move and the net result per cubic yard is about the same.

Mr. TAYLOR. $8 an hour for 1,000 yards.

Mr. FIELDING. No, $8 an hour was not for 1,000 yards. I stated the price per hour varied in accordance with the capacity of the dredge.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood $8 an hour was for a dredge that would do 1,000 yards in 12 hours.

Mr. FIELDING. I certainly did not mean to say that. The engineers inform me a dredge that moves 1,000 yards a day is paid $10 an hour.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister could give the amount of money paid for the inspection of this work.

Mr. FIELDING. $423.85 is the amount paid, although the name of the gentleman is not here.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman will see that $15 an hour for 1,200 yards is not as cheap as $10 an hour for 1,000 yards.

Mr. FIELDING. The variation on a cubic yard is very slight. It runs from 12½ to 13 cents or 13 cents and a fraction in all cases.

Blind river—dredging, $4,200.

Mr. BOYCE. What is that ?

Mr. FIELDING. In that case the dredge was paid $8 per hour with a capacity of 600 yards per day. The work was performed by Eddy & Coy's dredge, No. 1.

Mr. BOYCE. Under contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. By the usual arrangement, so much per hour, having due regard to the quantity of material to be moved.

Mr. BOYCE. Has dredging been done there before ?

Mr. FIELDING. At the time of the construction of the wharf some dredging was done there but not otherwise.

Mr. BOYCE. How long ago was that ?

Mr. FIELDING. Two years ago.

Mr. BOYCE. By the same parties ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it was done by the contractor for the wharf.

Mr. BLAIN. Whose constituency is this in ?

Mr. FIELDING. East Algoma.

Mr. BOYCE. What was the representation made as to the necessity of this dredging ? I did not know there was any necessity for any dredging in Blind river. There was always a good harbour there.

Mr. FIELDING. It not infrequently happens that after a wharf is built you discover that you want dredging in order to allow large vessels to approach the wharf.

Mr. BOYCE. I heard of some promises before the last election of dredging contracts to be given in that neighbourhood, but I expected much larger amounts. I suppose this is the performance of one of these promises ? The hon. member for East Algoma was largely interested in that and he moved his dredge up to the Port

Arthur district when he saw the contracts going through.

Mr. FIELDING. Not for this dredging that is referred to.

Mr. BOYCE. What amount of dredging is necessary there ?

Mr. FIELDING. The work is already practically done. It is not contemplated that more dredging is necessary.

Mr. BOYCE. Has all the work been done by this firm ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, all under this appropriation.

Mr. BOYCE. Who is the superintendent ?

Mr. FIELDING. The work at that point would come under the supervision of the late Mr. H. A. Gray, engineer of the department at Toronto, and there was also a local inspector whose name I cannot give now.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister is very anxious to impress the committee that they are fulfilling all the promises that were made and I would remind him of a promise of some dredging in Peel given five years ago. That promise was renewed each year since that time, and even if we are not able to get it done I would like at least a renewal of the promise from the minister, and when he is in another mood of fulfilment of promises perhaps the department will be able to send a dredge to Peel to do something that is a public necessity. The late Minister of Public Works sent an inspector to examine the work who gave a very favourable report saying that some work was urgently required to be done in order that the harbour could be used. It is very close to Toronto and is found useful for vessels coming in which in rough weather cannot go into Toronto, but can enter such a harbour as Port Credit. The present Minister of Public Works was spoken to and I wish to say in justice to the hon. gentleman who is not present that he also has promised that this work would be done. The complaint is that they cannot get dredges, but I notice from the estimates each year that dredges reach other counties without very much trouble, and I hope the minister now will look into this matter so that it will not be necessary for me to bring it up each year.

Mr. FIELDING. I can only promise to call the attention of the minister to it. I must not give one of those promises to my hon. friend which he says are so easily given and not carried out. If I give it I would like to fulfil it. But, I will call the attention of the minister to it. I would not care to say more at the present time.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand the hon. minister to say that this work at Blind river has been completed ?

Mr. BOYCE.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. And that there was no sum in the main estimates of last year for doing this work ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, there was an appropriation in the main estimates of $7,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. For dredging ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understood the minister to say that there was some dredging done here.

Mr. FIELDING. It has no connection with this. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) asked if there had been any previous dredging. I said not in connection with this item but that a wharf had been built there.

Mr. CLEMENTS. While we are on this dredging item, I would like to say that I notice that there is no appropriation in the main estimates for dredging in the mouth of the River Thames. I desire to impress upon the government the importance of this matter, and I trust that before the supplementary estimates come down the government will take it into their serious consideration and see that there is a proper appropriation for the work. My hon. friend from West York (Mr. Campbell), my hon. friend from East Kent (Mr. Gordon) and the hon. members for Essex know the importance of this work. I have had several letters lately on this subject in one of which it is stated that :

> The schooner 'Stademan' is at the mouth of the river with a load of coal for the Canadian Flour Mills Company. The water is low on the bar this year. There is not over nine feet three inches, and the 'Stademan' draws ten feet. She will have to be lightened over.

I have had a number of such letters upon this work and I think that the importance of the work was drawn to the attention of the government by my late opponent, who, I think, threatened to resign if the work was not done. I hope I will not be under the painful necessity of making a similar threat. I might also state that last year the government spent a good deal of money in the River Thames making a survey with the intention of dredging the river to a depth of 15 feet. I should like the government to carry this work out. I think it is an undertaking of very great importance. The city of Chatham is an important point and we have to rely a great deal on the River Thames for shipment by boat. The mouth of the river is something that both governments have taken care of for years, but it has now got into such a state that the government must do something to give us relief.

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that the attention of the minister is called to the hon. gentleman's observations.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. minister, if, in addition to the information which he is going to bring down about this Blind river dredging, he will tell us how much work was done for the amount that was paid out ?

Mr. FIELDING. The quantity of material removed consisting of hard-pan, clay and sand in 1,154 hours was 39,242 cubic yards. That was more troublesome and cost us about 24 cents per yard.

Barry's bay wharf—Madawaska river—to complete payments, $256.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was this wharf let by contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. That was done by contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is the balance to complete ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is asked to provide for payments due the contractor for additional works authorized in connection with a public wharf 100 x 25 feet built at Barry's bay on the Madawaska river.

Grand river—dredging at mouth, $6,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is this ?

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation for 1904-5 was $10,900.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it done by contract?

Mr. FIELDING. That was done by dredges on the basis of so much per hour.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There was nothing in the main estimates ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, there was an appropriation in the main estimates of the current year of $10,900.

Mr. BARR. Where was that dredging on the Grand river ?

Mr. FIELDING. First at the mouth of the river and afterwards at Dunnville.

Mr. BOYCE. Who is doing the dredging ?

Mr. FIELDING. The work is now completed. It was done by Mr. C. S. Boone's dredge the 'General Meade' at the rate of $12 per working hour.

Mr. BOYCE. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the principle of giving out works of this kind by the hour had been discontinued.

Mr. FIELDING. That is true.

Mr. BOYCE. That was the complaint made when the original estimates were under consideration and now we find that the same policy is being pursued.

Mr. FIELDING. This work is already done and tenders are being invited for other works now on the basis of so much per cubic yard.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask the hon. minister if it is not within his knowledge that dredges at this very moment in the employ of the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals are receiving remuneration by the hour ?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not answer in regard to the Department of Railways and Canals, but the chief engineer informs me that work of that character is not now being done by the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BOYCE. So that we can understand that practice has been wholly discontinued?

Mr. FIELDING. Tenders are now invited on the basis of so much per cubic yard for that class of work generally. Exceptional circumstances arise to justify some special case, and if that be so it will have to be defended on its merits, but it is not the policy of the department and no case of that kind is now contemplated.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Could the hon. minister give us the page in the main estimates at which this appropriation appears?

Mr. FIELDING. It was in the main estimates for the past year, not in the estimates for the coming year. In the main estimates for 1904-5 there was an appropriation of $10,900. It will be found in the Supply Bill, I am quite sure, but I will send for the book.

Mr. BARR. Would the hon. gentleman tell us when this $6,500 was earned ?

Mr. FIELDING. Within the current fiscal year which is now approaching a conclusion. I am told that the work was finished in September last.

Mr. BLAIN. Could the hon. minister tell us where these advertisements are published, in what newspapers? Are they published in the local newspapers or in the daily newspapers in the province of Ontario ?

Mr. FIELDING. They are usually published in the city of Toronto and in the newspapers of the district in which the work is to be done.

Mr. BLAIN. Has the minister a copy of the advertisements referred to ?

Mr. FIELDING. If it is required I will get a copy of the advertisement calling for some of these tenders.

Mr. BOYCE. I am sure the Minister of Finance regards the incident in connection with the Port Arthur dredging with as much regret as any man in this House. In order to avoid any such irregularity in

future I would ask that there might be a time fixed between the first appearance of an advertisement calling for tenders and the date at which the tenders are to be opened. Even if the Port Arthur incident stood alone it would furnish sufficient reason for a departmental rule being laid down in this connection.

Mr. FIELDING. It is difficult to lay down any universal rule. I suppose any business man would say that under ordinary circumstances probably two or three weeks notice would be reasonable.

Mr. BOYCE. In the Port Arthur case it was only three days notice.

Mr. FIELDING. Unless there were some exceptional circumstances I would say that three days would not be enough.

Mr. BOYCE. The Minister of Finance knows that the Port Arthur incident is absolutely indefensible.

Mr. FIELDING. I know nothing of the sort.

Mr. BOYCE. You heard what was stated in the House ?

Mr. FIELDING. I was not as much interested in the public works items then as I am now.

Mr. BOYCE. Then I will call to the memory of the hon. gentleman the fact that the advertisement was dated the 7th of April, it first appeared in the Toronto 'Globe,' April 11, and in the Montreal 'Herald,' April 10, and the tenders were to be opened on the 14th. The plans and specifications were to be inspected in Ottawa, and the work was two days distant at Thunder Bay which was then covered by two feet of ice. Surely the Minister of Finance must admit that this was indefensible. Will he now offer any guarantee to the House that a proper interval shall be fixed between the calling for tenders and their reception so that this thing may not occur again ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think each transaction must be defended on its own merits. I am informed that the hon. gentleman is mistaken when he says that it was necessary to inspect the plans and specifications. I am told the advertisement contained whatever information was necessary to enable parties to tender.

Mr. BOYCE. There were no specifications whatever announced in the advertisement, but simply the fact that the plans and specifications could be inspected at Ottawa.

Mr. FIELDING. I am told the advertisement contained sufficient information to enable any one to tender who desired to do so.

Mr. BOYCE. Then what was the object of referring tenderers to the plans and specifications at Ottawa ?

Mr. FIELDING. If one wants to come to the department to get more information he is free to do so. The statement is made to me that the information in the advertisement was sufficient to enable a man to tender. I think the time was extended in the case referred to.

Mr. BOYCE. But would it have been extended had attention not been called to it in the House ?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that it would have been.

Mr. BOYCE. I know that the Minister of Finance will not defend such a transaction, and if he acknowledges, as I think he will honestly acknowledge that there was no defence in this case, then I ask him if it would not be wise to fix some minimum time between the notice and the opening of the tenders.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know that any rule can be laid down except the general one that reasonable and sufficient notice should be given in every case where the government invites tenders.

Mr. BOYCE. That was the rule before but it was not respected.

Mr. FIELDING. It often happens that for some good reason it is found that the time is too short and that it has to be extended. I agree with the hon. gentleman that reasonable and sufficient notice should be given, but if he asks me to specify the number of days I would like to reserve judgment on that.

Mr. BOYCE. Would the hon. gentleman say that the minimum time should be ten or twenty days ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is better to allow each transaction to stand on its own merits. It is enough to say there should be a fair and reasonable notice that will give every man within reasonable distance an opportunity of tendering.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the Port Arthur case the time was only extended when attention was called to it in parliament, and the case was so indefensible that the Minister of Public Works had to back down and extend the time. The advertisement in that case was dated on the 7th of April, it was first published on the 11th and tenders were to be opened on the 14th so that there were only 3 days for the public to tender. It went further than that: the dredge had to be owned by a person in Canada, it had to be on the ground on the 20th of April before the ice was out of the harbour where the work was to be done, there was no allowance for towing and there was only one dredge in that locality which was partly owned by a member of this House. The government should learn from that instance that a reasonable time should be specified so that the public money may not be given

away to political friends as was clearly the intention in this case.

Now, with reference to the Grand river dredging, the item under discussion, the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) was obliged to leave this afternoon, and as there is not going to be a vote in the main estimates or further supplementary estimates for this work I will either have to ask the item to stand or else get the promise of the Finance Minister that when the Ontario estimates are being discussed the hon. member for Haldimand will have an opportunity to make the remarks he intended to make on this vote. This is another Conmee-Bowman job as I understand from my friend (Mr. Lalor). This work was done by a dredge owned by Mr. Bowman, and I believe that several hundred dollars were allowed him for towing this dredge from the mouth of the Grand river to Dunnville besides the handsome price paid him for the work. No wonder that the appropriation of last year is overrun by some $6,000 if the statements made by my hon. friend from Haldimand are correct.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite agree that if the hon. gentleman from Haldimand desires to say anything on this matter, that on the general vote for dredging in Ontario he should have the opportunity for a free discussion. If there is reason to believe that there is anything wrong in the expenditure I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that some of these days when the Public Accounts Committee meets, the matter be taken up.

Mr. TAYLOR. The trouble is that this money is being spent this year and we cannot get it before the Public Accounts Committee, but you will hear about it next year.

Mr. FIELDING. Wait till you see us next year.

Mr. BLAIN. I have here the advertisement with reference to the Port Arthur dredging as it appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of April the 11th, 1905. It says:

> Plans showing where dredging is to be performed can be seen in the office of the chief engineer of the department, where also any additional information required can be obtained.

If the Finance Minister looks at the advertisement he will see that no specifications are given and that it does not even say where the work is to be done. In fact it invites tenderers to go to the Public Works Department to get information. This very incident makes it most important that some fixed time should be provided. A minimum time should be fixed and that minimum time should be ample to allow all persons who desire to tender for work of this kind, a proper opportunity to do so.

Mr. FIELDING. I think there was an earlier advertisement which contained no information on that subject.

Mr. BOYCE. That is the advertisement we quarrelled about.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. gentleman's quarrel was with the lack of time and not the lack of information.

Mr. BOYCE. That was one of the principal grounds of complaint, that it only gave three days' time for an intending contractor to ascertain at what part of Port Arthur harbour the dredging was to be done, the character of the dredging and the conditions prevailing. Then, if an examination of the ground was necessary, he would have had to use a flying machine to get there, and then to cut through two feet of solid ice in order to ascertain what the bottom of the harbour was like, and then be back here with his tender, all within the space of three days. The effect of that was simply to eliminate from competition everything except the Conmee & Bowman dredges, which were ice-bound in Port Arthur harbour, and these dredges alone could perform that work. Another fact was brought forcibly to the attention of the government, the extraordinarily significant fact that no allowance was made for towing, whereas in other contracts as high as $1,500 had been allowed for towing plant to the scene of operations. That certainly was not conducive to any tenderers other than Conmee & Bowman, or the owners of the dredges then in the harbour. It was the first advertisement that was complained of and which the hon. member for Peel has cited. That advertisement, the hon. gentleman must admit, contains no such information as he thought a little while ago it did contain.

Mr. FIELDING. I was informed the first advertisement did contain such information. However, that is not the point in question; it is the time that is under discussion, and if three days only were allowed, I think that insufficient. I understand the real point of grievance was the time, and I quite admit that three days is not sufficient notice for such work.

Mr. BOYCE. Does the hon. gentleman not now think it is high time, when irregularities so grave occur in connection with a contract involving $195,000 expenditure, that a principle was laid down, and that the government should say: We will not allow a work of this kind to be awarded except after advertisement for ten days or two weeks, so that the public will know the minimum amount of advertising that will be allowed by the department? Surely it is not unreasonable to ask this. If this thing had not been brought to the attention of the government on April 13, the day before these tenders were closed, contracts involv-

ing $195,000 of public money would have been let practically without any opportunity of tendering, and without intending contractors having an opportunity even of knowing that tenders were invited, and, if they did know, they could only tender in the dark, because they could not tell from the advertisement what the conditions were there without coming to Ottawa to inspect these plans and specifications, and probably they might have been told when they came to Ottawa that they would have to go to Port Arthur to inspect the bottom of the lake in order to verify the conditions shown in the plans. The hon. gentleman admits that the time is too short. Will he say now that not a contract shall be let except on such and such notice, or will he stick to the principle that reasonable time shall be allowed? That was the principle in vogue before the Port Arthur grievance was raised. The Minister of Public Works said that was the principle on which these contracts were let, that reasonable time should be allowed, and this he considered a reasonable time. If that was the principle of the department before this irregularity was brought to the attention of the government, surely it is not unreasonable to ask the government now to change it and stipulate that at least a certain number of days, to be increased according to the importance of the contract and the distance to a longer time, shall be allowed.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not agree that any good purpose could be served by stipulating a specific number of days. I would be quite prepared to agree that ten days' notice would be little enough for a work of this kind, and that it would be better to have longer notice, but I would not be prepared to lay down a minimum time. I think the matter will have to be left to what is fair and reasonable; and if that is not done, my hon. friends will certainly not fail to remind us of it. Meantime, I promised the hon. member for Lennox to confirm a statement I made as to a certain appropriation having been made. I presume from his having left the chamber that he did not consider it important, but it will be found on page 42 of the Supply Bill.

Collingwood harbour, $50,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is for unpaid accounts for dredging performed by C. S. Boone, by dredges Nos. 10 and 14, in channel, to 24 feet depth, and some cribwork, steps, &c. There was an appropriation of $50,000 taken for the work in the main estimates, but a larger amount of work was undertaken, and it was found necessary to ask for $50,000 to close up the transactions of the year. $60,000 is asked in the estimates for the coming year.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will discuss it then.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be ample opportunity on the main estimates.

Mr. BOYCE.

Whitby harbour—dredging, $4,050.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation in that case was $10,000, and a further sum of $4,050 was required to complete the payments. The dredge 'Trenton,' owned by Contractor R. Weddell, operated from August 17 to November 14, 1904, the close of navigation. The dredging was carried on between the east and west piers, alongside the north pier and in the slip beside the elevator.

Mr. TAYLOR. $14,050 has been spent?

Mr. FIELDING. The work is done.

Mr. TAYLOR. It certainly seems to me that these over-expenditures are extremely large this year in nearly every instance. The elections certainly must have had something to do with the over-expenditures. I do not know by what right the government asks for $50,000 to make certain improvements and then spends $100,000 without consulting parliament. I think that when the amount voted is exhausted the work should stop until parliament meets again and the government can ask for another vote, instead of taking carte blanche to spend as much money as they like. I think the government should ask what they require for the year, and parliament will cheerfully vote it if, in their opinion, the work should be done. I do not think the government should say: We asked for $50,000, but we had an election and spent $100,000, and therefore must have another $50,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the Collingwood contract completed?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. The contractor was C. S. Boone, and the work was done on the basis of so much per yard—$2.30 for rock and $1.40 for hard-pan.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice that last year this matter was pretty fully discussed, and the minister, Mr. Hyman, said:

> The total amount of the contract is $87,000, we paid on that $49,000, and this is to complete the balance of the work.

What the committtee would like to know is whether the contract referred to by the minister at that time has been completed, and if so, what amount is unpaid on it?

Mr. FIELDING. The engineers inform me that the contract there referred to was finished, and that afterwards additional work was authorized at the same rates, so as to widen the channel.

Mr. BLAIN. That does not answer the point. The minister of last year stated that the work for which $50,000 was to be appropriated was let by tender, and that the contract was for $87,000. What the committee would like to know is whether that contract has been completed. The minister now says that the work has been done at so much per cubic yard.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that that contract was completed in the manner stated; that the work was extended at the rates I have mentioned, which are the equivalent of the contract price ; and that as respects any additional work, tenders have now been called for a further contract.

Sault Ste. Marie—harbour improvements, including dredging of approaches—balances due on contract work, &c., $25,000.

Mr. BOYCE. What is this work ?

Mr. FIELDING. This work was done by contract by Mr. Joseph Battle, of Thorold, Ontario. The amount of the contract was $65,000, and there was extra work authorized to the amount of $1,200, with charges for superintendence and contingencies, bringing the whole amount up to $68,700, of which $43,659.22 has been paid, and the balance of $25,000 in round numbers is still to be paid.

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman state what the nature of the work was, what the extras were, and who was the person employed to superintend the work ?

Mr. FIELDING. The officer who inspected the work was Mr. Boyd. He is not regularly in the employ of the government, but was employed for that purpose.

Mr. BOYCE. Is the hon gentleman aware that Mr. Boyd is employed as wharfinger at Sault Ste. Marie at a regular salary?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what the custom is there, but usually wharfingers are not paid salaries, but are allowed a percentage of their receipts, not exceeding 25 per cent in the Marine Department, and they are not commonly regarded as salaried officials.

Mr. BOYCE. With regard to the superintendent, the result would be that while that work was going on, Mr. Boyd would be sitting in his office, attending to his business as wharfinger, and occasionally inspecting this work. He would be getting the same fees as wharfinger whether he acted as superintendent or not. His time as wharfinger is supposed to be exclusively given to the government, while, as a matter of fact, his time would be divided between his duties as wharfinger and his duties as superintendent of this work. In short, he gets double pay for doing work that would require constant and exclusive attention.

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose that if a postmaster getting a few dollars a year in a small country post office were employed under similar conditions, we would be told that he was paid two salaries. I think the allowance made to wharfingers, unless the business is very large, is not contemplated as calling for a man's whole time. It is a small percentage on the amount he collects.

Mr. BOYCE. The hon. gentleman has not stated the nature of the work.

Mr. FIELDING. The stem of the old wharf, formerly called Plummer's wharf, was lengthened by adding 250 feet in length, 60 feet in width and from 25 to 31 feet in height, and a wing turned up stream 250 feet in length, 50 feet in width, and from 31 to 33 feet in height. The top stands 6¾ feet above low water.

Mr. BOYCE. Is that all the work for which this appropriation is required ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the dredging that is included ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no dredging in this. The word 'dredging' is a part of the heading of the first appropriation, and they copied the same words.

Mr. BOYCE. I refer the hon. gentleman to page 5627 of 'Hansard' where he will find a number of questions and answers concerning the government docks at Sault Ste. Marie. In question 12, I asked who was the wharfinger employed during the construction of the extension of the dock and at what rate was he paid, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied that the wharfinger appointed by that department was retained in office, that his name is George A. Boyd, and that he was paid at the rate of $142 per month during the season of navigation out of the fees collected by him, and further that the wharfinger paid for all necessary assistance. Well, this extension work was done during the season of navigation. By question 10, I asked under whose immediate local supervision was this extension work performed, and the minister replied that it was performed under the supervision of George A. Boyd, at $3 per day. Therefore this same man was getting $142 per month and $3 per day at the same time. What was the total period during which this man Boyd was paid for superintending that work ?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give the information. The usual practice is to pay these wharfingers by fees, and I was dealing with the usual practice, having no special knowledge of the amount of business done at that wharf.

Mr. BOYCE. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries said he was not required to give his whole time to the duties of wharfinger.

Mr. FIELDING. That would depend on the amount of business. It seems to be very considerable, and his fees would amount to a considerable sum. The Public Works Department might not have any knowledge of the fact that he was acting as wharfinger. I presume it is the same man.

Mr. BOYCE. It is said to be the same man.

Mr. FIELDING. Is it so stated in the answer to the question ?

Mr. BOYCE. No.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume the hon. gentleman knows that it is the same man when he says so ?

Mr. BOYCE. I know it is the same and a very useful man in an election.

Mr. FIELDING. That is an additional virtue.

Mr. BOYCE. No doubt that was the great factor in giving him this $3 per day extra. An election was imminent in that constituency. A great deal of money was spent and a great many votes created, and created in a manner which will yet have to be brought to the attention of this House, and which forms one of the greatest election scandals ever perpetrated in the Dominion. Votes were created absolutely without law or reason or any reasonable excuse at all in that district of West Algoma. 543 votes were put upon the voters' list in a single day without notice to anybody, and this Mr. George A. Boyd, who was not required to give his whole time to his duties as wharfinger and got $3 per day besides as superintendent, was the agent who was exceedingly active on behalf of the Liberal candidate. No doubt this was his reward. I wonder shall he be dealt with in the same severe manner as the Postmaster General dealt with the postmaster at Kentvale. Men were brought in on trains to my knowledge in parties of from six to eight to vote for the Liberal candidate in the January election. This same gentleman was very active on behalf of this government in the Dominion election and on behalf of the Ontario government in the provincial election.

Mr. FIELDING. I suppose that since all these different things happened in that election, the hon. gentleman will use the machinery provided by parliament for investigating them ? I take it for granted he has appealed to the courts to have this thing straightened out ?

Mr. BOYCE. I am glad the hon. gentleman brings that up. If he looks at the public accounts, he will see that it must have cost this country several hundreds of dollars to employ counsel to resist the demand for a writ of prohibition which I made at the moment this outrage was committed. If he will consult Judge Meredith's decision, delivered shortly before the election, he will see that the judge held that the extraordinary Order in Council was not to be followed, by which this government proposed to make voters' lists in violation of every statute in Ontario. That is what was done and that is on record, and that record will be laid before this House. It was fortunately not necessary to go into the election court, but it may be necessary to ask parliament to refer the matter to the Privileges and Elections Committee. 543 names were created in that district illegally, without any excuse, with indecent haste, in defiance of the law, and without notice to anybody. We had this upright government amending forsooth the Ontario statute by an Order in Council, which shortened the delay for appealing from 30 days to 6, and that delay was to be counted from the time these lists were made and posted in some distant lumber camp without notice to anybody. When those appeals were made I was in attendance, and these appeals were going on within 20, and at the outside, 30 days of the time those original lists were made up and sworn to, some of them, by officials of this government. Out of 543 names, over 300 were struck off by the judges on revision, as being the names of men who had not the necessary qualifications or who had not been in the district the requisite length of time.

I am glad the hon. gentleman asked for information on that score. The information was all furnished to the courts. And, although the learned judge held—and it is a matter of doubt whether he held rightly, but I am not quarrelling with that—that it was not a case for prohibition—he gave some very important dicta in the course of the proceedings as to the preparation of these lists. Nine voters' lists were made up ; they were made up without notice to anybody, although the Ontario statutes provide that thirty days' notice of the time and place for making up the lists shall be given by proclamation. The personnel of the enumerators who were appointed was peculiar. One of these who, I remember, was examined as a witness in the famous Sault Ste. Marie case, although an Indian agent, and an employee of this government, was appointed returning officer at Michipicoten Harbour, where the famous cruiser the 'Minnie M.' landed. This gentleman was in his office and saw the boat land with her crew of pluggers. He saw them take the train to the Helen Mine. He saw the train come back bringing these men. The returning officer swore that he had appointed this gentleman as deputy returning officer because of his knowledge of that district. This gentleman saw these pluggers get off the train. They entered his booth and he allowed every one to vote and took no steps in the matter. And when cross-examined in the election trial, he said he thought he must have been chosen on account of his extreme ignorance. Another of the enumerators who made up these lists was the gentleman who was found by the chancellor in the Sault Ste. Marie petition to have been the eminent George M. Sutherland, the king of the Sault St. Marie election campaign of 1903, and the famous 'Lack' Kennedy who was found to be in charge of the 'Minnie M.' expedition. This was the kind of men who made up these lists. If the hon. gentleman wants

further information it can be given him later on. But, I can only assure him that, so far as concerns relief being asked from the courts it was asked for and very promptly. The machinery of the law was set in motion in two or three different directions, and, notwithstanding the activity of this government we were to alter the provisions of the Ontario law, under which no appeal could be made against these outrageous lists, and to cut off more than 300 names inside of thirty days from the time they were made up and sworn to by gentlemen of this class. And although of the balance of some 200, principally shantymen the percentage to vote for the Conservative party in that riding was not more than one or two per cent, the general body of the community were so far impressed by the fact that an outrage had been committed on the franchise of the district that they repudiated those who were carrying out that scheme.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) if the attention of the Attorney General of Ontario has been called to these outrages, and if so, what that officer is doing ?

Mr. BOYCE. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) was in the House a little while ago or not. But I may tell him that the attention of the courts have been called to the matter. And I may tell him that three counsel were employed and paid by this government, and I suppose that a reasonable amount will appear in the public accounts for their services. I would remind the Minister of Finance of that, there is very interesting reading in the judgment. And I would commend that judgment also to the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) together with the facts on which it proceeded. I was struck with the virtue shown by the hon. gentleman in commenting on certain matters before we rose at six o'clock. If he will study the facts in connection for the application for prohibition in respect to the West Algoma voters' lists during October last, he will find interesting reading and may have reason to change the view as to the absence of the virtue of every action of this government.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I would rather have the evidence than your version of it.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the minister if there is any dredging in connection with this ?

Mr. FIELDING. The item is under a general head which includes dredging, this particular work does not include dredging.

Mr. BOYCE. There is no dredging of the St. Marie river in this item ?

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Owen Sound harbour—dredging, &c., $6,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The appropriation for that was $28,000 and we are asking for $6,000 more. This is for dredging performed by the dredge 'Frank' of Mr. A. F. Bowman.

Mr. TAYLOR. Bowman is a lucky man.

Mr. FIELDING. I think Ontario is lucky to have a Bowman and others to do the work. I would be glad to have such men in the maritime provinces to do work at fair prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was this by contract or by the day ?

Mr. FIELDING. By contract at 13½ cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BLAIN. When the hon. minister is bringing down the information in connection with the Sault dredging, will he please bring down the contract between Joseph Battle and the government for dredging at the Sault ?

Mr. FIELDING. I am informed that Mr. Battle did not do dredging there.

Mr. BLAIN. When the item was up last year of the Sault St. Marie harbour improvements including dredging of approaches $30,000, Mr. Hyman said : 'This work is under contract. The contractor is Joseph Battle, of Thorold, and the estimated cost $71,500.' Would the minister lay on the table the contract so that we may examine it ?

Mr. FIELDING. A copy of the contract with Mr. Battle will be brought down. But the old headline for this item has been carried on, and it included dredging. But for this part of the work there was no dredging.

Little Current—improvement of northern steamboat channel in Georgian Bay, $16,000.

Mr. FIELDING. We had an appropriation at first of $25,000 for this work.

Mr. TAYLOR. How was this estimate made up ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is a work that has cost a considerable amount of money and we shall have an appropriation for it in the coming estimates.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it under contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, with Mr. Boone, at $2.60 per cubic yard of rock and $1.40 per cubic yard of hard-pan.

River Otonabee—dredging at Peterborough, $1,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this in connection with the canal ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is for work at Peterborough. This is to pay the Department of Railways and Canals for the use of their dredge which was employed for this purpose.

Haileybury wharf—Lake Temiskaming, $3,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to complete the wharf at Haileybury. The engineer informs me that the wharf was built, but afterwards sank and there had to be a further expenditure of money.

Mr. TAYLOR. Was it done by contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, by day labour.

Mr. TAYLOR. In what district is this work ?

Mr. FIELDING. In the district of Nipissing.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was an election there, too ?

Mr. FIELDING. There were elections everywhere, the hon. gentleman will remember. But public works must be constructed—the King's government must go on.

Mr. TAYLOR. Did it cost as much to complete the wharf after it had sunk as to build it in the first place ?

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that the wharf cost $13,000 and that extra expenditure was $3,000.

Honora wharf—revote of lapsed amount $800.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where is this ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is in Algoma. The appropriation was $8,000 and this supplementary estimate of $800 is to complete the work.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why build wharfs up there ?

Mr. FIELDING. Because we wish to be fair to all parts of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have urged upon the government for many years to be fair to the district in the St. Lawrence, the township of Howe island which is thickly settled with farmers, principally lower Canadians who settled there many years ago. The government had never spent a dollar to build wharfs for them, nor will it give them a ferry or build them a bridge. Yet, the government can go up to Lake Temiskaming and build wharfs there.

Mr. FIELDING. Ferries and bridges would rightly come within our jurisdiction but wharfs are our legitimate business.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are about a dozen wharfs around this Howe island but all built by the people. At my urgent request the government has promised again and again to look into the building of a wharf there, but it has not been done. The Dominion government control the river there, but they will not build a bridge to connect the island with the mainland.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a provincial work.

Mr. TAYLOR. No, it is a Dominion work. The Dominion controls the navigation.

Mr. FIELDING. A bridge within the limits of a province, is ordinarily considered a provincial work. An inter-provincial bridge sometimes has claims upon the Dominion, but an ordinary highway bridge entirely within the province would be considered a local work. Of course, it is not always easy to lay down the line between local and Dominion authority, but I think the definition I give, so far as it goes, is correct.

Georgian bay and Pointe au Baril route—improvement of the Devil's Elbow channel between Parry Sound and Kilarney $750.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. This is the last item of the Ontario group. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is nothing in these supplementary estimates for Toronto harbour. This is a matter which has been again and again brought up in this House, by the late Mr. Clarke and also by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) and the hon. member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp). The necessity for the work is beyond question. The government engineers have, from time to time so certified. The particular work to which I refer is the straightening of the River Don and the dredging of the harbour. When the main estimates were under consideration the attention of the minister was called to this work and he promised to take the matter into consideration. Since that time a deputation consisting of the mayor and others from the city of Toronto have waited upon the Minister of Public Works and made out what appears to be a very good case for an appropriation for this work. The minister again on that occasion promised to consider it, and the deputation were led to believe that something would be done, or at least considered. Now the supplementary estimates are completed and nothing appears. From year to year, in the past, amounts have appeared in the estimates for this work, but the work has never been done and the money has never been expended. I desire to warn the government now that Toronto harbour is a government work the same as Quebec, Halifax or any other, and the harbour is rapidly filling up for want of dredging. Material is carried down in large quantities by the River Don and deposited in the harbour. It is estimated by the government's own engineer that enough silt sufficient to cover five acres to the depth of 10 feet is deposited in the harbour every year by the action of the River Don. The result is that the eastern part of the harbour is no longer a harbour—it has ceased to be one. The slips in the eastern part of the harbour are

kept open, where they are kept open at all, by dredging carried on by the city council and the harbour commissioners of Toronto. The government has spent no money on that work. The work will have to be undertaken some day and it will cost a great deal of money because of the delay which has taken place. I had hoped that these supplementary estimates would contain some appropriation for that work. However, if the supplementary estimates are not all down I hope the government will consider the matter and the Minister of Public Works will give it the consideration he promised the deputation should be given.

Mr. FIELDING. The estimates we have under consideration, I would remind my hon. friend, are only for the fiscal year which has now nearly expired—they are simply to close the transactions of the year. The appropriations for the coming year do not appear in these estimates. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) will turn to the main estimates for the fiscal year beginning 1st July next, he will see considerable appropriations for Toronto harbour. On page 54 of the main estimates for the coming year is one appropriation for Toronto harbour, eastern entrance, $28,000, and one for the extension of the Island breakwater $60,000. I do not know whether these cover what my hon. friend has in mind, but they are certainly two estimates for Toronto harbour.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I am aware of the fact referred to by the minister. But these works are entirely different from the one to which I refer. The work I refer to is the straightening of the River Don and the dredging of the main harbour. Now that the hon. minister has mentioned those works I think it only right to say that although they were provided for in the original estimates the contract is not yet let. I believe that on no less than two occasions tenders have been called for, once during the latter part of November last and once in the early part of January. Tenders were called for in the usual way and submitted to the department, but for some reason that is yet unexplained the contract was not let, the tenders were returned to the tenderers and in so far as I am aware these works have not been undertaken to this day.

Roads and bridges—Ottawa city bridges over the river Ottawa, the slides and the Rideau canal and approaches thereto, ordinary repairs and maintenance, $2,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why does not the province of Ontario look after these bridges ?

Mr. FIELDING. These are over Dominion works, over our own works. If we cut a canal or build a railway, or do anything which interferes with the highway, we have to build a bridge across it.

Mr. TAYLOR. These bridges are not over the Rideau canal, but over the Ottawa river.

Mr. FIELDING. And over slides and booms. These are Dominion works. We have interfered with the natural highway.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand this vote to be divided between slides and booms, the Rideau canal and bridges over the river Ottawa. I believe the government have built bridges across the Ottawa river independently of the Rideau canal. Why did not they ask the province of Ontario to do that ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Ottawa river is the dividing line between two great provinces, and the bridge there is an interprovincial bridge. This is somewhat different from a bridge entirely within the province.

Dredging—Dredge vessel repairs, $25,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is this for ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is for general repairs to dredges all over the Dominion.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much was taken for this last year ?

Mr. FIELDING. $61,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why an increased expenditure of $25,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. The dredges are getting older and the repair work is naturally more expensive than it was in their earlier record.

Mr. DANIEL. How many dredges has the government, and where are they placed ?

Mr. TAYLOR. This simply applies to dredges of the Department of Public Works and not to those of the Department of Railways and Canals or the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. FIELDING. I am told that there are fifteen dredges, besides the tugs and scows connected therewith. All these are entirely within the Department of Public Works.

Mr. DANIEL. The dredges that are used in the maritime provinces and the St. Lawrence all belong to the Department of Public Works ?

Mr. FIELDING. The ship channel dredges are now attached to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but all the maritime province dredges are included in this statement.

Mr. DANIEL. How many dredges are there in the maritime provinces ?

Mr. FIELDING. Seven.

Mr. DANIEL. Could the hon. minister say where they are located ?

Mr. FIELDING. The 'Canada' is at Lockport, the 'St. Lawrence' in the Restigouche river, or is about to be employed there, the 'Cape Breton' is at Sydney, the 'George Mackenzie' is at Shippegan, the 'Prince Edward Island' at Charlottetown,

the 'New Dominion' at St. John, and the 'New Brunswick' on the St. John river.

New dredge for Prince Edward Island, $15,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Will the hon. minister explain this ?

Mr. FIELDING. This is to provide a new dredge for Prince Edward Island, which is under construction at Toronto. The contract for the dredge, including dredge, scows, &c., is $65,000. There was an appropriation of $25,000 for the current year ; we are asking now $15,000, which will be $40,000, and there are $25,000 in the main estimates for the coming year, which will cover the cost of this new dredge.

Mr. LEFURGEY. You say she is to cost $65,000 ? Is she being built by contract ?

Mr. FIELDING. She is being built at the Bertram Engine Works in Toronto.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When is she to be finished ?

Mr. FIELDING. She is expected to be finished this summer.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When will she be available for work ?

Mr. FIELDING. She will be available for work during the latter part of this season.

New dredging plant, maritime provinces, $160,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. minister if this item refers to the completion of the new dredge 'W. S. Fielding' ?

Mr. FIELDING. Part of this applies to the dredge which bears that name, a name which was placed on that dredge by the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte).

An hon. MEMBER. Is it out of repair ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; she is an entirely new dredge. She has not yet gone to work. She is a pretty expensive article, and I am sorry that I have such an expensive article bearing my name, but they say she is to do very good work. This includes the amount required for finishing that dredge and also for another dredge that is to be called the 'King Edward,' which is under construction at the Polson Iron Works at Toronto.

Mr. DANIEL. When will the 'W. S. Fielding' be finished ?

Mr. FIELDING. She is approaching completion now, and will likely be finished in a short time.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Where is she being built ?

Mr. FIELDING. At the government shipyards, Sorel.

Mr. DANIEL. Where will the 'W. S. Fielding' be placed at work ?

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a matter which is still not decided. I do not know whether it is the dredge or the name but there are numerous applicants for her.

Mr. DANIEL. When the construction of this dredge was being provided for, I believe the Minister of Public Works stated that she would be able to do some work at St. John harbour. It requires a special kind of dredge to do the work there and the then Minister of Public Works stated that this dredge would be suitable for that work and that she would be sent to St. John harbour when completed. Is that still the intention of the department ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is not the intention to regard this dredge as being built for any particular place ; it is built for service in the maritime provinces generally and it certainly would be capable of doing the work at St. John. I understand, however, that other provision is being made for certain dredging at St. John harbour, which will not require the services of this dredge.

Mr. DANIEL. I am aware of that. Can the minister say what action has been already taken with regard to that other dredge to which he refers ?

Mr. FIELDING. There have been some negotiations which I think are intended to make provision for the work which the hon. gentleman and I have in mind. However, it has not yet been finally arranged, although it is likely to be arranged very shortly.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister think it will be arranged early enough to have the work done this season.

Mr. FIELDING. No. The quantity of dredging there is very considerable and I do not imagine it will all be completed this season. I would not like to be too definite, because it is a matter which has engaged the attention of the Minister of Public Works and except in a general way I am not familiar with it.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. What is the cost of the 'King Edward' that is being built by the Polsons.

Mr. FIELDING. According to the information furnished me it will cost $220,000.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Was the contract let by tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Was the construction of the dredge which is being built by the Bertram Company let by tender ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. How many tenders were put in for these two dredges, and by whom ?

Mr. FIELDING. The deputy informs me that speaking from memory he thinks three tenders were put in, all from Toronto firms. There are only a few people in Canada who can do work of that character.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I am aware of that.

Mr. WILMOT. Is it the intention of the government to do any dredging in the St. John river this year ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a dredge engaged in the St. John river every year and I think she will be continued this year.

Mr. WILMOT. I directed the attention of the Minister of Public Works to some dredging which is necessary to do on the Washdemoak river, one of the tributaries of the St. John. It is a very important and necessary work and would not be very costly.

Mr. FIELDING. Was there not some dredging done there last year ?

Mr. WILMOT. Yes, there was some dredging done in front of the wharf and it has been found very useful. The work I speak of is required in the channel of the river, and it is situated at a point near where there are quite a number of people living. The vessels that ply along the coast have too large a draught to be able to navigate there under present conditions without unloading part of their cargo, which of course, causes great inconvenience as well as loss of money. I have already drawn the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the matter and he informed me that he would direct his engineer to make a report. I ask now if the engineer has acted on the minister's instructions ?

Mr. FIELDING. I will see that a note is taken of the request made by my hon. friend (Mr. Wilmot) and I will draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to it. I am not able to give any information as to that point at present.

Mr. WILMOT. I wish also to draw the attention of the government to the fact that there are several points on the main river St. John which ought to be attended to. I have complained to this government and also to the Conservative government, that I never saw a Minister of the Public Works or any of the chiefs of the department visit the St. John river which is one of the chief rivers in the Dominion. The ministers seem to depend altogether on the opinion of the local officers, and I would earnestly urge on the government and on the Public Works Department that they should pay more attention to that important river.

Telegraph lines, Qu'Apelle, Edmonton and Moosejaw, (Wood Mountain section), $4,500.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the government own that telegraph line ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How many miles of telegraph lines have we there ?

Mr. FIELDING. The line from Qu'Appelle to Edmonton, 625 miles, and the Wood Mountain section, 90½ miles.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that the total number of miles owned by the government in the Territories ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are one or two small loop lines in addition to that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is that the only portion of Canada the government own telegraph lines in ?

Mr. FIELDING. No ; we have telegraph lines over the coast of the maritime provinces, and also in the Yukon.

Deep Waterways Commission, $7,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is to meet the expenses of what is called the International Waterways Commission.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount first voted ?

Mr. FIELDING. There has been no appropriation hitherto for it. It is a work that has been undertaken since the last session of parliament, and the commission has been engaged for some time past.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the men who compose the commisison ?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. King, the chief astronomer, Mr. J. B. Maybee, K.C., Mr. Louis Coste, C.E., and Mr. Thomas Coté, secretary.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are they now ?

Mr. FIELDING. They have been in the United States, but they have returned to Ottawa now.

Mr. BERGERON. What were they there for ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is a joint commission for the United States and Canada, with reference to all the adjacent waters of the two countries.

Mr. DANIEL. Can the minister state whether the St. John river, the boundary line between New Brunswick and Maine, is to be included in the investigation of this commission ?

Mr. FIELDING. There has been some question as to whether the St. John river would come within the scope of this commission, and the matter is now engaging attention, but no conclusion has been reached.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a report ?

Mr. FIELDING. Not yet. They have not been long enough employed for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Will there be a report?

Mr. FIELDING. In due course there will be.

Mr. TAYLOR. Parliament was not consulted about this.

Mr. FIELDING. Matters arise occasionally on which it is necessary to take action without waiting to consult parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. Did this arise with the American government ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think the commission was at the instance of the American government ?

Chief engineers' office—salaries of engineers, draughtsman, clerks and messengers, $11,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is this for ?

Mr. FIELDING. The business of the country is increasing, and a larger staff is required.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount voted last year for that branch ?

Mr. FIELDING. $73,200.

Mr. TAYLOR. We were passing estimates in July or August last year, and the government must have known how much it would take to run that staff for the balance of the year.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must remember that while parliament did not prorogue until August, the estimates were prepared long before that.

Mr. TAYLOR. But an engineer, if he is competent should be able to estimate within a few dollars what it would cost to run his department for the year.

Mr. FIELDING. In proportion to the total expenditure the excess is not very large.

Mr. BERGERON. When the minister of a department goes before Council and asks for money, does not the Minister of Finance ask questions to find out whether the expenditure is necessary or not ?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, yes.

Mr. BERGERON. More than that, the Minister of Finance used to cut out some expenditures and act as if he had charge of the treasury of the country. There is no doubt that we are voting very large amounts of money that should have been thought of when the main estimates were made up. There seems to be a lack of business management on the part of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure that some of these votes are not due to the fact that the Minister of Finance is apt to be stingy and to try to cut down some of the estimates; for the minister affected comes back at the end of the year and says, you would not give it to me at the beginning of the year, and I must have it now.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the rates on these lines ?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a regular rate from Ottawa by the Canadian Pacific Railway to Ashcroft, and from Ashcroft to Dawson City, the rate is $3 for ten words. It was higher and has been reduced.

Mr. BLAIN. What are the rates on the lines in the Northwest Territories ?

Mr. FIELDING. Over the Canadian Pacific Railway to points in the Territories, 50 cents for ten words. On messages from here we have to pay the Canadian Pacific Railway rates from Qu'Appelle.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the line made by Mr. Charleson ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes; the Yukon line.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did it cost altogether ?

Mr. FIELDING. About $700,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Does it pay expenses ?

Mr. FIELDING. No; the deficit is about $50,000 a year.

Mr. TAYLOR. This $43,000 is all for working expenses ?

Mr. FIELDING. It is for maintenance, including repairs and operating.

Mr. TAYLOR. How much is taken in the main estimates ?

Mr. FIELDING. $183,000. We are asking $43,000 more.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who does the disbursing or the keeping of the accounts of this Yukon line ? Is it Mr. Charleson ?

Mr. FIELDING. No; he was employed on the construction. This comes under the general supervision of the officer in charge of our telegraph service at Ottawa, Mr. Keeley.

Mr. TAYLOR. How comes it that he asked for $183,000 last year and now wants $41,000 more ?

Mr. FIELDING. The old arrears on maintenance have something to do with this.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What do the repairs cost each year ?

Mr. FIELDING. I have not that information just now, but will get it later on. The repairs are done by our own officials, and are included in the general charge of maintenance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This looks a very large item for a newly constructed line.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been running six years.

Mr. BERGERON. Is not that the line which a company offered to build for nothing and to carry besides government messages free? Was not that shown by the correspondence between Mr. Blair and some English company when it was taken out of his hands by Mr. Tarte and built at the expense of the government? Now, it has cost over $700,000, and there is a deficit on it every year of $50,000.

Mr. FIELDING. It would not follow that the company which made the proposal would have been able to do the good things they promised. Companies are usually generous in their offers. Mr. Tarte's view was that the construction of this line was of great importance to Canada, and that we could not afford to let it go into the hands of a company, which might not maintain it efficiently.

To pay J. C. Taché for special services as district superintendent of telegraphs at Chicoutimi from January 1 to June 30, 1905, $150.

Mr. BERGERON. What is his salary?

Mr. FIELDING. His regular salary is $1,750, and he is allowed these $300 extra for this service, increasing his salary to $2,050. He could not get an increase according to his rank without a special vote, and that is why it is done in this way.

Franchise Act—to complete cost of voters' lists for election of 1904, $10,000; new edition of Electoral Atlas, $3,500; $13,500.

Mr. FIELDING. When this item was up before I was asked one or two questions with regard to the electoral atlas that is being printed.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that be distributed to members before the end of the election?

Mr. FIELDING. The King's Printer says he is not quite sure that it will be completed before the end of the session but it is distributed to the members. I was asked whether the lists under the Franchise Act were printed every year. It is not the practice to print these every year although the Act may seem to contemplate that, but the custom is to print them at any time when there is an expectation of an election.

Mr. BERGERON. A few days ago the Printing Committee had the pleasure of visiting the Printing Bureau and through the courtesy of Dr. Dawson and his assistants we were shown everything that could be seen there. I wish to call the attention of the minister to the inadequacy of the space in that building. It is entirely too small for the work done there and I think the public service would have better results if the establishment was enlarged so that all the printing for the public service could be done there. Take the printing of the lists. That is an immense work and that building I think should be at least double the size it is to-day. As we are spending a lot of money—my hon. friend speaks of the growing time—I think money voted for that purpose would be usefully spent and although the building was enlarged last year the enlargement is hardly noticeable, it is so small. The government have a good deal of ground there and I think it would be good policy to enlarge the place as soon as possible. If my hon. friend asks the opinion of Dr. Dawson he will be convinced that the sooner that is done the better.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I presume when the lists are sent down from the various provinces, they come direct to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and he sends them to the King's Printer to have them printed. I do not suppose that after they are printed from the original copy they come under the supervision of the King's Printer himself. There are certain proof-readers no doubt, but what I wish to draw to the attention of the Finance Minister is in connection with the lists for Manitoba for the last election. There were a great many typographical errors; in fact so many that there was a suspicion in the minds of many of my own friends that they were not at all accidental. Of course I am not blaming the King's Printer for this, but some of my supporters desired me to bring it up in the House, because they thought some person, possibly in the printing office, must have been tampering with them and that an arrangement existed. For instance in the particular district where I reside, there was a list of 11 names shown to me. All these 11 names were typographical errors; instead of being put down as residing in 15-16, they were put in 16-17. This gave a good excuse to the officers who prepared the list for scoring these men off their own township and many of them had to travel many miles from their own township although their own polls were within a mile or two of their homes and when they got to these other polls perhaps ten or fifteen miles away, they found their names had not been transferred. Out of these 11 names 10 were Conservative, and the only one that was a Liberal was not scored off. I thought I would bring this up because really there were a great many errors of this character in connection with the printing of the municipal list in our province.

Mr. FIELDING. These errors are most annoying and it is very difficult to give any explanation of such a statement as the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) has mentioned. But I am assured by the King's Printer it is hardly possible that there should be any intention of any wrong-doing in the matter. The lists are

read very carefully, or should be, by capable proof-readers, by reliable men who have been in the service of the department a great many years, and the King's Printer feels the utmost confidence in their good intentions. If the error has occurred some one is to blame.

Mr. BERGERON. Their eyesight is failing.

Mr. FIELDING. They are not as young as they used to be, but it is hardly possible they could have any conception of who the people up there were.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Unless there was some one to post them.

Mr. FIELDING. That is still more difficult of conception.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is quite possible.

Mr. FIELDING. If any one was unfair enough to do it they would hardly go to the Printing Bureau and no one there would permit such a thing to be done. It is a blunder and it is unfortunate it has happened, but it is hardly possible it could be done by design. It is carelessness, but I am sure it is an accident.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It is strange it should be confined to the one party.

Mr. FIELDING. The King's Printer has never had it brought to his notice before and has had no opportunity of investigating it.

Mr. BLAIN. On the question of expenditure for printing voters' lists it seems to me that an arrangement could be entered into between the Dominion government and the local governments that would avoid the expenditure of such a large amount of money for printing Dominion lists. The minister will keep in mind the fact that the list used, in Ontario for example, for the local is the same as for the Dominion. These lists are printed every year by the municipalities and are used for the municipal elections and used as well for the provincial election when it is held every four years. I cannot understand why an agreement should not be entered into between the government of Canada and the local governments so that the list as printed by the municipalities, which is after all the list used in the election, should not be used without being sent to Ottawa to be printed at all. We have these lists printed every year and it seems to me a useless expenditure of money that the very same names should be transmitted to Ottawa, printed in new form and sent back to the different constituencies when they are already in printed form.

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion is worthy of consideration. I am inclined to think the provincial or municipal printing of lists is not so general as my hon. friend thinks. He is particularly speaking no doubt from his own observation in Ontario. I think I am correct in stating that in some province the municipalities do not print their lists. I know I have seen in rural districts, written lists posted up and I dare say the municipalities would not care to incur the expense of printing. If it would be possible to bring about harmonious action between the Dominion, provincial and municipal authorities there might be much convenience. I am not advised as to whether it is possible to arrange this.

Mr. BERGERON. In Quebec the lists are not printed, but I do not see if they are printed in Ontario that there is any use in doing it a second time. The lists might be printed in provinces or municipalities where they are not printed. The printing of lists in Ontario, where there are 90 counties, is a useless expense.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is one feature connected with the printing of the lists to which I would call attention, that is the form in which the lists are got up. Would it not be possible to have them made up in a form more convenient for the use of candidates and others ? Of course it may be more convenient for the Printing Bureau to get them out in long sheets, but they are rather inconvenient for handling.

Mr. FIELDING. The printing in blank form would be convenient for the candidates and the public certainly. But it would involve more cost and more time in the printing.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Were many of the lists preparatory to the last Dominion elections printed outside ?

Mr. FIELDING. About forty of them. The details are given in the report of the King's printer.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the minister know what provinces they represented ?

Mr. FIELDING. They were mainly of Ontario and Quebec constituencies.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Were they printed in one particular newspaper office ?

Mr. FIELDING. They were scattered among a number of offices.

Mr. BERGERON. Liberal, I suppose ?

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt. The others would not do work for this wicked government.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—harbours and rivers—Ontario—Port Arthur and Fort Willian—harbour and river improvements, $26,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. This item was allowed to stand because an hon. gentleman who

wished to discuss it was not present. He is not present this evening, but, with the same understanding as in Dunnville matter, we will allow the item to pass—that is that on some Ontario item in the main estimates the discussion may take place.

Mr. FIELDING. That will be quite satisfactory.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—further amount required for steam communication between St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth, $521.80.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a balance due on a contract for steamer service. Some difference arose as to whether the service had been satisfactorily performed and the minister delayed payment. But this does not change the amount of the contract.

Miscellaneous—miscellaneous printing—further amount required, $12,000.

Mr. FIELDING. The main appropriation was $40,000. This item to some extent represents the arrears—that is they have had to pay at the beginning of the year some portion of the previous year's outlay. Then the departmental reports are increasing in bulk, and besides the cost of printing generally is increasing. The wages were increased during the last fiscal year.

Inspection of staples—further amount required on account of wages and contingencies, $7,500.

Mr. FIELDING. The present vote $60,000 will be sufficient to meet the expenditure for the current fiscal year. It is difficult to estimate what the cost of grain inspection will be. Nearly the whole amount is repaid in fees.

Mr. LAKE. Have any additional assistant warehouse commissioners been appointed or are they to be appointed ?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give that information to-night. But I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would renew his question, and to have the Minister of Trade and Commerce furnish a written reply.

Prince Edward Island Railway—Working expenses, $60,000.

Railways and Canals—chargeable to collection of revenue—railways—Intercolonial Railway working expenses, $2,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will have to ask the minister to allow this item to stand as the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Haggart) is not present. This is a large item.

Mr. FIELDING. I admit that the amount is large. It represents the working expenses which increase of course, with the volume of business. The receipts no not always increase proportionately, I am sorry to say. But the business is growing and the increased cost of operation must be provided for. This amount will be necessary to pay the working expenses for the current year. If my hon. friend wishes the item to stand, I am quite willing.

Unprovided items, 1903-4—To cover unprovided items, 1903-4, as per Auditor General's Report, page C—4, $280,551.40.

Mr. FIELDING. This is not an appropriation of money, but a mere formal vote which the Auditor General likes to have at the close of the year to wind up the accounts. It arises in this way : Appropriations are made to the department for the different branches of its business. It sometimes happens that the minister, the accountants and the Auditor General do not exactly agree as to the particular manner in which charges should be made. For instance, the minister has an expenditure charged in one way ; the Auditor General makes up his mind that he will charge it against another. The result is that one particular branch is exceeded while in the other there is an excess. This is not an authority for the payment of a dollar, but the Auditor General has asked that a formal appropriation be made in this way to wind up the accounts.

I understand that, with the exception of the two railroad items, we have disposed of the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30 next. I desire to express my appreciation of the assistance I have received from my hon. friends on the other side in passing these items.

Mr. BERGERON. We understand that we can discuss some of these matters when we go into the main estimates later.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly ; any of them.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business are we to take up on Monday ?

Mr. FIELDING. We have happily disposed in Committee of Supply of all the items in the supplementary estimates for the current year, save two, which have been held over and which we would like the House to consider again in committee on Monday. After that we will endeavour to have concurrence and facilitate the passing of a Supply Bill as rapidly as possible. That being disposed of, we will proceed with the main estimates. I am not quite clear as to which particular department we will take up, but we will be governed by anything that may arise, and if there be any objection to that, we will endeavour to meet the views of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BERGERON. What about the Autonomy Bill ?

Mr. FIELDING. That is arranged.

Mr. R. BORDEN. I suppose the government has made arrangements to have the Supply Bill assented to properly.

Mr. FIELDING. We will have to consider that carefully. The Senate is to meet on the 6th, and as soon as we get through here I hope to find that all the necessary facilities are provided.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 5, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

TRADING STAMPS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. Is the government or the Prime Minister aware that the leading boards of trade of the country have adopted resolutions asking for the abolition of trading stamps ?
2. Has the government or any of the members of the ministry promised a deputation of the merchants of this country to bring in a Bill prohibiting the circulation and the sale of trading stamps ?
3. If so, will that Bill be introduced during the present session ?
4. Is the government aware that this system of trading stamps is a heavy tax upon the general trade of the country ?
5. Has the government, or has any of its members, had interviews or conversations on this subject with the attorneys of one or the other of the trading stamp companies ?
6. Does the government or the Prime Minister know that the attorneys and lawyers of the principal trading stamp company, the Traders' Advertising Company, are the honourable the Minister of Justice and the honourable the Speaker of the Senate ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister).

1. The government is aware that many boards of trade of the country have adopted resolutions asking for the abolition of trading stamps.
2. The government has promised a deputation that it would consider the advisability of introducing a Bill to prohibit the circulation and sale of trading stamps.
3. That matter is still under consideration.
4. The government is aware that it is alleged that the trading stamp system is a heavy tax upon the trade of the country.
5. The government has had a conference with parties representing both sides of the question.

Mr. BERGERON.

6. The government is not aware that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) or the Speaker of the Senate is attorney for the Trading Stamp Company. The government is aware that Hon. Mr. Dandurand, the Speaker of the Senate, and the firm to which the Minister of Justice belongs have acted before the courts of the province of Quebec, and now, I believe, before the Supreme Court, with regard to the legality of legislation passed by the provincial legislature of the province of Quebec on the subject of trading stamps. I am advised by the Speaker of the Senate that he has declined the application of the company to represent them with regard to federal legislation. Owing to the illness of the Minister of Justice, I am not in a position to communicate with him on the subject.

NORTHERN ALBERTA—STEAMER SERVICE.

Mr. AMES—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. How many miles of navigable waterway (suitable for light draft steamers) are there within the northern part of the proposed new province of Alberta ?
2. How many steamboats were engaged in this service during 1904 ?
3. What was the freight tonnage and the number of passengers carried by said steamboats ?
4. What is the tonnage, horse-power and length of beam of each steamboat engaged upon this service ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has no official information as to the number of miles of navigable water there may be in the northern part of the new province of Alberta, unless such information is to be found in the reports of surveyors. The matter will be investigated, and if such information is found it will be brought down. The government has no official information of the number of steamers engaged in this service for the year 1904.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—SALARIES.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the commandant of the Royal Military College shall not exceed $3,200 a year, and that the salaries of the staff adjutant, professors, instructors, assistant instructors and staff, shall be fixed, and may be readjusted from time to time, by the Governor in Council.

He said : I beg to inform the House that I have obtained the consent of His Excellency the Governor General to the introduction of this resolution.

Motion agreed to.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT—PERMANENT FORCE.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Militia Act, and to provide that the permanent force may be increased to five thousand men.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. While we are on that motion, it might be well for the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) to give us some information concerning the reports that are abroad of the diminution of the militia force. I see that the minister is taking steps to increase the permanent force. I understood that that was opposed to his policy, and that he was in favour of increasing the militia. What does this mean ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In these growing days it is necessary, not only to increase the militia, but to increase the permanent force. I will give a full explanation of the point when this resolution is taken up for consideration. With reference to the question which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has put, I may say that my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) informed me a moment ago that he was going to ask that question, and I requested him to wait until to-morrow, when I expect to have a memorandum from the chief of the general staff, General Lake, which I will read to the House, for I think the matter is of sufficient importance to demand such a course being taken. In the meantime, I wish to say a single word, and that is that the so-called reduction of the militia is not a reduction in reality. There has been a reduction, I believe, in what is called the training establishment, but there has been no reduction in the general establishment of the active militia. I will give a full explanation to-morrow of what has been actually done.

Hon. DAVID TISDALE. In the meantime may I ask the Minister of Militia a question, for I confess I do not understand his explanation ? If it is true, as stated in the newspapers, that the minister is reducing the strength of nearly all the regiments or battalions, how does it come that this is not a decrease of the whole ? Is he increasing the number of battalions or regiments so as to keep up the standard number of men ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The number of the active militia is increasing all the time, and the actual peace establishment—or the war establishment, either—has not been diminished ; it is the training establishment that all the talk is about. I do not wish to go into that point now. But perhaps I ought to add this word, that, as compared with the training establishment of 1904, there has been practically no change at all. But to-morrow I will give full details as to what has happened.

Mr. TISDALE. Meantime, I would like to understand the point that the minister has made. Possibly I was a little stupid at first, but I think I see now the distinction the minister makes, and I would like to be sure. He is drawing a distinction between the popular idea of the strength of the militia and those that have been trained. Is that the idea ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is the idea.

Mr. TISDALE. Still, the standard of 36,000 or 40,000 is not increased——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is considerably over 40,000 now.

Mr. TISDALE. But the idea used to be that it was necessary to train that many. Now as I understand, although you keep up the nominal strength you propose by regulation to say that only so many of them shall train, even though the regiment may be filled up to full strength. I remember once having that very question brought up at camp. I had a regiment of the authorized strength and they were not going to pay it. I declined to take any pay at all, and I said I would arrange the pay and would march the men home, because I was within the establishment. I understand that you propose by regulation to say that although you have 40,000 men in the establishment you will not allow more than 30,000 or 35,000 to train.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A certain number.

Mr. TISDALE. You will not allow a commanding officer, even though he is able to keep up to the full establishment, to train them all.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sorry the discussion could not be allowed to go over until to-morrow, because it is a little awkward to give an answer on a technical subject, which is entirely in the hands of the military members of the Militia Council, without having the papers before me. I expected to have them here and they should be here.

Mr. TISDALE. It will do to-morrow.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like in this connection to remind my hon. friend that two or three years ago there was a reduction of the training establishment which was recommended by the then military adviser of the government.

Mr. TISDALE. For that year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. For that year, and I wish to say with regard to this alleged reduction of the establishment, that it is simply a reduction in the training establishment for the year and as a mat-

ter of fact so far as the city establishment is concerned, there is no reduction this year, but authority for the training of even the number fixed must be obtained from year to year. That is to say authority must be given for the actual number to be trained each year before the training takes place.

REPORT PRESENTED.

List of vessels registered in Marine Department of Canada as on the 31st of December, 1904.—Mr. Prefontaine.

SUPPLY—PATENTS TO HALFBREEDS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House goes into supply, I would like to ask the First Minister if the Minister of the Interior has informed him as to whether or not patents in respect of the half-breed claims, about which we have been talking on two or three occasions, are being issued or whether the minister took any steps to delay the issue until the papers were brought down ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give any information to my hon. friend to-day, but I can inquire and give an answer to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway—working expenses, $2,000,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In view of the fact that we cannot possibly prorogue before the 1st of July,—there is no suggestion that we can do so—and of the fact that it has become expedient to provide for certain expenditures for the current year, I would propose, with the consent of the House, to take up the two items, 109 and 110, working expenses, Intercolonial Railway, $2,000,000 and working expenses Prince Edward Island Railway, $60,000. If the House would agree to facilitate matters we could have a Supply Bill passed in order to provide for current expenditure, the whole of the supplementaries having now been passed with the exception of these two items. I am sorry to say they are important items, and I am also sorry to say that the Minister of Railways is not here to give such a full explanation as he should on a matter of this kind. He intended to do so before his departure, but he had to leave on a domestic errand of some importance to him and he cannot be here before Thursday of this week. In the meantime I may say to the hon. gentlemen that this first item requires $2,000,000 extra money for working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. In the supplementary estimates of the current year, there will be a similar item of $1,200,000 so that upon this occasion the Minister of Railways proposes to make the statement which he has to make every year on the policy of the government with regard to the Intercolonial Railway and the management of the railway, so the House will be given ample opportunity to discuss not only the expenditure of the coming year, but the expenditure of the past year also. If this be agreeable to my hon. friends we will take up these items and I shall give what little information I have to-day on the subject.

Mr. FOSTER. This item was up the other day. and was allowed to stand at the request of the Minister of Railways who was not then ready to make a statement. He promised to be ready in a week or so and to make his statement. The great trouble about having the discussion on an item in the next supplementaries is that we have no knowledge at all as to when they will be down. If we are to judge from the general actions of the government they would leave it until about two days before prorogation and bring it down when the House is tired out, few members are here and it is almost useless to attempt to criticise it. If the Prime Minister could give some assurance that the supplementaries would be down in reasonable time and that the minister would take this up amongst the first items, so that on such an important matter as this we might have the House as fresh as possible for the discussion, I do not want to interfere with the Governor General's arrangements.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The request of my hon. friend is perfectly reasonable and if he will take my word I will give him positive assurance that we will take the item in ample time to have full discussion. I cannot say to-day exactly when the supplementaries will be brought down, but it will be at an early day, probably in the course of two weeks. If my hon. friend will take my assurance I will give all opportunity for discussing it. I have in fact requested the Minister of Railways to cut short his visit although it is important, connected with a domestic occasion, and he will be back at the end of the week.

Mr. FOSTER. Under that state of circumstances I do not think we will trouble the Prime Minister to give a partial explanation. I am quite sure he would rather be out of the explaining which this requires. We will try and get the explanation much more fully from the Minister of Railways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection to that.

Prince Edward Island Railway working expenses, $60,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The same thing applies to that I suppose ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Some resolutions reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Civil government—Department of the Interior—salaries, including J. J. McArthur and C. A. Bigger, at $2,300 each, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $166,254.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure whether the subject to which I desire to draw attention comes under the Department of the Interior or the Department of Indian Affairs, but to make sure, I will take it up on this item. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will remember that when he was putting through these estimates, the Minister of the Interior at that time being absent, he took some items for promotions in the Indian Department—I think it was—named the person to whom the promotion was to be given and laid down the policy that if he had arrived at the maximum of his salary promotion was his due. This sum was named in order to provide for that promotion. The principle was that the person should have arrived at the maximum, and the statement was made that in this case he had arrived at the maximum. That was information which I think was not correct. The gentleman who was mentioned by the Prime Minister as having arrived at the maximum has not arrived at the maximum by quite a considerable amount, but there are gentlemen who are senior in point of service who have arrived at the maximum, and I imagine this was a case of mistake and that another name should be substituted for the one that was mentioned. Clearly the Prime Minister was explicit in the fact that it was amongst other things length of service and having arrived at the maximum which rendered one eligible for promotion, and the circumstances being equal, the man who had arrived at the maximum should have the promotion rather than the man who had not. I ask the Prime Minister to make a note of it, so that nothing shall be done in the premises until it is looked into to see that a mistake is not being made. Just at the moment I cannot think of the gentleman's name who has come to the maximum of his class and who is older in service than the one whose name is mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: This is in the Indian Department, and I was acting minister at the time and received the instructions given to me. Since there has been a Minister of the Interior I have not looked into the matter. This vote can stand and I will get the information in the meantime.

Steamboat service between Canada and Mexico, $50,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Does any one know what the condition of the Canada-Mexico service is now? It has been an appearing and vanishing quantity for some time; I do not know in which category it is now.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That matter is still under consideration. Tenders were first asked for a service with Cuba and Mexico; but the government of Mexico refused to subsidize any line which would call at Cuba. Therefore the question had to be considered as to whether there should be two different services, one for Cuba and one for Mexico. We have not yet received the last answer from the republic of Mexico as to what it intends to do in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister's explanation was that there were two services contemplated, one on the Pacific coast and one on the Atlantic coast. I did not hear him say anything with reference to Cuba. I think my hon. friend has got the children a little mixed.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No. It is a fact that two services were proposed, one for the Atlantic coast and one for the Pacific coast; but there was nothing completed as regards a Pacific coast service.

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys, construction and other expenses, $290,500.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the Prime Minister now would give some information as to what results have been reached by this National Transcontinental Railway Commission in its surveys. The Prime Minister will remember that on several occasions we recounted for his information what we gathered from the newspapers, but could not get from official sources. My hon. friend used to discount these sources of information somewhat, but they were all we could rely on. By this time I should think that we might expect the officers to give us a pretty good idea of the grades, length of line, curves, and what kind of working railway line could be constructed over the parts that had been surveyed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to say I cannot to-day give any more information than I have myself. The Minister of Railways, I think, has laid one or two reports of the commission on the table of the House. I do not know if my hon. friend has had an opportunity of reading them. I have not, but I think they are merely technical and do not go into that class of information which my hon. friend desires to have, at least as to the character of the country. As to the location of the line I think they are very minute and circumstantial and give a good account of the country, but I must say frankly to my hon. friend that I have not myself read the reports, I have only casual information as to their contents and I would not like to give information except what I have read myself. My hon. friend will agree that that is the proper course to follow.

Mr. FOSTER. If a man has not information he cannot give it. We will live in hope.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, my hon. friend will get it in print by and by.

Cattle quarantine—further amount required, $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to cattle quarantine an extra expenditure has already been made of some $29,000. The right hon. Prime Minister will recollect that ever since this parliament has been a parliament and we have had quarantine established and have looked a little after the health of animals the point has been pressed upon the government of paying for animals ordered to be slaughtered by veterinaries under the direction of the government. My right hon. friend will remember too that we have always been very cautious as to how far that principle was admitted, because, if it were fully admitted, no one could tell to what extent the expenditure could go, and it is also open to very great abuse as my right hon. friend will very readily see. Parliament had never sanctioned and no government had ever undertaken the policy of paying for the slaughter, of horses and cattle afflicted with certain diseases. It is a fact, I think, that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) takes a vote for cattle quarantine, and I think he feels that he is authorized to make certain payments by Order in Council, but I think the right hon. Prime Minister will agree with me that no new policy should be inaugurated in the way of the extension of these payments to such a degree that may entail paying out such enormous sums of money. By an extension made by Order in Council such as never was contemplated by parliament—and amongst all the discussion never received the assent of parliament—an Order in Council has been passed and the hon. Minister of Agriculture has already, he tells us, paid out about $29,000 and he has admitted that if it went on at the same rate as it probably would, a year would see $100,000 expended. He agreed with me when I said that if we carried out that policy in that way we would very soon be in for an expenditure of $500,000, or $1,000,000, or more. The point I raised was that it should not have been done without the previous authority of parliament after having the extension of such a policy discussed in parliament and getting the consent of the people's representatives. Otherwise it must be a somewhat strenuous and, I think, unauthorized stretch of cabinet authority to involve the country in so much expense as that would cost simply by Order in Council. The reply to it is a ready reply, but it is not at all satisfactory, that if parliament does not conclude to vote it then we will have to go back. That is putting the cart before the horse. You have the government pledged to such a policy and then you have the party behind the government, ready, as they always are, to carry out the government's policy in this respect; so that virtually, you force it on parliament. It seems to me that the better way is to come first to parliament, discuss it, give us the information as to what it will all amount to, and then, if parliament thinks fit to authorize the vote, the hon. minister has the right to expend under that vote. In this respect it was just the opposite, and I made the point—I think it is a good point and I did not raise it factiously—that I did not think that ought to be done until parliament had authorized it either by specially assenting to a vote, which is one way, or by a particular enactment. It certainly will lead to a tremendous expenditure of money, but what is almost as bad it will also open the way to a great deal of improper practice unless you can have sleuth hounds in almost every section of the country.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I agree to a very great extent with what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has said, and I want to assure him that the action in this particular respect was taken after very careful consideration and in consequence of the discovery of a state of affairs which seemed to call for some prompt action. I do not say, and I would not like to accept the theory that compensation should not be paid unless parliament has been warned of it. The theory and the practice of compensation are thoroughly understood when the vote for animal quarantine is passed. The Animal Contagious Diseases Act lays down the restrictions under which compensation for the slaughter of animals must be paid, and I think when that Act is passed and when the general vote for this purpose is passed by parliament, parliament does these things with its eyes fully open. I accept what my hon. friend says in this particular case about a new policy which had not been foreshadowed or debated and in such cases, if the circumstances will allow us to wait until parliament may be warned and the sense of parliament taken, I think it will be very much better. I would like to pursue that course, but at the same time I can quite understand cases arising, and I think in this particular instance such a case did arise, when it would be not in the public interest that action should be delayed until the meeting of parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that there was a vote for this particular purpose?

Mr. FISHER. Not for this particular purpose. There is a general vote for the health of animals and out of that vote compensation for the slaughter of animals is paid. We have for many years paid compensation for hogs slaughtered for hog cholera and we have paid compensation for

cattle slaughtered for what is known as Pictou cattle disease. This is the general policy and it has been for many years. We have never paid for slaughtering horses for glanders except in a few cases. We have never adopted the policy of paying for horses which are affected with glanders. We took the action to which my hon. friend refers, because we found that this disease, which is a very dangerous and a very treacherous disease, had been spreading and the condition of affairs had come to the point where drastic action seemed to be required. It was only because of what appeared to be the necessity for this drastic action that the government took the course which my hon. friend has properly described and they did it by Order in Council as the law authorizes them to do. In regard to the question which my hon. friend raises and in which I sympathize with him as to whether a new departure should be made which is going to involve such a large expenditure of public money and about which he thinks—I think rightly—that it is rightly—that it is advisable parliament ought to be consulted, I am quite willing to accept my hon. friend's suggestion, but I do it with the condition that where a condition of affairs arises which requires prompt action the authority of the Act which gives that power to the Council may be used in the public interest on such occasions and only on such occasions. I think that in this particular case such a state of affairs arose. We found, after trying for a long time to reduce the extent of glanders throughout the country without paying compensation and after the urgency of the case had been represented to us, that we had to do something to stop the spread of this disease. It was undoubtedly coming more prominently before us and we found a condition of danger existing that we had not appreciated or expected during the last session of parliament. For that reason we felt that it was our duty to act and act promptly in regard to it.

Mr. FOSTER. To what extent was that a sudden, abnormal development, or a matter of great urgency ?

Mr. FISHER. When I say 'sudden' it was just this : We had been for some time slaughtering horses that were afflicted with glanders without compensation. We found a great many more cases than we had any expectation of finding or than we had any suspicion existed. We carried on the practice of slaughtering horses. Very urgent representations were made that we ought not to slaughter these horses without compensation being granted. If we did not slaughter them disease would spread more and more, and on one or two occasions my officers reported that they were in danger of their lives almost if they carried out our instructions because the people resisted, and protested against the slaughter of their horses if they were not paid compensation. They held that if we paid compensation for hogs and cattle we should pay compensation for horses. I had either to cease to apply the regulations or I had to recommend that we should pay compensation, and an Order in Council was passed to a limited extent at first and afterwards applying to all cases. My chief veterinary who has just come back from the Northwest tells me that as a result of the work we are doing, he hopes and believes this expenditure will decrease in the very near future. Last month it was heavy, it probably will be heavy for the current month, but after that we expect there will be a decrease. I trust that before two or three months we will find a material decrease in this expenditure per month, but I warn the House that I will have to ask a considerable supplementary estimate for the fiscal year so as to make sure that I will be in a good position to carry out this policy. I am advised that it will probably be necessary to pay compensation for horses in the Northwest Territories suffering from maladie du coït. We first discovered the existence of this disease a little over a year ago. It is a very insidious disease, and it has spread more extensively than we had expected. If we neglect it, it may attain the same proportions as tuberculosis in cattle or glanders in horses, but if we endeavour to suppress it now we hope to be able to stamp it out very soon. It is in the public interest that in the case of horses running at large in the Northwest this disease should be suppressed at once.

Mr. HAGGART. If I understand the minister, there is an Act of parliament at present which authorizes him to do by Order in Council what he has done.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. It seems extraordinary that the minister can make this expenditure without a vote of parliament.

Mr. FISHER. Of course parliament has to vote the money.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, but you made an expenditure over the amount voted by parliament.

Mr. FISHER. No. The claims for compensation are in but I have not spent the money. I have not used more money than was voted, but I am waiting to get this money to pay claims which have been made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to recollect that we have not violated the law either in the letter or in the spirit. We have authority from parliament to slaughter animals suffering from these diseases, but

we have to take a vote of parliament every year for the money to pay compensation. Under this Act we have been slaughtering hogs for twenty years in different parts of the country, we have also slaughtered cattle and latterly we have had to slaughter horses suffering from glanders. We thought we could slaughter in a few isolated cases which were very serious without paying compensation, but the disease spread more than we expected. A man has just as much right to be compensated for the loss of his horse as for the loss of his cow or his hog. I agree that if the expenditure should reach $200,000 or $300,000 a year, parliament should be notified in advance. This year we have a supplementary vote on account of the outbreak of a certain disease, but next year as we may have to expend on that item alone a couple of hundred thousand dollars, the appropriation will be contained in the next supplementary estimates.

Mr. HAGGART. Parliament should have also the right to consider whether the compensation should be in full or in part.

Mr. FISHER. The Contagious Diseases Animals Act fixes the mode of compensation, and all payments in regard to compensation are made under the provisions of that Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What I have not had made clear yet is that there was any extraordinary development of that disease which made it necessary for the minister to act at this particular time. There may have been; but glanders has always been with us, and is here or there through the country more or less all the time. What has not been shown is that there was some sudden outburst of the disease, which operated as a menace to public property, something which, unless it was immediately dealt with would have entailed a tremendous loss on the country. I do not understand glanders to be that kind of a disease, or that there was a special outburst of it at this particular time, which rushed the minister and the government into an expenditure of $29,000 over and above their vote. I think it would have been fair for the government to have said: We will take up these claims and consider them, but we have no vote from parliament for this, and you will have to wait until we advise with parliament about it. I quite understand that if you slaughter a man's hog or his cow and pay him something for it, it is pretty difficult to say that if you slaugther his horse, you ought not to pay something for it; but, after all, the resources of the country are limited, and you cannot do everything which, by parity of reasoning, you might be asked to do. A very important point made by my hon. friend here is that parliament ought to have a chance to discuss this whole matter and to fix the amount and the mode of proceeding; because there are dangers lying in this slaughter of horses and paying two-thirds of the value of the horse in every case. There is no reason at all for doing this unless there is the strictest effort on the part of the department to stamp out the disease and to prevent it coming into the country from outside. If you are going just to start an industry of paying for glandered horses, and allow the disease to come in and spread without dealing effectively with it, that is not defensible. You have to put the three things together, and very closely together if you expect to avoid tremendous expenditures. If the disease can be stamped out in a few years, so that it will be confined to a very small extent, that will be a great gain to the country and a legitimate effort for parliament to undertake in the way of co-operation. I think there ought to be co-operation, because it is helping the citizen to keep his stock in such a condition as to avoid loss.

Mr. FISHER. The whole principle of compensation under the Animals Contagious Diseases Act rests on what my hon. friend has just alluded to, that is, co-operation between the owner and the country at large. The payment is only two-thirds of the value, and under our regulations the value is fixed by the officer of the department who orders the slaughter. We have found that the valuation should not be fixed by local veterinarians, neighbours of the people whose animals were being slaughtered; and therefore we have made it a fixed rule for several years back to have the compensation fixed by a permanent officer of the department, and to have the slaughter carried out only on his order or report. I think this is necessary in the interest of the taxpayer at large, and I have been pressing on my officers the importance of seeing that while this work is done properly and effectively, still great care should be exercised to avoid any unnecessary compensation. In regard to my hon. friend's contention that no case has been made out of urgency, I thought I had explained the condition which antedated the Order in Council. We have for some time been killing horses for glanders wherever found. We found a great many more rather suddenly during the last year. We continued to kill without paying the compensation. My hon. friend can quite understand that when one or two horses a month are killed, there is no great outcry or difficulty; but when a hundred a month are killed there is an outcry which accumulates in force and makes the procedure very difficult; and our officers were being resisted and obstructed in carrying out their instructions and the regulations. Under these conditions we had either to suspend the regulations and let the disease spread, which I do not think would have been in the country's interest, or to make arrange-

ments for carrying out the regulations satisfactorily and effectively, and the only way we could do that was to pay the compensation. We therefore passed the Order in Council for that purpose. The emergency arose under the conditions which I have described, and I think it is a legitimate reason. If we had waited until parliament met and provided the compensation, we would probably have had a continuous conflict between the officers of the department and the owners of the horses; and if we had suspended the slaugther of the horses during those months, we would have had a very material spread of the disease, which would have been injurious to the public interest, and which I do not think parliament would have supported me in allowing.

Mr. BARR. Has any consideration been given to the subject of lump-jaw in cattle, which I suppose the minister is aware has broken out violently of late in some places in western Ontario?

Mr. FISHER. If that is so, it must be from some local cause, because we have not had any report of it. The law requires every veterinarian, and even every owner of animals, to report the existence of contagious disease within his knowledge; but we have not had any report of the disease to which my hon. friend alludes. Lump-jaw is a disease which is not as a rule, carried from animal to animal. The matter from the affected animal is conveyed to the grass while the animal is grazing, and another animal eats part of that grass and thus becomes affected. But it is a disease that is quite curable in its early stages. I have known several cases to be cured in my own herd.

Mr. BARR. I may say that the department was telephoned to in connection with the matter, and I understood that the answer which came back was that they did not pay compensation for lump-jaw if any animals had to be slaughtered.

Mr. FISHER. We have never paid for it.

Mr. BARR. Is there a list of diseases in which compensation is paid?

Mr. FISHER. No, there is no list of diseases. The diseases I have mentioned are the only ones in which we have been in the habit of paying compensation. I may say that the Act authorizes the minister to pay compensation by Order in Council at any time. I am authorized by the Contagious Diseases Animals Act to pay compensation for an animal which was slaughtered for lump-jaw, slaughtered by my officers, but I never have given an order for the slaughter of an animal for that disease, because, as I have stated, it is not a very widespread disease.

Mr. BLAIN. The officers of the department, as I understand, have power to destroy a stable in which an infected animal is found. I would ask if, in the Order in Council in March last, compensation is allowed for a stable.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so, because I do not think we have ever contemplated the destruction of the stable. There have been a very few cases where we have destroyed the stables where hogs had been slaughtered, and where the stables were of such a character that it was cheaper to destroy and pay for them than to cleanse, disinfect and rebuild them. But we always give the owner the alternative, saying that if he will satisfactorily disinfect the buildings, they need not be destroyed.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister will remember a letter that I read to the committee the other evening from Mr. Brumell, of Mono Road, Peel county, stating that an officer of the hon. gentleman's department had ordered an animal to be killed and the stable to be taken down. The writer of the letter pointed out that the stable cost $25, and he lost not only the horse but the stable as well. I want to know whether, in a case of that kind, the officer of the department having fixed the value of the horse, he would have any power under the Act to fix the price of the stable, and if so, would the stable be paid for?

Mr. FISHER. I have forgotten the case the hon. gentleman mentions. But I will look it up before the supplementary estimates for next year come up.

Archives, $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. I notice that concurrence has been given to item 36 of the main estimates for next year, that was passed on the 28th of February, and to which I call the attention of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). I intended on concurrence to ask that words be added to the item allowing that expenditure to be made contrary to the Civil Service Act. I explained to the House the other night when passing the supplementaries for the current year, that until quite recently the Auditor General had considered that the archives vote was not governed by the Civil Service Act, but he has recently changed his mind, and consequently a number of employees engaged in this work, but who have not passed the Civil Service examinations, cannot receive their salaries. I think it would be unfair to turn these people out, and unless these words are added to the vote, I will not be able next year to pay some of these officers their salaries. Now, however, that the Auditor General has changed his mind, and considers that that vote ought to be paid subject to the Civil Service Act, I am going to ask the House to allow those words to be added. I was not aware that we were going to take up any of the items in the main estimates,

otherwise I would have been prepared to make this explanation sooner.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister want the whole of that vote to be outside the civil service ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister will have to mention specially the sums that he wants to be excepted, otherwise he will have to except the whole $20,000.

Mr. FISHER. That is not necessary. A good many of the officers have passed the civil service examinations. Until recently, the Auditor General informs my deputy, he never considered that that vote came under the Civil Service Act, and it was only during the present fiscal year that he informed my deputy that he had changed his mind, and having looked into the matter, thought that it ought to be subject to the Civil Service Act. If I was beginning work in that branch now I would only appoint men who had passed the Civil Service examination and who would consequently be subject to the Act. But before this information was given to me, some people were appointed, and some have been a long time in the service who had not passed the examination, and if this vote was taken as subject to the Civil Service Act these men would have to step out, and I would have to find others who had passed the examination. I could not give my hon. friend off-hand the details now, but I think if $5,000 of that $20,000 was allowed to be expended without the restrictions of the Civil Service Act, it would be quite sufficient, perhaps $3,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not desire to see old officers lose their positions because of a change in the ruling of the Auditor General ; at the same time, I do not want to make the whole of the archives possibly outside of the Civil Service Act, as it would be if you made that amendment apply to the total vote. I wanted to know if the minister could specify the amount of the salaries that would be affected by the ruling of the Auditor General, or the names of the officers.

Mr. FISHER. I could not say at the moment ; but I am sure that $5,000 out of the $20,000 would be sufficient.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister thought $3,000 might be enough.

Mr. FISHER. I got $3,000 the other day in my supplementaries for this year, free from that restriction, but my deputy tells me he thinks it would hardly be enough for the whole of the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Auditor General's ruling affect all the salaries for 1904-5?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I imagine that $3,000 would cover it all, because you have probably got enough to cover it for the year.

Mr FISHER. No. One officer did not commence the beginning of the year, but about the 1st of January.

Mr. FOSTER. Except $4,000.

Mr. FISHER. Yes—as to $4,000, the Civil Service Act does not apply.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that might go in.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that only those who have passed the civil service examination will be employed in the Archives Branch ?

Mr. FOSTER. Unless authority is given by parliament?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. I would propose that this item be amended by inserting the words '$4,000 of which may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Mr. FOSTER. That would do for this year. For next year it can be made more definite.

Amendment agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the item in the Department of Indian Affairs that was reserved, the salary in question was not that of Mr. McArthur or Mr. Bigger, but of Mr. Bray. Mr. Bray is acting as the chief surveyor of the department. When we had that item under discussion some time ago, I stated that Mr. Bray had reached the top of his class and that the object was to make him a chief clerk. The item provided in the estimates for another chief clerkship ; there were already five and we asked an appropriation for six. On the information given to me, I stated that Mr. Bray had reached the top of his class. In that I was in error; he has not reached the top of his class, but it is still thought in the department that he should be promoted to the rank of chief clerk. The reasons for this have been given to me in the following words by the head of the department :

Mr. Bray was appointed on June 14th, 1884, as a third-class clerk in the survey branch. His salary was $800. He was promoted to a second-class clerkship on the 1st July, 1887, at $1,100, the minimum salary for that class, and he reached his maximum on July 1st, 1893. He remained a second-class clerk at a salary of $1,400 until the 1st July, 1899, when he was appointed chief surveyor with rank of first-class clerk, his salary for the first year not being increased.

Attention is drawn to the fact that owing to the death of the chief surveyor, Mr. W. A. Austin, in December, 1896, Mr. Bray assumed charge of that section of work. He was then a second-class clerk, and did not receive promotion to a first-class clerkship (which was Mr. Austin's rank) until the 1st July, 1899. This

fact is stated to show that Mr. Bray has not been rapidly promoted.

Mr. Bray is receiving promotion not because he is at the maximum of his class, but because the chief surveyor of the department is considered now to be entitled to a chief clerkship, not only on account of professional and technical qualifications, but because of the large increase of work owing to the settlement of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

The department is now undertaking subdivision of reserves and the delimitation of boundaries which is constantly being called for.

Mr. Bray is in charge of all survey and engineering improvements for reserves, drainage, roads, &c., and his position requires not only technical qualifications but good judgment.

For these reasons the head of the department has recommended that he should be promoted from the position which he now has to the position of chief clerk. Mr. Bray receives to-day a salary of $1,650, and by the statutory increase of $50 a year in four years more he could reach the maximum of his class, but the deputy head recommends that he should be promoted to the position for which provision is made in the estimate.

Mr. FOSTER. The emendation which has been made in the information rather forces a change of ground on my right hon. friend, which he takes with facility equal to that with which he has pressed the claim on the other grounds. I do not know that the ground is altogether satisfactory. The right hon. gentleman says that Mr. Bray has not been very rapidly promoted. Mr. Bray commenced his service in 1884, seven years later than one clerk in the first class and three years later than another clerk in the first class, and one year later than a third clerk in the first class, all of whom have therefore performed longer service, and are at the head of their class except in one case and close up to the head of their class in two other cases, so that on the ground of length of service in the department, Mr. McGirr, especially as it stands there, has a right to the promotion rather than Mr. Bray, who commenced his service seven years later. Taking the length of service, Mr. Bray getting now $1,700 and Mr. McGirr getting $1,900, Mr. Bray has had a more rapid promotion than Mr. McGirr, and has nothing to complain of in that respect. I do not see why it is necessary that a surveyor taking charge of a branch should be a chief clerk. If he has taken charge of the survey branch following the death of Mr. Austin, it might be a fair argument that he should receive an increase of salary if that were deemed right, but you are not only giving him an increase of salary but are putting him over the heads of those who have served longer and are thoroughly efficient clerks still. Then you are putting him in a branch above that of chief clerks, where he can come to the maximum of $2,500. It does not seem to me that it is fair treatment that the old and tried servants of the department, who have been longer in the service, against whom, as I understand, nothing could be urged at all, but who are overlooked, against the principle which was so strongly advocated by the premier, that when a man got to the head of his class he ought to create a chief clerkship in order to promote him and not disappoint him. You do not want to disappoint Mr. McGirr any more than Mr. Bray, but Mr. Bray would not be stopped for two or three years, for he would get his increase while Mr. McGirr gets none, although he is seven years longer in the service and is a thoroughly efficient clerk. I am not saying anything against Mr. Bray, but it does look like a forced promotion, and certainly leaves a bitter taste in the mouth, not only of those in that class, but in every class in the service, who seem to find out that even when they have done good service and longer service, for some reason they are not preferred, but are left in the old class whilst others are put over their heads.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have nothing to retract as to the principle which I laid down when we had the discussion on this before. There is simply another principle which applies in this case. I stated on a former occasion that when a clerk had reached the maximum, if he was a good man and a deserving official, he should be promoted. I think so now ; and, as a rule, that the more aged should be promoted before those who are younger in the service. Still, my hon. friend would not take that as an absolute rule. There are reasons which I do not say apply to this case—for I know nothing of the merits of either of the men—but my hon. friend would not say that in all cases promotion should go by seniority. There may be cases where seniority ought to make way for special causes. I would not apply this rule to the present case, because, as I said, I know nothing of the men. If the case occurred in my own department, if the men were meritorious, I would promote both of them to chief clerkships, but the matter is not one in my own department, and when I dealt with it I acted on the information furnished me. The information was erroneous ; I thought then that Mr. Bray was at the top of his class, and, so far as I remember, that was the chief reason given for the promotion. In this I was in error. The promotion is not because he is at the top of his class, but it is that for the services he performed, and for the manner in which he performed these services and for his qualifications, he ought to be promoted to the rank of chief clerk. My hon. friend says : That may be true, but you pass over the head of another officer who is at the head of his class and who is a good officer, and certainly it seems to me invidious to pass over one and not the other. I do not say no to that. It may be that there is good reason to promote the other clerk, but if Mr. McGirr is not promoted that is not a

reason why Mr. Bray should not be promoted. I think my hon. friend will agree to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot agree to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He ought to agree. Suppose that Mr. Bray is qualified in every respect and is giving good service, and that the services which he performs are, in the judgment of the deputy head, such as would entitle him to promotion, my hon. friend would not refuse to promote him because there is another gentleman who is at the head of his class and who may be also well qualified. The logical conclusion would be that there should be two promotions instead of one, but because one is not promoted it does not follow that the other should not be. I refuse to make it an absolute rule that in every case promotion should be by seniority. I do not think my hon. friend is ready to commit himself to that principle.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If promotion is not to go strictly by seniority, and if, in the judgment of the deputy head of the department, this gentleman, Mr. Bray, is entitled to promotion, it is no objection to say that he has passed over the head of another gentleman who is his senior in the service. That may be a case, not against the promotion of Mr. Bray, but in favour of the promotion of Mr. McGirr. In that case, I think the matter might be inquired into; and, more than that, I think my hon. friend will agree, that he should not ask of me.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot accept my right hon. friend's argument or agree with him for several reasons. In the first place it is neither good ethics nor a good economical basis for a sound state of affairs. My right hon. friend will not say, that, because a deputy head, for reasons we do not know, recommends it, a man who has had a less service, who has been promoted more rapidly in the service and who is not at the head of his class by two or three years should be promoted into another class higher than that which he now occupies with the advantage of advancing yearly to $2,500, as in this case, and that a man equally as good in his service, longer by seven years in his term and who has gone to the maximum of his class should be passed over. If the circumstances are equal an injustice is being done—not perhaps an injustice because you put Mr. Bray up, but an injustice because you do not take up the claims of the one who has had longer service and who is at the head of his class. An officer who makes such a recommendation ought to have some very good reasons for passing over Mr. McGirr, who has been seven years longer in the service than Mr. Bray. I am bound to stand up for the conditions of promotion which are length of service, fidelity and capacity to do the work. Now then suppose that in point of fidelity, and capacity they are equal; Mr. McGirr has the advantage of seven years priority, he is at the head of his class and has been at the head of his class for years. He has a stone wall directly ahead of his. Mr. Bray has no stone wall ahead of him. He may go on for three years, making a step in advance every year, and bettering his position. That is a condition which I think the right hon. Prime Minister should take into account. It is no argument that because he is not the Minister of the Interior he will allow the Deputy Minister of the Interior to perpetrate an injustice if it be an injustice. For the time being he is the Minister of the Interior and if an injustice is being perpetrated my right hon. friend has to take the onus of it. Does it seem fair that Mr. McGirr, an old servant who has been doing his duty faithfully, who has reached the head of his class and has been there for years, shall be allowed to stand there facing a stone wall, and that you shall take another man who is three years from the head of his class, boost him up and say: go along, peace and prosperity and increased salary be with you; we want you to get up to $2,500? That does not help the morale of the service and it is not fair treatment to other officials. Who recommends this? The Minister of the Interior? One comes and another goes. We do not know whether the Minister of the Interior has been at the bottom of it. It may be that deputies sometimes have whims, sometimes have favouritisms, and it is the duty of the minister to find out whether or not an injustice is being done through some whim of the deputy. I think we ought to at least get a statement from the right hon. Prime Minister, that, if this vote passes, before it is put into effect, we shall have a full explanation from the Minister of the Interior and have an opportunity of seeing whether an injustice is being done to Mr. McGirr. I will ask my right hon. friend where he will be with the civil service if he takes the ground that the moment a clerk gets to the head of his class he is to be put into another class. That is a ground, which, I am afraid, my right hon. friend's colleagues, if they are careful thinkers, and look at the effect on the civil service of all this will say is not one based on sound principle. When you arrange your grades and when you have your different classes of service your theoretical idea is that within certain ranges of salary you get all you want for the service and you expect that these services will be performed within their theoretical ranges. Now and then, if a man has strong personality, excellent ability and shows merit and the like of that he will advance, but it must always be the case that a large proportion of those in the service must

keep within the bounds of the classes within which they are. But, if every time a man gets up to the top of his class, in the generosity of his heart and with the country's money, my right hon. friend will say: Boost him up into another class, he will have a lot of trouble on his hands in a short time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The very last reason which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) gave is the best defence of this vote and of the promotion of Mr. Bray. I call the attention of my hon. friend to his argument. Where would the administration be, where would the ministers be, where would the country be and where would the treasury be if you admit the principle that the moment a clerk is at the head of his class he is to be hoisted up into another class? I think my hon. friend will agree with me that we have to consider not only the length of service and the fact that a clerk has reached the head of his class but we have to look also into his qualifications. One man therefore might be entitled to promotion if he has not reached the top of his class and another man who has reached the top of his class might not be entitled to promotion.

Mr. FOSTER. I want that shown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we have a pretty efficient service, but at the same time I think my hon. friend will agree with me that all the members of the service are not equally efficient. It is not sufficient to say that a man has been in the service for a certain number of years. He must also show that he has the qualifications that my hon. friend has enumerated of fidelity and capacity. I would add another qualification, that of the responsibility of the work that the man has to do. If a man like Mr. Bray is at the head of a very important branch of the department, I think it is a good reason why his claim for promotion should be considered. As to the merits of Mr. McGirr, I know nothing at all. I do not know Mr. McGirr. I do not know what position he has in the service. It may be that the reasons which have been given by my hon. friend would entitle Mr. McGirr to promotion; it may be that his fidelity, his capacity and the responsibility of the work which he has to do might entitle him to promotion in preference to Mr. Bray. If we apply the test of fidelity, capacity and the responsibility of the work done to the case of Mr. Bray it may entitle Mr. Bray to promotion, but if there is only one promotion to be given and if the qualifications of Mr. McGirr are such that he should be given the preference then it is a question to be considered by the minister who is in charge of the department. My hon. friend says that deputy heads sometimes have whims. All men are apt to have whims. That applies not only to deputy heads, but also to members of parliament, and perhaps a man might be considered qualified who is not qualified. However, if there is a promotion to be had, I have no objection at all that the merits of the candidates—I will not say candidates—shall be considered and that the one who is to be promoted shall be selected by the minister on the recommendation of the deputy head. In these matters the recommendation of the deputy head is not final although as a rule it goes very far towards forming the judgment of the minister in charge, and I think we had better leave the matter to the judgment of the minister in charge. I am sorry to say I have not that familiarity with the case which would enable me to give my own judgment. I simply take the representations which have been made to me.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, we will take it up again some time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the money you want now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, we have not had a bad day. The Supply Bill is not quite ready, but it will be ready after eight o'clock to take the first reading and I would therefore, if my hon. friend has no objection, ask you, Mr. Speaker, to call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Printing and distribution of reports and bulletins of farms, $7,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is the usual item. I overlooked it when I was passing the items for the experimental farm; it has been for a number of years a separate item.

Mr. COCHRANE. Could not some means be devised for expediting the distribution of these reports? The report of last year is only being distributed now when it has lost a good deal of its interest to the farming community. If the reports were reduced in volume, the facts put in concise language and the reports gotten out sooner they would be more valuable.

Mr. FISHER. The experimental farms report is issued for the year ending November, and we generally get the copy into the printers' hands by the first January. The printer has been doing the work with more despatch lately, and I do not think it can be considered as dilatory if we get it printed within three months. Of course the entire edition is not out in that time,

but it is distributed from the central farm as rapidly as we get it from the printer. I sometimes struggle to somewhat condense the report, but there is always so much information that seems to be of value that the director is very loth to cut it out and I sympathize with him generally. I doubt very much if the reduction of the report by a few hundred pages would make much difference in the promptness of its delivery.

Mr. COCHRANE. The facts might be couched in a great deal less verbiage. The officials appear to think they are not doing anything unless they produce a big volume, and it is pretty hard for a man coming off the farm to get at the facts.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Would it not be possible to have a complete set of these bulletins bound and given to every member of the House. Although it may be true that some of the lawyers would not care for them, still they contain a great deal of valuable information and the agriculturists would like to have them.

Mr. FISHER. As the information is collated the bulletins are printed and issued. We do not keep a number of copies for the purpose of rebinding them afterwards; the people who get them might be expected to put them together and take care of them.

Mr. BLAIN. It seems to me that a footnote should be printed on all of these bulletins informing the farmers that all correspondence which they may send to the Department of Agriculture will be carried through the mails free of postage. A very large number of the letters that come to the members of parliament are stamped, and I am quite sure that a considerable number of letters addressed to the government also bear stamps.

Mr. FISHER. It is very seldom that we get letters with stamps on them.

Mr. BLAIN. I am very much surprised at that, because it is not generally known to the farmers that correspondence addressed to the department comes free. I have addressed farmer's audiences on this point and it is often a surprise to them to learn it. It would be very simple to print a foot note stating that letters addressed to the department will go free of postage.

Mr. FISHER. It is a very simple matter.

Mr. BLAIN. If that were done I think it would encourage a more extensive correspondence with the department, although the minister may think that the correspondence is sufficient now.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, not at all.

Mr. BLAIN. I am one of those who believe that expenditure for bulletins of this kind is wise, and if necessary I would vote for a larger sum, so that the farmers in different parts of the country might be supplied with these bulletins which really contain very useful information.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to confirm from my observation what the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) has said. It is not only in the counties, but in the towns and cities, that the impression prevails that while a member can send a letter free, his correspondent cannot send a letter free to him. It is generally understood that we at Ottawa can use the post office free, but the great mass of the people, whether in the cities or the counties, do not know that they can send a letter through the post office without postage to a member or to the departments.

Mr. FISHER. I only know that in the department we do not get one letter in a thousand with a stamp on it.

Mr. BARKER. I venture to say that I do not get one letter in ten that has not a stamp on it.

Mr. HENDERSON. My experience has been something like that of other hon. members. It is not only the farmers who get astray on this question. On Saturday evening I had occasion to ride through the very rich and intelligent county of North Oxford on a very important mission, and in conversation with a gentleman who had been a parliamentary candidate in North Oxford at one time, I told him that he could send correspondence free to any member of the House of Commons, when he begged to correct me, and said it was only members who could send correspondence to their constituents. I told him that he was mistaken, that he could send anything up to 5 lbs. in weight.

Mr. FISHER. That gentleman was defeated?

Mr. HENDERSON. He was defeated, and no wonder; but the next man who is running there is not going to be defeated; they are going to change the programme. I am surprised that there is not more correct knowledge on this subject. The department has done a great deal, but postmasters ought to be instructed to direct the people when they are posting letters to members that it is not necessary for them to put stamps on them. If the department would instruct the postmasters throughout the country to that effect, that would convey the information to the people better than it could be done in any other way.

Mr. BARR. With regard to the distribution of these bulletins, I regret to say that they are not the benefit to the country that they ought to be. The fact is that they are lying around the corridors of this House to-day, as they have done in former years.

Mr. FISHER. Allow me to correct my hon. friend. These bulletins are sent direct

from the farm, and do not lie around this House at all.

Mr. BARR. I refer to the reports which we have now.

Mr. FISHER. They are also sent direct from the farm to the extent of 60,000 or 70,000 besides a few which are sent to members.

Mr. BARR. They are sent to whom ?

Mr. FISHER. To people who have applied for them and to persons whose names have been given to us. My hon. friend has in his mind. I think, the reports of the evidence taken before the Committee on Agriculture, which the House manages, and which the department has nothing whatever to do with.

Mr. BARR. My hon. friend is right so far as that is concerned. I was coming to that point. I wish to bring before the House a grievance which I brought to some extent a few days ago. It might be as well to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, as we have not at the present time a Postmaster General—at least, he is on the stump, and will not return for a week or two. It has been the custom of members of this House, and I think a very wise one, to send copies of the evidence taken before the Committee on Agriculture, in parcels to rural postmasters, with the understanding that they would place them on their counters, so that the farmers, when coming to the store to purchase, might carry them away if they so desired. My experience has been that the farmers appreciated these reports very much. But to my surprise I find that the following letter has been sent to one of the postmasters in my riding :

> The department is informed that under date of the 20th April last a package of government publications addressed to you was posted from the House of Commons, the contents of which were apparently intended for distribution by you at your office, contrary to the instructions contained in departmental circular of the 15th day of April last.

I telephoned to the deputy postmaster general asking him what the contents of that circular were, but I was informed that it was a departmental regulation and therefore could not be divulged. I thought, owing to the lateness of the session, that I could not ask for a copy of that circular to be brought down. As it has been sent to the rural postmasters who have been accustomed to distribute these reports, they are afraid to place this information on their counters for fear that their heads will be taken off. The course we have been pursuing is one calculated to distribute a great deal of useful knowledge. I have been accustomed to follow that course, both in this House and in the Ontario House, and this is the first time in my political history that I have heard any objection to it. On the contrary, I think it should be encouraged. How otherwise is that evidence to be distributed ? I have endeavoured to distribute all the matter that has come to me, but I cannot find time to send it out in different envelopes. The next paragraph of this circular goes on to say :

> Be so good as to let me know precisely what this package contains, and what disposition was made of the contents by you.

I ask by what right any inspector of the Post Office Department inquires what are the contents of a package which has my frank on it ? To my mind it is a gross infringement on the rights and privileges of members of this House. The very fact of the department sending out that circular has the effect of frightening the postmasters and preventing them giving information which they would otherwise give. As neither the Postmaster General nor the First Minister is present, I think the Minister of Agriculture should look into that circular and should inform the House what it contains. It is the right of members to know what is in a circular relating to the parcels which they send through the mails from this House.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will see that this is a matter that does not affect the item before the House at all.

Mr. BARR. It certainly does.

Mr. FISHER. Was the package to which my hon. friend refers a package of bulletins from the farm ?

Mr. BARR. One of them was.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be glad to look into that matter.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think it matters much whether they were bulletins issued by the department or evidence taken before the committee. It is very strange that while we have a Department of Agriculture and an Agricultural Committee of this House, the reports are issued and they lie around this House ; or they may not be printed for about a year, and the result is that when they are printed they are of very little use, because they have become stale. There is another reason why they cannot be sent out separately, and that is because the regulations provide for giving the members only 5,000 envelopes of a size sufficient to hold these reports. Now what are we going to do ? Are we going to buy envelopes to send these out separately ?

Mr. FISHER. I do.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The Minister of Agriculture is a man of wealth, I understand.

Mr. FISHER. I use a portion of my sessional allowance for that sort of work.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Some people can well afford to do that, because they have got a lot of means behind. Besides that, the Minister of Agriculture not only has his indemnity, but he has officials to do this work for him. He has got $7,000 back of that again, and besides, a very large income from his private property.

Mr. FISHER. Has he ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Now I am strongly of the opinion that we ought to be allowed to send these things out in parcels. I was not aware that a circular had been issued by the department prohibiting that. I do not see why postmasters in any part of this country should not be instructed to distribute these, because they are parliamentary papers. I think we ought to have that circular at once laid upon the table of the House so that we may see what it contains.

Mr. FISHER. I will see the Prime Minister about it.

Mr. BARR. I think that in other respects there could be a great improvement in the distributions. We have in the room upstairs, I suppose, about twenty men called typewriters, and I think only one of them is a shorthand writer.

Mr. FISHER. Would the hon. gentleman pardon me for interrupting him ? Really this discussion about the distribution of literature from the House of Commons has nothing whatever to do with this vote. I have no objection at all to this discussion at the proper time, but this is not the proper time ; this vote is purely for the cost of printing and distribution, it has nothing to do with members distributing their literature from the House.

Mr. BARR. I entirely dissent from my hon. friend. We are now trying to get information to the farmers. As I said, we have about twenty of these men upstairs, whereas in Toronto last session, and even under the Reform government, there were less than twenty, and all were shorthand writers ; and the result was that members of the house had some one to help them distribute their literature, and do all their correspondence. The number of members in the Toronto legislature is less than half the number of members in this House, and yet they had nearly twenty shorthand writers at their disposal. It is utterly impossible for the members of this House to do all this work and do justice to their correspondence. I would like to ask the First Minister if he has obtained any information concerning that regulation of the 15th of April.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have received the information from the Postmaster General. I am sorry I have not got it with me, I will give it to my hon. friend to-morrow.

For the development of the live stock, dairying and fruit industries, the improvement of seeds, and the promotion of the sale of food and other agricultural products ; employees paid from this sum not to be subject to the Civil Service Act, $220,000.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that this is a regular vote taken every year for the Agriculture Department. It has heretofore been administered under the supervision of the Commissioner of Agriculture and Dairying, Prof. Robertson. Perhaps I ought at once to explain that during this fiscal year Prof. Robertson has handed in his resignation and has severed his connection with the department. I need hardy dwell upon the regret which I personally feel at the loss of so eminent, and successful, and painstaking a public servant. My only relief at his loss is the knowledge that although he has left the service of the government, Professor Robertson still serves the agricultural interests of Canada, having taken a position in the control and management of a great agricultural station or college which is to be established on the island of Montreal through the beneficence of Sir William McDonald. I had a conversation with Professor Robertson not long before this step was taken, and had the advantage of discussing with him the future arrangements for carrying on this work. I think it is not necessary to appoint anybody to take his place. Under Professor Robertson the work for which this money has been voted was divided into three divisions, each one having an efficient officer at its head. I think that each of these officers is well qualified to take charge of the divisions with which they were specially charged, when they reported directly to the deputy minister and through him to me. I have now organized this work on that basis, and it is moving very satisfactorily. I think that no harm to the public service will come from it. While I regret extremely the loss of Professor Robertson's services to the country and to myself, I feel satisfied that the departmental work will go on very satisfactorily under the charge of Mr. Ruddick, Commissioner of Dairying, Mr. Hodgson, Commissioner of Live Stock, and Mr. Clark, Commissioner for seeds and seed growing, each of these being directly responsible through the deputy minister to myself, in the same way that Professor Robertson was before. The vote is still the same vote, but it is being divided amongst these three divisions.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why do you not take three votes and give us the sum for each ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any necessity for dividing the vote. I was going to give a short outline of the way this money will be spent. The dairy commissioner has about $130,000, the commissioner for seeds about $35,000 and the live stock commissioner about $50,000. This leaves about $5,000

not devoted to any one of these great divisions, but retained for any agricultural work that may arise during the year for which no other provision may have been made. I would instance some investigations in regard to the growth of tobacco which have been carried on in recent years under Professor Robertson, but not under any one of these officers who had charge of a division under Professor Robertson. With regard to these three great divisions, I may explain that the dairy commissioner has charge, not only of the dairy work—the cool curing rooms for cheese which we have been running for two or three years, the creameries in the Northwest which we have been running for many years, and the cold storage work of the country generally—but also what is called the extension of markets for Canadian food products. This latter includes the inspection and management in regard to the shipping of our different products, the question of prices, and also the work of our officials in England, who watch the arrival of our food products in that great market. The administration of the Fruit Inspection Act and the Fruit Marks Act also come under this division, which has to do with what we call the commercial work —the management of the transportation and handling of our food products which this great branch, under Professor Robertson, has always dealt with. The live stock commissioner's branch carries on the work we do on behalf of the live stock interests of Canada, the keeping of the records which I explained to the House a little while ago, the sales of live stock throughout the country ; the work we do in connection with farmers' institutes ; the work we do in connection with the exhibitions, trying to bring them to uniform lines and helping them by supplying judges ; and also the work we do in connection with the interprovincial trade in live stock which has arisen of late years, and which has called for a good deal of supervision and assistance in the way of spreading information among the people as to the supplies of live stock that may be had from different parts of the country. The seed division will cover two main items. The first is the work we are doing to promote the use of better and cleaner seed. And now that the Seed Control Act has passed this House, and, I hope, will pass the Senate soon and will become law, the second item will be the administration of that Act. In connection with this branch we are encouraging and helping the formation of seed-growers' associations all over the country, by means of which we hope to get men interested in growing better seed for use on our farms. I regret to say that many of our farmers are careless with regard to the quality of seed they use. There is immense room for improvement, not only in the varieties of seed which ought to be used, but also in the use of good, well-matured seed, which will be sure to germinate and seed which is clean and free from weeds. When I say that our farmers have been careless in this respect, of course, a large number of our best farmers are very particular on this point, and have been doing good work both in the seed they have produced and in the choice of seed for use on their farms. Still, there is an immense number of our farmers who do not seem to understand the importance of watching closely the quality of the seed they use. The consequence has been, in many instances, that the crops have deteriorated, not only in quality, but in quantity.

This, in general outline, is the work covered by these divisions. I have a staff of, I believe, efficient and, I know, enthusiastic and energetic officers to deal with these matters, and I have proof from all parts of the country of the good work that is being done. I believe that the money spent in years past has been productive of great good, and I trust that in future increasing advantage will accrue to the Dominion through this branch of the public service.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems to me objectionable that the minister should have so large a vote to devote to any purpose he chooses within these very wide lines. The vote should be divided—so much for dairies, so much for live stock, so much for seed and so much for markets. When the Auditor General comes to look over this expenditure he will find no means of checking it, so long as it has been spent for any one of the things here mentioned. The minister may stand by what he says to-night or he may change—there is nothing to prevent him. If he knows what we want for each of these branches, I do not see why this vote should not be divided. If that is done, the minister can be held to account by the Auditor General. Perhaps that is the very thing the hon. gentleman does not want. I find that the vote for immigration is included in about three items, covering about $700,000 or $800,000. I think it is about time we had these estimates divided more carefully, so that we may know what we are voting, and so that the ministers may be held strictly to account for the expenditure of these large sums.

Mr. FISHER. We have not found any difficulty with regard to that in the past. I have always been ready to give full information on the subject. Occasionally, of course, one particular line of work costs a little more than is expected, but, under such a vote as this, it can be done, and so the public work can go on effectively.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What objection has the minister to dividing this up in the manner I suggest ?

Mr. FISHER. I may tell the hon. member frankly that my chief objection is that if you meet an unforeseen difficulty, involving

a change in the estimates, it generally requires more discussion and explanation in the House. This vote is not changed from what it has been. The only difference is that the head has been removed and the whole has been brought under the deputy minister. Formerly it was under the control of Professor Robertson. That is the only change. Otherwise, when this was voted for Professor Robertson's branch last year it was voted just in the same way as I am asking to have it voted now.

Mr. COCHRANE. When Mr. Robertson was head he had control of the three departments for which the minister is now to have three gentlemen.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact Professor Robertson had five or six departments under him and they were just as separate as they are to-day.

Mr. COCHRANE. I beg pardon, Mr. Minister. Professor Robertson had control of the three departments you have taken here, and he was responsible to the deputy minister for the conduct of these three departments.

Mr. FISHER. No, excuse me, Professor Robertson was independent of the deputy minister.

Mr. COCHRANE. He was responsible to you.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, he was responsible to me. Now the deputy minister is responsible.

Mr. COCHRANE. If you want to do all the talking let us know it. The minister is a good deal like his officials ; unless he has a great amount of verbiage to give us a little information, he does not think he is doing anything.

Mr. FISHER. I will not do it any more.

Mr. COCHRANE. We want you to do more, but it is better for the minister to answer the question and sit down and not do all the talking before the committee. I was right, Professor Robertson was responsible to you if not to the deputy and there was one man who controlled this money and now you have three controlling it responsible to the deputy and the deputy is responsible to you, so we do not know where it is going and you may spend money on departments, for which we do not vote it at all. We leave it just to your sweet will to spend this money where you see fit. We hear a good deal about the efficient work of these gentlemen but when I wanted to get from the minister himself in the committee the name of one of these gentlemen in order to get some seed, I could not get the information, but I found out from a circular sent to me that there is one man in East Northumberland whom I know very well who would not be able to supply half a dozen farmers with ten bushels apiece. I do not suppose he had any grain of the kind. I think there is a good deal of fraud in connection with this matter, and when the minister tells this House and the country that the farmers do not know enough to select the seed to sow on their farms I want to tell him he was brought up in a section of country that is not very intelligent, and he must not speak from that section of the country for the farmers of Ontario. The farmers of Ontario know how to select their seed as well as any official he has in his department and it would not take them half so long to put it in concise language so that a man of ordinary intelligence would know what it meant.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think the minister has given a very good reason why this vote is a lump sum. The fact that it has been done before to my mind is no reason why it should be continued unless it is the best way. If the minister has an outline in his mind of what he wants for each of these departments, each of these items, I think that is the way to put it in the estimates, and then he would not spend any more than the amount specified on any particular service without coming back to the House for another vote. I think it would be better if the minister cannot do it this year to consider it another year.

Mr. FISHER. It is well worth considering.

Mr. FOSTER. I think what the hon. member (Mr. Uriah Wilson) has said is very true. The same argument that the minister uses might very well be used for simply saying we should vote to the Minister of Agriculture for such purposes as he has mentioned the sum of $525,600 in the belief that he will use it properly, in the proper proportion for each item. An estimate is for two things. It is in the first place to define to parliament what you want a certain amount of money for, and in the second place it is to give the auditing officer a chance to check according to the law and to see that no amount shall be expended except for the specific purpose for which it is voted. You put $220,000 in a lump sum and say : This is for the development of live stock, dairying, the fruit industry, improving the state of trade and agricultural products. You lump them together and it is absolutely at the will of the minister first and of Council afterwards. You could use that sum as you choose. The essence of every proper estimate is definiteness. You ought to know about what you are likely to spend on live stock, dairying and each of these other branches. There are at least five or six different specific objects there, and each vote should be divided so that it would be definite and clear ; as it is it is a lump sum. Something of this kind to a certain extent may have always been done, but I know when I had to do with estimates my purpose was to get them definitely stated. We happened this year to be ques-

tioning the Minister of Militia with reference to a lump vote. It appeared innocuous and it seemed to show that it was for a certain purpose that when we came to question him we found that he was undertaking three or four different works with it, in different parts of the country and in different provinces, and unless the question had happened to come up at that time, the city of Fredericton for instance would never have known that in that vote was included a sum to be spent for certain military works there. In proportion as you gather these different items and put them in a general vote, you do away with the definiteness of your estimates and you do away with the guard that the Auditor General has over them. The minister does more than that, he lays up trouble for himself. Influential supporters may come to him and say: Here is a project that we want you to carry out in the line of one of these things. You say: I was not proposing to spend this much. But they will reply: But your vote does not tie you, it allows you to do as you please; what we want you to do is to spend a lot of this money say for this fruit enterprise. The minister lays himself open, at least he takes away from himself this guard that he has definitely told parliament what he would use this money for, and he must keep his pledge to parliament. I call the attention of the minister to that and I would particularly call the attention of the Minister of Finance to it if he were here. I agree with what my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) has said and I think we must certainly insist on having these estimates divided. I am not going to insist as my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) did not insist that it should be done for this year, but after this I am going to make a plea with the Finance Minister who supervises these estimates that he shall ask each minister to definitely show each vote. Of course you cannot go into every detail; you must have some omnibus votes but, omnibus votes should be few and small.

Mr. FISHER. The general principle which my hon. friend has enunciated is undoubtedly correct. This vote is a large one to-day. It has been growing steadily from the needs of the country. I can remember this vote long before I came into office as a vote for some of the purposes which are included in it now. These are all cognate objects. They are not different. They are very largely interlaced; that is to say some of the men in connection with this vote attend to part of the work and attend also to other parts of the work, and it is a difficult thing to exactly divide the proportions of their time which may be applied to one piece of the work or applied to another piece of the work. I am trying to do that to a certain extent. I find that where it is possible to avoid that it is better because an officer who is shifted about from one work to another, I find, is not very likely to be effective. I therefore have been trying to get the staff divided, and when the time comes that I can divide this work I think it will be well to do as my hon. friend has suggested, but at the present time I would like to ascertain by experience how much each of these pieces of work will require.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. You will have this year to try it in.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but it is only three months since Professor Robertson resigned and I have only begun the reorganization.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. You will have a year from the 1st of July.

Mr. FISHER. I will have a year after July in which to test the success of it after I have reorganized it if I get this little vote. I know my hon. friend is quite willing to have this little vote go through this year and I appreciate that courtesy on his part. I will say quite frankly to my hon. friend that when I ask for that item for the succeeding year I will have such information as will enable me to divide it in a way that will meet the wishes of the House. I do not take exception to the criticism that is made. I think that in regard to a vote of these proportions the criticism is to some extent justified. When this vote was originally taken it was a comparatively small affair, but it has increased from year to year and I think that when it has reached its present proportion what my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says has a good deal of justification. When it was a very much smaller vote it was not so necessary to discuss the features of it. But, I will carefully look into the question and see if, in another year, I cannot meet my hon. friend's desires so that the House can thoroughly understand what the money is intended for. I need not say that I have no intention of hiding from the House what the money is intended for.

To promote dairying interests for advance of milk and cream, to be recouped out of the process of sales of such butter and cheese, to be placed to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, $40,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What was done with that vote last year and what was recouped?

Mr. FISHER. We run certain creameries in the Northwest Territories and in making sales of the produce of these creameries we advance a portion of the money at once to the patrons; then, when we come to complete the sales and get the money from the purchasers, we reimburse the treasury and the result is that at the end of the year this money is all back. But, in the meantime we have to have it in the bank to draw upon. A portion of it, I do not know how much, is drawn upon. Some

years only a little is drawn sometimes it runs pretty close to the amount.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. You are out the interest, I suppose ?

Mr. FISHER. We do not charge interest. My officials tell me that it would hardly be safe to undertake the work unless we had available this $40,000. Last year we had something over $100,000 worth of butter. We had to sell that and to handle it and for that purpose my officers think that about $40,000 is needed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Was there any loss in the transaction to the government last year?

Mr. FISHER. There was no loss except the interest. There was never any loss. The money advanced comes back and more too. We only advance a proportion of the price. We advance 10 cents a pound and the price of butter is 20 cents a pound and over.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the nature of the transaction last year and what is the policy? Are you continuing to do the same thing year after year in the same locality, or are you trying to put an industry on its legs, and then go to another locality and try to do the same thing ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think my hon. friend understands the situation. A good many years ago—I think the very first year after I came into office—representations were made to me that certain creameries had been started in the Northwest Territories chiefly in the Alberta district as private creameries and had failed and that the plant and buildings were there lying useless. I was asked to see if I could not do something to restart the industry there. I had Professor Robertson look into the matter very closely and we came to the conclusion that there was an opportunity for the establishment of a successful creamery industry in the Northwest Territories. To do that we undertook to advance some money to some of the creameries so as to put them on their feet and to manage and run them. It is in the management and running of them that this money is required. It is only those creameries in the Northwest Territories that are built; we have not for a number of years back started many new ones. I think there was one new one started last year, but most of the older ones have paid up their advances and are paying their way. We are still managing them. I have been informing the people that they must look forward in the near future to our handing over the management to the patrons. We have been begged from year to year not to do it and it has been represented that the management by government officials has been on the whole satisfactory and more successful, especially in the marketing of their products than private management. Up to the present time I have not discontinued this system, but I did instruct my officers who went there last winter to say that as a considerable number of the people there were now paying their way and doing well enough to assume the management themselves, I must insist on their taking over the management and so reducing the resposibility of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. I must say that the sting is in the tail and that the last sentence or two of the hon. minister came down to really what I did want to know. With all due deference to the hon. minister I did know exactly how this was being carried on. Is the government going into this in perpetuity?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you always going to take charge of these creameries and run them, or are you just taking hold of them and putting them on a basis where they will be established and self-sustaining, and then say to the people: Here, we have shown you how to do it, we have brought you through a certain amount of instructive practice and now you must take this over yourselves ?

Mr. FISHER. That is the intention.

Mr. FOSTER. The government surely does not intend to be running these factories in this way ? How many of these are you running in the Northwest ?

Mr. FISHER. Sixteen, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. After you run these for two or three years you must have half of them or more on a fairly good basis, and the people then will know their benefits. If you are going to go into a certain amount of that business for educative purposes, I presume you will try and get say eight of them on to a self-management basis, and then you could take up another eight districts if you wish. It is the people's work and not the work of government, and there can be no excuse for the government doing it except that by its educative influence it may point out the right way of making and marketing the article.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). He has outlined the policy I wish to pursue, but every time I try to drop a creamery the people protest and beg us to continue, and so long as we are doing some of them it is not very much extra expense to do the whole of them. With the influx of settlers there will be other parts of the Northwest Territories which will want to start these creameries soon, but where wheat growing is successful, they do not care to go into dairying.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand the minister to state that for this $40,000 of advances

the country was recouped by the sale of the butter, and that that money was paid to the credit of the consolidated fund.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, no. The patrons send their cream to the factory and the butter is sent to a central warehouse at Calgary and disposed of on the open market. The accounts are made up for each individual patron of the factory and when the monthly statements are prepared, frequently the butter is not sold or perhaps only part of it is sold. In the meantime we pay to every patron what is equal to 10 cents on every pound of butter which his milk has produced. Then when the sales are consummated and the money received for the butter, we pay him the balance according to the price received. None of it is paid to the consolidated fund; it is a separate fund for each creamery and nothing comes back to the country except perhaps a charge for making.

Mr. DANIEL. The item says 'the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese to be placed to the credit of the consolidated fund.'

Mr. FISHER. Quite so, but it is not put into the ordinary revenue of the country. It is a special account for each creamery.

Mr. DANIEL. Then the country gets no money return whatever for the expenditure of this $40,000?

Mr. FISHER. The $40,000 is not spent. At the end of the fiscal year the $40,000 is intact; we simply pay 10 cents on account, for every pound of butter and we pay it out of this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. What profit do you make?

Mr. FISHER. We do not make a profit. When the price of the butter is received by our officer he retains 10 cents for every pound and pays it back to this vote.

Mr. DANIEL. In what account will the payment back to the country be found?

Mr. FISHER. The payments out of this vote and the re-imbursements are all submitted to the Auditor General by a special accountant in my department who has charge of this work; it includes an immense amount of detail as an account for each patron is kept.

Mr. DANIEL. The item states, that this money is placed to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund. Where can I find in the Consolidated Revenue Fund account a statement of the recouping of this money, or any portion of it?

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot tell the hon. gentleman exactly.

Mr. DANIEL. I have the Consolidated Revenue account here, and the only item I can see which would refer even in a distant way to this item is: 'Department of Agriculture; special account, $4,855.'

Mr. FISHER. I know in general terms how it is done, but I am afraid I cannot say as to how it appears in the Public Accounts. Perhaps I have not made myself clear to my hon. friend, who probably is not familiar with the way in which these co-operative factories are worked. Each patron sends his milk or cream to the factory and gets credit for so much butter fat; and when the total amount of the butter fat is made up into butter and the butter is sold, the money received for it is distributed to the patrons in proportion to what they have sent to the factory. Before that final distribution occurs, however, my officer pays to each patron 10 cents per pound on account out of this fund. When the final sale of the butter takes place and the money is received by my officer, he pays back into this fund the 10 cents which he had advanced out of it to each patron, and then pays the balance to the patrons in addition.

Mr. DANIEL. What we still do not understand is where the country gets recouped. I understood the minister to state that the $40,000 was merely handled, and the country got it all back. If that is the case, there ought to be some entry of that repayment in the public accounts; but I can find no such entry.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot explain that, but I think it is due to the fact that at the beginning of the year a credit is given by the Auditor General to the Department of Agriculture; my officers from time to time use what they want of it, and replace it before the end of the year. Consequently, it would not appear as impaired in any way; and, in consequence of that, I suppose it does not appear in the public accounts at all.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I think this is a fair item to stand until the minister can give us that information. Is there an officer in every factory; and if so, is he paid by the patrons?

Mr. FISHER. We pay the officers and we charge the patrons so much for making the butter.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money was actually paid out last year to these patrons at the rate of 10 cents a pound?

Mr. FISHER. I have not that information at my hand. I can find out immediately the number of pounds of butter that was made, which would show how much was paid out. Of course, my hon. friend will understand that this $40,000 might be used three or four times over during the season as needed. We pay out the 10 cents when the butter is made in the creamery. We might sell that butter in a week and get the money all back, or we might not sell it for two or three months, and consequently

be unable to reimburse the fund for that length of time. It is practically a deposit to be used as working capital, and to be recouped when the money comes in.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has not answered clearly the question of the hon. member for St. John. What he wants to know is where that money comes back to the treasury. We can easily understand how it goes out; but my hon. friend from St. John says that within the covers of the book he cannot find more than $4,000 that has come back. That question has not been answered by the minister. I think we shall have to have this item stand until that can be made clear, and also because two or three of our members who are not here want to say something about these features.

Mr. FISHER. I have no objection to let it stand.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The minister might tell us how much a pound he gets for making the butter, and whether the account comes out even or shows any profit?

Mr. FISHER. We get 4 cents a pound. In the large creameries that more than covers the cost, while in the small creameries it does not cover the cost.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How do you even up the accounts?

Mr. FISHER. Where there is any money over we give it to the creamery where it is made; and where there is a deficit we pay that ourselves. We do not charge the good creameries with the losses of the poor ones.

Item allowed to stand.

Salaries and contingent expenses of the Senate, $76,576.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the usual vote for the Senate. It shows an increase of $1,000, of which I am sorry to say I cannot give any explanation. They want that much more to carry on their business.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite sure the House of Commons would never abnegate its right to have an explanation of this increase. We cannot vote money here without knowing what it is for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have given the information to my hon. friend. The gentlemen of the higher court of parliament say they desire it and must have it, and cannot carry on their work without it. It is a growing time and a growing country, and the only explanation furnished to me is that these estimates are prepared by a committee of contingencies of the Senate.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one thing that grows in the Senate, vacations and holidays. Would the Prime Minister give us the exact number of days the Senate has been sitting?

Mr. FISHER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My memory is not equal to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my hon. friend abandoned entirely the view, so strongly held by himself and many of his supporters, that the Senate ought to be reformed, reformed out of existence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was not my view, my hon. friend knows me too well. That was the view of some of my friends, but not my own.

Mr. FOSTER. I know my right hon. friend made a great deal of capital in the country on that ground.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Reforming the Senate out of existence?

Mr. FOSTER. Reforming it even out of existence; and especially one thing was going to be done, there was going to be no old——

An hon. MEMBER. Women?

Mr. FOSTER. Women, yes, or defeated candidates, men of an age so advanced that it is difficult for them to get around. Will the right hon. gentleman now tell us exactly the age of the last gift made by himself to the Senate?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, I do not know exactly, but I think he has cut his wisdom teeth.

Library of Parliament—salaries, $23,575.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is an increase in salaries of $475, made up altogether of statutory increases.

Books for the general library, including binding, &c., $13,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the government considered the need of enlarging the library building?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the attention of the government has been brought to the necessity of providing additional space for the increasing number of volumes. A plan has been suggested to the government, but we have come to no conclusion. If my hon. friend has views upon the subject, I would be glad to hear them, because the government will approach the subject with an absolutely open mind.

Mr. BERGERON. The subject has been brought to my notice by reason of my membership of a committee of the House of Commons. I have been told that another plan has been prepared, but the session is so far advanced that unless the government has finally come to a conclusion, it will be a long time before anything is done. More space is needed. I understand that nearly half the books of the library are hidden, or are in some place where they cannot be seen.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has the selection of the new books for the library?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend knows, the Library Committee gives sometimes directions to the librarians, but when no directions are given to the librarians they use their own judgment. But so far as I know, the committee have no control over the librarians regarding the purchase of books, these gentlemen are absolutely their own masters. The committee has never suggested to the librarians how they should employ the money. I think my hon. friend is a member of the Library Committee

Mr. FOSTER. I am a member. It meets once, and nothing is done; that is a preliminary meeting to make arrangements for a second meeting. It meets the second time, and a report is read, and then we adjourn. We may have another meeting before the session closes. Sometimes I think there is a lack in the library of up-to-date books. I do not know whether other members have noticed it or not in their requirements for reading, but I have wondered whether the committee had advisory duties in connection with the purchase of new books.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure that depends altogether on the librarians. There was a time when I was a more faithful attendant of that committee than I have been of late years, and my experience was something like that of my hon. friend, that a meeting was more of a social gathering than anything else. Sometimes we had a general conversation, and a suggestion was made that we should get such and such a book; but nothing was ever done, nothing is done now, the librarians absolutely use their own judgment in the purchase of the books.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another thing, and that is the failure on the part of many who take out books to return them. I do not know how it can be overcome, unless it be done by the passage of resolutions requiring parties to return books taken from the parliamentary library. The librarians are really the servants of parliament, parliament is composed of members, and if there is any collision between the parliamentary librarian and a member, the librarian generally gets the worst of it. At least all he can do is courteously to ask for the books to be returned, but if the member simply does not answer that request, the books are not returned. I think the Prime Minister himself would be surprised if he knew just how many books are absent from the library because, under circumstances that we usually forget, they are not returned. But that is not the purpose for which the library was instituted, it was to keep books in the library itself, in order to afford the advantages both of quick reading and of circulation. I was wondering whether anything could be done to facilitate the gathering in of books that go out to the different departments.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not heard of any complaint of late. I remember some fifteen years ago when the Library Committee had rather a warm discussion over this subject, but at that time no means could be devised by which a check could be put upon this evil practice. We have to trust to the honour of those who took the books away from the library to bring them back again. Many of those books are never returned simply because of carelessness on the part of those who take them out. It was suggested that it would be a good thing to pass a rule that books should not go out—I would not say out of the library, because that would not be possible, but that books should not go out of this building. That, I think, is the only rule that would be satisfactory—that the books in this library like those in any other library of a similar nature should not be taken out of the building. But our library here is really a circulation library——

Mr. FOSTER. Very much so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Members have the privilege of taking books away, and they also have the privilege of taking them for their friends. This, it seems to me, ought not to be allowed. It is difficult, perhaps, to say that a member of parliament, at the end of the session, for instance, should not be allowed to take books with him. A good many members do that. And I believe that those who use the library most are those who return books most surely and quickly. But there are members who take away books which happen to strike their fancy and, through sheer carelessness, do not return them. Then, members facilitate the taking out of books by their friends, and this, I believe, is the cause of the disappearance of the larger number of books that are not returned. The redeeming feature of the case is that these books are generally of those that can best be spared from the library. There has hitherto been no great public library in Ottawa, and it has been difficult, when we had a large and valuable collection of books here, to keep that collection closed and not allow any of the books to go out. But, unless we have a rigid rule to this effect, I am afraid the leakage cannot be stopped.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. Prime Minister has spoken of this as a circulating library. Well, it has at least one of the elements for circulation. The arteries are there, but whether the veins are there, to complete the circulation by bringing back that which is sent out through the arteries, is a great question. Not only do members get these books, but this library is largely a convenience to the people of Ottawa.

Through the members, or in some way, books are circulated throughout the city. The Prime Minister says that one redeeming feature is that the books thus sent out and often lost are largely of the kind that can best be spared from a library of this kind. But that seems like saying that the people's money is voted each year for the purchase of books which are not useful in assisting members of parliament in their work and are not of the kind for which this library was instituted. I think it would be difficult to make a rule that books shall not be taken from the precincts of this House. One's time as a member is pretty well taken up during the working hours of the House, and unless one can take a book to his room and digest it there, he is denied opportunities which enable him better to carry on his work in this House. But two things might be insisted upon : That the privilege, very much abused by some of us, of handing out books to all and sundry of our friends, might be curtailed or done away with. And, then, though it might seem a drastic remedy, I think the librarian might be backed up by a rule which would enable him to say to a member that books out must be returned within a reasonable time, otherwise he would not be allowed to take out more books. I am sure that if such a rule were applied in my case it would bring me to time—I would be pretty careful to send books back that I might not be on the prohibited list. But I think the time has come when we should stop this leak. It is impossible to get some books from the library that ought to be there. You ask for them, but they are out. Who has them ? Nobody knows ; they have been out, perhaps, for three or four years. It would surprise some members of the House to see the list of the books that are out, never to come back I suppose, for they have been out so long that they have lost all knowledge of the haunts from which they came. But I think that the suggestions I make if carried out, would result in good.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The next time there is a meeting of the library committee, I will attend if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will be there, and I will support his suggestions.

Mr. FOSTER. I will be there.

Mr. BUREAU. I would suggest to the Library Committee an idea for their consideration at their next meeting. Why not create a fund by asking every member who wishes to take out books put up a cash deposit ; then, if the book is not returned in the proper time, use the money to buy another copy. That is the way they do in circulating libraries, and it seems to me that that is the proper way to do here.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest, to the leader of the House that the next Act that is passed adding to the sessional indemnity of members should carry a condition that a certain percentage of the increase shall be kept back for one or two years, to be used in supplying the deficiencies caused by books being borrowed and not returned.

Legislation—general—printing, binding and distributing the laws, $7,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When will the consolidation of the laws be completed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is expected that it will be completed this year, and that the Bill will be ready for the next session of parliament.

Legislation—general—printing, printing paper and binding, $125,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What does that cover ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This covers the expenditures of the Printing Bureau on the items stated. There is nothing new in this—it is the usual vote.

Mr. BERGERON. I take this opportunity to repeat what I said the other night. The Printing Bureau is a great institution with which, I am sure, many of the members are not familiar. The members of the Printing Committee had occasion to visit the Bureau recently and were astonished to see the work that was done there, especially in the binding of the reports submitted to parliament and the books for the library. The building is not nearly large enough for the work to be done. The King's Printer and his assistants all complain of that, and rightly. An addition has been made to the building and is now about ready for occupation, but it will do but little good, for much more room is needed. The government have a large property there, and the sooner they use it the better. There are a great many employees in the Printing Bureau, but, for lack of space they work at a great disadvantage. We are losing money because the place is so small that the employees cannot do their work as well as they would otherwise do it. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) is not here, but, in his absence I will call the attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to this case as one deserving his earnest attention.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) has mentioned this matter, as it gives me an opportunity to give my hon. friend and to those who take an interest in the subject my own view. I know that the building of the Printing Bureau is altogether too small. The Secretary of State has complained to me more than once and has proposed that provision should be made for increased accommodation. I have stated more than once to the Secretary of State—and I might just as well make a confession of it now—that the selection of a site for the Printing Bureau was very unfortunate. My opinion is that we should have the whole of that space

vacant, extending Major Hill Park to the bank of the river which would add much to the beauty of Ottawa, but you have the Printing Bureau just where it is, interfering with such a park. It is an ugly building, it has no architectural beauty, and I think if we were to make an addition of one-third or one-half of this building we might very well select another site and leave this site vacant in order to have what we should have, a park which would cover the whole of Nepean Point. I do not know if parliament would entertain that view. The plan would not cost much, it would cost something of course, but it would add very much to the beauty of this city in which we take a good deal of pride, and I think this idea ought to meet with some favour on the part of my hon. friends. At all events this is an idea which I have not dared to mention very often, but since the matter has come up, I would like gentlemen on the other side to think of the suggestion I have made that if we are to spend a good deal of money in enlarging the Printing Bureau, and we must do it, we might consider the advisability of putting it elsewhere and leaving the space which is now partly vacant absolutely vacant, covering the whole of Nepean Point with a continuation of Major Hill Park.

Mr. BERGERON. The new Mint is being built close to that spot which shows that the idea has not been very much thought of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the Mint is near Sussex Street. I would have preferred to have it elsewhere, but where it is it will not interfere with the idea I have in my mind of extending Major Hill Park along the river.

Mr. BERGERON. Of course that is another question. Whether we are to enlarge the Printing Bureau or place it somewhere else is the important thing. I believe it would be a saving of money and would improve the good work that is now done there if the building was enlarged one way or another.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I dissent entirely from the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) with regard to our losing money in this connection. An examination would reveal to any person interested the fact that notwithstanding that the printing of parliament is not entirely done at the Bureau here the country is not suffering as a result, and that being the case I think it will be found that the printing done outside the Bureau is done at rates that compare very favourably indeed with the rates paid at the Printing Bureau. I chanced to be present before the Public Accounts Committee when Dr. Dawson gave evidence. He pointed out and satisfied me that in some particular instances he was able to get work done outside the Bureau at rates very much cheaper than he could get the work done at the Bureau. I think upon close examination very many items will be detected in which it will be found that the work can be done more cheaply in printing offices as in connection with the preparation of the various reports. In some cases this could be done cheaper in Montreal, Toronto, or even some of the smaller cities. This is a matter which might very well engage the attention of the Printing Committee, and I desire once again to protest for the present at least, against any further enlargement of the Printing Bureau until it has been shown that the country is saving by it. If the matter is gone into carefully, I think it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of parliament that this work can be done by printing concerns throughout the country at rates from which the country not only will not lose, but I have no doubt will gain.

Mr. BERGERON. I think I remember the occasion of which my hon. friend speaks. One of the reasons given by the King's Printer was that the building was too small and they could not have all the plant necessary to do all he would like to do. Secondly there was a question of printing the lists, and it was said—and there was a great deal of sense in it—that the printing of lists for British Columbia or the Northwest Territories for instance, would be done cheaper as a matter of fact in those provinces than having them printed here and sent there. Another subject was the printing of maps.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Lithographing.

Mr. BERGERON. That kind of work can be done better and cheaper in Toronto or Montreal, because the Printing Bureau here is too small to contain the apparatus necessary. At the same time the King's Printer said he could do everything here, and if my hon. friend will go back a few years to the establishment of the Printing Bureau he will find a great many reasons given in favour of having all the printing of parliament done here, not only for reasons of economy but for other reasons. My hon. friend, I am sure, must recognize that there must have been some good reasons given for the establishment of that office here; indeed, I think it has given satisfaction and the only question I was bringing before the House was that as the business of the country is enlarging—as we are told and it is true—the printing is enlarging. The printing of 'Hansard' is a great work at the Bureau. The binding is a much greater work at the Bureau than I supposed. We have some very good experts in their lines doing that work and when congratulating the King's Printer on such good work we were told that he was handicapped by the small space in which his men were working, and that is the reason why

I for the second time called the attention of the government to it. I do not think we could vote money for a better purpose. My hon. friend may have the Bureau somewhere else, that is another idea. If parliament decided to put the Bureau somewhere else, if we knew what to do with the old building which is a very costly one, I would have nothing to say, but whether we build somewhere else or enlarge the present building it is high time to do something. One of the highest officials there suggested that the building could be heightened by a couple of stories which I understand would be the cheapest plan. The King's Printer's idea would be to enlarge the building, because there is a good deal of ground there, but of course that is not taking into consideration the plan of my hon. friend. If the building is put somewhere else, all of the demands would probably be met in the new building.

Mr. HENDERSON. To my mind the question of public printing being done outside of Ottawa was settled years ago when the present Bureau was established. I confess I have never heard any good reason given since that time for returning to the old practice of having a portion of the work done in Toronto, Montreal or any other city of the Dominion. I think myself it is decidedly better to have the entire work done here under the strict supervision of the government.

Now as to the cost being less when done in some outside office, it is quite possible that the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) may be correct. To my mind, it is absolutely impossible, with the present conveniences for doing the work, to get all the work out of the men that they can do. I had occasion a short time ago to visit the Printing Bureau along with other members of the Printing Committee. We went through the building, I think through almost all the rooms. I was astonished to see the crowded condition, and because of the way that men were huddled together it was absolutely impossible to do work. They had not an opportunity of doing the full amount of work that a man could do were he given space—not only space to work in, but space to breathe in. Having spent an hour and a half in that building, I was glad to get outside. I fail to see how in the world these people live there. The health conditions are practically abominable. How those women manage to sit there for eight or ten hours is something I could not comprehend, and certainly the sanitary arrangements are far from what they ought to be. We cannot expect to get people to do the amount of work they should do with such surroundings. We cannot expect them to perform the same amount of work if they really have not space to breathe in. It only requires a visit for a short time to see that the first requisites of health and of the opportunity to do work are absolutely wanting in every department of that building. In regard to the suggestion of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), certainly something will have to be done, no matter whether the cost is great or small. The country is losing money and will lose money as long as the present conditions prevail, for the reasons which I have assigned. We want the Printing Bureau to be as near as possible to the parliament buildings. Many of us have occasion to go there from time to time, and it would be very inconvenient if the Printing Bureau were removed half a mile or a mile from the public buildings here ; in fact, at the present time, even when the Printing Bureau is located as it is, I think that very much better conveniences ought to be and could be provided for giving members of parliament access to the Printing Bureau for the purposes that they require to go there from time to time. I think the time has come when a foot-way should be so constructed from parliament hill across to the park and to the Printing Bureau so as to give easy access without going around by way of Wellington street and Sussex street, or going through the park, to get there. I have occasion to go at different times when I find that time actually prevents me from doing so. I find it inconvenient, and if we could be assisted in any way by such means as I suggest I know it would inure to the benefit and convenience of every member of parliament. Were it not for that I would not object at all in the construction of a new building to have it removed to a greater distance, but I fear that by scattering these buildings too much we are going to inconvenience men who have all their time fully occupied in this House if they pretend for a moment to attend to their parliamentary duties. I sympathize with the government in any desire they have to increase the accommodation. I confess that at the present time I would favour an enlargement of the present building to the suggestion of removing it a considerable distance further away, but certainly it is a matter with which the government will have to deal, and that at a very early date, because the country is increasing while the conveniences for doing that work are not increasing. I would dislike very much to see a friend of mine go into that Printing Bureau. I think it is destructive to health. I do not know what the experience of those who are working there is, but I think I made a note of it that I saw depicted on the faces of people who are working there that they are not enjoying the health conditions they ought to enjoy, that they are not able to perform the duties which this government and this country would expect them to perform, and that under the present crowded conditions they are not doing what they could do if the conditions were more favourable.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. The words of my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) convince me more strongly than ever that the Printing Bureau has undertaken a little more work than it ought to undertake, more particularly under the conditions which he depicts. In spite of what has been said to the contrary, I still stick to my opinion that this country is not a loser as the result of work being done outside the Printing Bureau, and I am quite satisfied that if my hon. friend had heard the testimony of the King's Printer before the Public Accounts Committee he would share the opinion which I hold, that the fact that work is done outside does not necessarily mean that money is lost to the people of the country. I am quite sure that if the King's Printer finds his work crowded in the Printing Bureau and if he looks around him he can have his work done without entailing any loss to himself or the country. The work would be expedited, and I have no doubt that we could get many returns before we are now able to get them if the King's Printer were to send them to outside offices. The work might necessarily have to go outside the city of Ottawa, but that is no reason why the work should not be done outside. The only condition which should be considered in this connection is that the work should be done at a reasonable price, and the prices that prevail in the printing offices of this country compare very favourably and, in some instances, as I have observed, are lower than the amount for which the work can be done here. I am perfectly well aware, as my hon. friend says, that this is not a new question. This question has probably been decided some years ago, but perhaps, after all, it has not. It is not so absolutely decided that it cannot be resurrected and considered at the present time or in the future, but I do say that it is well worth considering as to whether or not just as good satisfaction can be had by following the suggestion I made in favour of having work done outside as from having it done at the Printing Bureau under the conditions which prevail there. These conditions have been the subject of complaint here. The King's Printer, before the Public Accounts Committee, during the present session, sounded a note of warning. He said that for many years, for as far back, I think, as ten or twelve years, he has been annually bringing this question to the attention of parliament. He prepared a very elaborate report on one occasion pointing out to members of parliament the necessity that existed for the enlargement of the plant there. Of all the members of parliament, there was but one who took any interest in the matter. There was one member out of two hundred and thirteen who took sufficient trouble to read the report which he made to parliament on that occasion, and at the very earliest opportunity that member was defeated. He rather gave it as a warning that nobody should take any further stock in any reports which he put forward as to the inability of the present plant to cope with the situation. Therefore it is that I throw out the suggestion that before deciding that the plant should be enlarged it would be well to consider whether or not the work could be as well, as cheaply and as expeditiously performed there as elsewhere.

Contingent expenses in connection with the voters' lists, $40,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When this matter was up a few nights ago under the supplementary estimates, I asked the hon Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) how these voters' lists were printed, if they were printed every year and distributed to members. I could tell him, as a matter of fact, that they had not been distributed to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the lists are printed as fast as they come.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the intention, but as my hon. friend knows, the lists are revised at different times in different provinces. In Quebec and Ontario they are now revised about April, but it often happens that there are appeals.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The final revision takes place before a judge in Ontario.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We do not print the lists until they have the seal of the authority of the final revision. At all events it is the intention of the government to print the lists as fast as they come in.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the government print the lists for every constituency each year. Last parliament I know that in some constituencies in New Brunswick they had two lists before I could get one for Lennox, Ontario. I think I only got one voters' list during the whole parliament, and that before the last general election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say how the orders have been carried out, but I understand that the instructions to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery are that as soon as he receives the lists he shall send them to the Printing Bureau.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Every year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As fast as they come; if they come every year they are sent to the printer.

Mr. BERGERON. I think my right hon. friend is mistaken. My recollection is that the lists were only to be printed when an election was to take place.

Mr. BRODEUR. The law provides that the lists be printed every year.

Mr. BERGERON. One of the reasons for repealing the old franchise law was because of the expense of printing these lists every year. I am surprised to hear from the right hon. gentleman that the lists are now printed every year. They should only be printed when they are needed. Generally speaking, an election may not be expected for three or four years in most constituencies, and as the lists will be greatly modified before they are needed for our elections, I do not see why they should be printed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend think the lists should not be printed as fast as they come?

Mr. BERGERON. I cannot see the use of printing the lists when they are not needed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am glad to hear it, and when next we discuss the matter I will be prepared to give an answer to my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. In the province of Ontario, the voters' lists are printed by each municipality every year, and these municipal lists with the same names on them are sent to the Printing Bureau in order to make up the Dominion lists. It seems to me that in any province where each municipality prints the voters' lists every year, it is a useless expenditure to have them reprinted in the Printing Bureau here when the general election comes off. It seems to me that if the government take this matter into their serious consideration, they must arrive at the conclusion that it would be very much better to adopt the lists as they are printed in the province each year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is quite reasonable and for my part I would favour it. I have to say to my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that I was wrong in my statement; I am informed that the lists are printed only when they are required.

Mr. BERGERON. That is what I understood when the law was passed. How much of this vote did you spend last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say. This is a precaution that is taken in case of an emergency.

Mr. BERGERON. This year it may not be needed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It may not, and I do not expect it will.

Mr. FOSTER. It might be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It might be; there is no telling what may take place.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not voted with the intention of spending it?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but I do not see why we should not gratify even the wildest dreams of gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BERGERON. In that event I will not criticise the vote.

Fenian Raid pensions, $2,400.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the right hon. gentleman tell us something about the proposed land grant to the Fenian Raid veterans?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That matter is under consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. I know cases where the widows of some of the officers who rendered valuable service to the country during the Fenian Raid, have never received pensions in any shape or form. As I understand it the land grant will be given to those who are still living, and it would in no way benefit the widows of deceased veterans. The country appreciates the fact that we owe some debt of gratitude to these people, and the proof is that this vote is always passed without criticism. It seems to me that we should go a little further and that in certain cases where men now deceased have rendered valuable military service to the country in other directions, it would be proper to recognize the services by granting some compensation to the survivors of their families who may be in need of assistance. Would it not be proper for parliament to come to the rescue of these people in the same way that we are now voting these items?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The class of cases to which my hon. friend alludes is of a different character from the class covered here. These pensions on acount of the Fenian raid—I speak under correction—must be to persons who were wounded or disabled. My hon. friend is proposing another class of pensions for military service, out of the ordinary. We have not under our law given any pensions for that class of service. Whether we will do it or not is a matter for consideration; but that is not included in this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Then, I am surprised that the names of those to whom we pay the pensions are not mentioned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The names are given, and I will have them for my hon. friend to-morrow.

Compensation to pensioners in lieu of land, $116.76.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is a small vote, but I think it ought to be explained.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not take the trouble to get explanations of these matters, which have been on the votes for several years; but I will give the explanation to my hon. friend on concurrence.

Pensions payable to militiamen on account of the rebellion of 1885, and active services generally, $19,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the same thing. I believe it would be a good thing to have the names. We all know that the United States government is paying more for pensions on account of the Civil War than it did at the commencement. The pensioners, instead of dying, are increasing in number.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that the names are all given in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BERGERON. Then there ought to be a reference in the estimates to the page in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that there is no extension. These amounts were settled, and if there is any change at all, it will be a diminution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. No new name is added. If the name drops, the amount drops accordingly. I will get the names.

Northwest Mounted Police—Northwest Territories, $535,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not intend to take up this item this evening, as I do not see present any member from the Northwest, and I would ask that $25,000 for buildings be reserved, and when we take that up, I will give all the explanations I have to give. I may say that the increase of $35,000 was due to the Bill passed this session to increase the pay of the men from 75 cents to $1 a day, not at one fell swoop, but according to length of service.

Miscellaneous printing, $40,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is to pay for envelopes, labels, paper, paper wrappers, twine, postage, &c., for the distribution of parliamentary documents during the whole year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am afraid it won't do it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have done it before.

Expenses in connection with the Canada Temperance Act, $500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is taken in case we should have an election in a county. We spent nothing last year on this account, and probably will not spend anything this year; but we take this money in case there is a vote in a county.

Returns and other expenses under the Naturalization Act, $3,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the items?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is to pay clerks of courts for furnishing returns of all the naturalization papers which are issued in the year.

Mr. FOSTER. What other expenses are there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that there are any others.

Mr. FOSTER. How many were naturalized last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not tell, it is in our records somewhere. I will get it to-morrow.

Unforeseen expenses, expenditure thereof to be under Order in Council, and a detailed statement to be laid before parliament within the first fifteen days of next session, $30,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this the secret service fund?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend understands what this is for.

Mr. BARKER. Anything spent last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we spent nearly the whole of it.

Salaries and contingencies of the Paris agency, $6,500.

Mr. HENDERSON. That requires some explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very old friend. Mr. Fabre is our commissioner at Paris, and has been since 1881, I believe. Everybody knows the Paris agency, especially those who have been in Paris. The duties performed by Mr. Fabre are well known. He was first appointed commissioner of immigration, but I do not know that he has been very successful in that work. In other respects, however, I think he has been a very efficient and useful officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Outside of immigration, what does he do from year to year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that he does anything except to keep the office open and furnish information to Canadians. The number of Canadians who now visit Europe is very large. As soon as they reach Paris they go to the commissioner's office for all the information they want, and they get it. They register their names, they have their mail sent there, and are able by means of this agency to keep track of their friends. I think Mr. Fabre renders valuable service in these respects.

Mr. FOSTER. What portion of this is for Mr. Fabre's salary?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the greater part is for salary, I could not say how much exactly. But there is the rent of the building to pay, repairs, furniture, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he any staff?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He has no staff except a secretary, that he pays out of his own pocket.

Academy of Arts, $2,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this for pictures ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, this amount is given to the Royal Academy of Arts in this city. If my memory serves me well, this is a special vote given to a certain society in Ottawa to encourage art—the school of design, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman may be right, but I am inclined to think his recollection is not accurate.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, let it stand.

Miscellaneous—expenses of litigated matters between the Dominion of Canada and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec (payments on account of service rendered may be made to members of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act) $3,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. When is this likely to be brought to an end ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish I knew. It has been there to my certain knowledge for nearly forty years. It has been gradually decreased every year, but it has not yet come to an absolute termination. If my hon. friend asks me when it will come to an end, I am sorry to say I cannot give him much information, nor, I am afraid, very much hope.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is no progress being made ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand there is progress being made.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is sometimes hinted that certain gentlemen keep that matter on foot all the time ; it brings in a certain revenue yearly and it is a matter of importance to those who are interested to keep it going along. I am not convinced that the difficulties are so great that the matter could not be brought to a termination. Surely now, nearly forty years after confederation we should pretty well understand how financial matters rest between the Dominion and the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I really think the government should urge the commissioners to bring in a report covering a final settlement of these old questions. There may be some considerable interest involved, but a hint from the government might do much to bring the matter to an end.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I need hardly remind my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that the mills of the gods grind slow and the mills of the courts grind——

Mr. HENDERSON. Slower still.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will not say that, nor yet will I take issue with my hon. friend on that point. My hon. friend is aware that time and again points have been decided by the commissioners, then taken to the courts, and there appealed to the higher courts. Gradually all the questions have been settled—I believe only one question now remains for consideration and decision.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that that bridge question in Quebec ? I understand that there was $37,000 involved in some question concerning a bridge—I think it was over the Yamaska river. It seems a pity to keep this whole question open on that account. It would be better to pay for the bridge and let the matter be wound up.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the matter to which my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) refers is the Richelieu bridge matter, which was disposed of by the courts.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) may be right. Now that I come to think of it, I believe the commissioners decided—and decided against Quebec, did they not ?—but allowed an appeal if the parties were not satisfied. So if it is before the courts it is one of the matters still unsettled.

Mr. BRODEUR. The bridge is in my own county. A decision has been rendered in the matter. An action was taken by the proprietor against the federal government who pleaded that they were not bound to pay. The judgment went against the government. I do not know whether there has been a claim by the federal government against the provincial government or not.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the case that had something to do with the Yuile family ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the Supply Bill not ready ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We expect to take up the Supply Bill, then the resolution of the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and, in that connection the subject brought up by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) about cutting down the militia establishment.

Mr. FOSTER. And clause 16 of the Autonomy Bill ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we shall resume that on Thursday when the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is here.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 6, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Pensions payable on account of Fenian raid, $2,400.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I promised yesterday that I would give certain information asked for upon the item of pensions on account of the Fenian raid. The details are to be found in the Auditor General's Report, Vol. 1, G—16. In regard to pensions to militiamen on account of the Northwest rebellion, the accounts are to be found in detail in the same volume, same page. As far as I remember, these pensions were granted to some of the men in the force upon the report of the board appointed for that purpose.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked me yesterday about the number of persons naturalized last year. The number is 4,402.

Mr. FOSTER. In what report is that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The details are in the report of the Secretary of State, page VI. But this information I have received indirectly from the Secretary of State.

I was also asked for some information with regard to another item in the pension list, that is the amounts paid to pensioners in lieu of land. This is such an old item that it is somewhat difficult to get the information; but I understand that the amount paid so far has been $8,900. A pensioner gets $19.14 per annum. So far as we can ascertain, there are only two now living.

I was also asked for information about the item in the estimates of $2,000 granted to the Academy of Arts. This amount is paid to the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts, at Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. Then with reference to the issue of patents, in relation to scrip.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have not the information yet; I may get it to-day.

POST OFFICE REGULATIONS.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). Whilst we are waiting for the Supply Bill, might I ask the Prime Minister whether he has a copy of that circular from the Post Office Department to lay on the table of the House?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Speaking on behalf of the Postmaster General, we have not a copy of the circular to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I may say that circular was sent out pursuant to regulations of the Post Office Department dealing with the conduct of postmasters generally. The department issued instructions that postmasters must not distribute matter which was sent to them in bulk, as it interfered materially with the collection of revenue, inasmuch as such mail matter would pass through the mails at cheaper rates than it otherwise would. That of course would not apply to a frank, but at the same time the post office authorities have found it necessary to deal with the postmasters on general principles and to instruct them as to their conduct with regard to all mail matter whether franked or stamped. If discretion were allowed to postmasters as to when they should carry out the departmental instructions, we would have endless difficulty and the postmasters would be constantly contravening their instructions in a way which would very materially interfere with the postal revenue. In this particular case the postmaster seems to have received a parcel of something sent by a member of this House. The post office authorities have no information as to what instructions the postmaster received from the sender of the package. However he was doing what was contrary to his instructions in taking the contents of that parcel and distributing them. Under ordinary circumstances if that parcel had been stamped the revenue received from it would be very much less than if the documents had been sent separately and each stamped. It is therefore evident that in the public interest postmasters should not be allowed to follow the practice complained of. If postmasters could exercise their discretion to do or to refuse to do what they are requested, it might lead to complications in regard to the personality of the postmaster and result in postmasters doing what would entail dismissal or severe reprimand from the postal authorities. The post office considers that a frank is merely a substitute for a stamp, and that franked matter is subject to all the regulations which govern stamped matter sent through the mails. The frank is accepted by the authorities as entitling a letter to go forward, but at the same time it carries with it no privilege which stamped mail matter would not carry. I do not think there is any further information to be given, but if my hon. friend desires further explanation I will be glad to ascertain it from the Post Office Department.

Mr. D. HENDERSON. We are all very glad to hear the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, because we have no desire to put the postmasters of the country in an improper position. I may say that I have been a frequent offender under the rule laid down by the Minister of Agriculture. We receive a great many bulletins, not only those emanating from the Commission on Agriculture and Colonization of the House, but other documents of a character such

as pass through the mails without postage, and I have had no hesitation at any time in putting these up in parcels of from ten to twelve, addressing them to a particular country postmaster, and writing upon them 'parliamentary papers,' and a request to distribute them. I have found the postmasters always willing to hand these out to the farmers, exercising, I presume, a discretion in giving them to such farmers as are likely to make a proper use of them. I do not think that is an improper use of the post office. These bulletins are entitled to go free through the post office, whether sent from Ottawa or from our homes; and this method of sending simply avoided the necessity of my addressing them separately. I have made it a point to ask the farmers in the section of country to which they were sent, and I have found that the postmasters did, at my request, distribute these bulletins. I know no better way of getting this information into the hands of the people of the country, and I think the Postmaster General is placing undue restriction upon the liberties of members of parliament in making a strict rule of this kind. The question of revenue is not involved at all, because if a member has a right to frank a parcel containing a dozen documents, he has a right to frank each one separately. If he franks each one separately and addresses it to the individual into whose hands he wishes it to go, there is nothing lost to the revenue, and there would be nothing lost to the revenue if he sent ten or a dozen of these to the postmaster and asked him to distribute them. I do not presume that any member of parliament would think of sending out mail matter that was not entitled to free delivery, and ask a postmaster to distribute that. I do not think such a practice has taken place; I have not heard of it; nor do I think that any member of parliament would jeopardize his position by presuming to do anything of that kind. I think the Postmaster General might reasonably make an exception of parliamentary documents bearing the impress of the King's Printer, which are entitled to go through the post office free of charge. The Minister of Agriculture is certainly mistaken in regard to the loss of revenue. The revenue would not be affected one whit. I fail to see that any wrong would be done to the country, and so long as the postmaster is willing to do this slight service in accommodating his neighbour by handing around such documents as bulletins, I think there is practically no ground for complaint. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture, who is acting for the Postmaster General in his absence, to point this out to the Postmaster General, and ask him not to deprive us of this privilege which we have enjoyed, legally or illegally. I never thought that I was doing anything wrong when I was using the postal service for a very proper purpose—to promote the work of the Minister of Agriculture. Now he seeks to impose a restriction upon us. I think the farmers of the country will not care to have him stand up in the House and say that their privileges should be interfered with in this way. This is a matter of convenience to members of parliament, who are busy people when they get home. If we get four or five hundred bulletins, and have to sit down and address each one separately, and look up the post offices, my impression is that they will be found in the waste basket instead of going into the hands of the farmers. If an exception were made in this case, I am satisfied that no loss of revenue would result, and no harm would be done in any way.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend does not seem to have caught the point I was making. I had no intention of expressing the idea that the mailing of matter by members in that way affected the revenue. What I did point out was that the franking privilege carries with it no privilege that stamped mail matter does not. The frank simply takes the place of the stamp. The regulations and rules of the office have to apply to franked matter just the same as they do to stamped matter. If postmasters are to be allowed to do this work for correspondents, whether members of parliament or not, it will interfere, very materially and seriously, with the collection of revenue in the case of stamped matter. That is the view of the Post Office Department. If they are to allow a postmaster to do this under certain circumstances and not under other circumstances, the authorities contend that it would bring about confusion in the post offices. Postmasters would very often do it when they were not allowed to do it as well as when they were allowed to do it. I am informed by the deputy Postmaster General that there has to be on the part of the authorities a very constant and close watch, especially over country postmasters, because they are constanly being asked to facilitate the use of the post office for the carriage of matter without payment. It is very common for people in a country village to put things into the post office without placing stamps on them for somebody else who collects his mail at that office. That of course is clearly contrary to the interest of the postal revenue, because all such matter ought to be stamped. That is only one of many ways in which postmasters are tempted not to collect revenue which ought to be collected. Every exception made tends to increase that confusion and the chances of loss of revenue. My hon. friend has said that it is a great convenience to members to be able to call on postmasters to do this work for them. I grant that; I have no doubt of it. At the same time, the post office authorities consider that the calling on postmasters to do that is a distinct interference with their work as postmasters,

and is detrimental to the public service. If postmasters are asked, they do not like to refuse. They will probably find a great deal of difficulty in refusing their representative in the House ; and yet the doing of it might seriously interfere with the performance of their duties for which they are paid by the Post Office Department. For that reason the Post Office Department does not consider that it is in the public interest that such a request should be made to the postmaster. My hon. friend speaks about the distribution of literature to the farmers. No doubt it is very desirable that that should be done as widely as possible. At the same time, I do not think that the farmers of the country are asking any special privileges or advantages which other people should not have. If this concession were to be made to members, there is no evidence or knowledge as to the kind of literature that would be sent.

A member can send a bundle to one postmaster and a bundle to another, but unfortunately in the country post offices that opportunity has been taken advantage of for the distribution of circulars and advertisements and things of that kind—I do not mean with the frank but without the frank —in the ordinary course of business. Consequently the post office authorities had to exercise very considerable supervision over the conduct of the post masters in this respect.

Mr. BARR. I regret very much that the department should have seen fit to change the present practice which has been in vogue for the last quarter of a century ; not only in this House but in the provincial parliament as well. Of course in the latter the postage must be paid. The custom is one which is worked, not only to the convenience of members but to the interest of the public. As regards the plea that this occasions trouble to postmasters, I can assure you, Sir, that such is not the case. No member would think of imposing additional trouble on the postmasters if the latter were not willing to do that work. In fact the work in that connection is exceedingly trifling. I hardly think that the Postmaster General understands the position in the country districts or he would not have made the change. All that a postmaster in a rural district has to do is to open the package and place the documents on the counter and let those who call at the office take them. In that way a great deal of useful information can be spread throughout the country and no loss of revenue occasioned. This change will put the members of this House to great inconvenience and deprive the country of those bulletins, because members will not have the time to send out each bulletin separately. It would be impossible for members of this House to do this when, as at present, they have to do so much of their own writing, unlike the practice in some of the local legislatures, where the members can avail themselves of the staff of sessional clerks for that purpose. Here, however, there is no such staff which members can utilize by dictating their correspondence to shorthand writers and having it typewritten and transmitted through the mails. I hope that the hon. the Postmaster General will consider this matter of sending out packages of official documents and also the suggestion of endeavouring to place members in the position of being able to attend to the wants of their own constituencies without the great labour, inconvenience and expense now entailed upon them.

WAYS AND MEANS—INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved :

1. Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1905, the sum of $6,364,522.27 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

2. Resolved, That towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1906, the sum of $37,374,535.62 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Resolution reported, read the first and the second time and agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 168) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June 1905, and the 30th June 1906.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time and passed.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—SALARIES.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the salary of the commandant of the Royal Military College shall not exceed $3,200 a year, and that the salaries of the staff adjutant, professors, instructors, assistant instructors and staff, shall be fixed and may be readjusted from time to time by the Governor in Council—Sir Frederick Borden.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The object of this resolution is to found thereon a Bill which I will introduce presently, if the resolution carries, which will provide that the salary of the commandant shall not exceed $3,200 a year, and that the salaries of the staff adjutant, professors, instruc-

tors, assistant instructors and staff, shall be fixed, and may be readjusted from time to time by the Governor in Council; and that the details of such salaries shall appear in the annual report laid before parliament by the Minister of Militia and Defence. In fact it will be an Act to amend the existing provisions in the Act respecting the Royal Military College, which are as follows :

The salary of the commandant shall not exceed $3,200 a year ; the salary of the staff adjutant shall not exceed $1,400 a year, and the salaries of the professors, instructors and assistant instructors shall not exceed the total sum of $26,000 annually. The Governor in Council may from time to time readjust the number and duties, and, within the limit above mentioned, the salaries of the staff, and the details of such salaries shall appear in the annual report laid before parliament by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the college has grown, and we have now reached the limit of $26,000 for salaries provided in the existing Royal Military College Act. I think it desirable, as later on there may be a further growth and expansion, that the limit of $26,000 should be removed. Parliament always controls these votes, and I thought it better that an amendment should be passed adhering to the limitation of the salary of the commandant, and to the provision with regard to the other professors, but withdrawing from the Bill the limitation of $26,000; leaving it to the Governor in Council to fix the amount of salaries, and leaving it to parliament to vote such sum as may be considered necessary.

Mr. DANIEL. Do the present salaries appear in detail anywhere?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, my hon. friend will find them in the Auditor General's Report, and they are in the report of the Minister of Militia.

Mr. DANIEL. In the Act just read is it provided that they shall be in the militia report?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The salaries shall appear in the annual report laid before parliament by the Minister of Militia and Defence.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the present amount?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are spending more than $26,000 now.

Mr. TISDALE. Do I understand that under this amendment, by Order in Council you can change the salary and the amounts without first getting the consent of parliament?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We can do that now up to $26,000. We are not increasing the salaries, but we may want more professors. At the present moment we are unable to go beyond $26,000 in providing for the teaching staff of the college. We have reached that limit, we are beyond it now, and it was thought wise to remove that restriction, seeing that the whole matter is absolutely within the control of parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. But do you mention a limit in the new Act?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend might be able to fix a limit by calculating how much money he will require, and say that the total shall not exceed the sum fixed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There is no objection to that, but I think it would be wiser to remove the restriction, because in the course of a few years the college may grow, I think it will. The number of students that can now be accommodated is only 100, and I should think that before many years the capacity of the college will need to be extended to accommodate 200.

Mr. TISDALE. What was the object of fixing a limit in the first place?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know, I suppose the object was to prevent an expenditure beyond $26,000. But the question is whether such a limit is either desirable or necessary, in view of the fact that every year the whole expenditure is submitted to parliament and subject to criticism, the salaries are all published to the world, and are the subject of discussion here when the estimates are taken every year.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not remember having read the discussion that took place when the limit was fixed. But I can imagine that it was pointed out that, so long as we know that the expense for these professors cannot exceed a certain sum unless a statute providing for that excess is passed, it is a guarantee that there will be opportunity for careful discussion before increase is made ; whereas, if it is left unlimited, additions may be made imperceptibly and without any opportunity for discussion. If the minister would fix a sum beyond which he would not go, I should think that would be sufficient. I was glad to hear him say that he had no objection to that limitation. Even when, in the fullness of time, it becomes necessary to make an increase, it would probably be well to limit that increase and so continue the safeguard that we now have. I think this would be in the interest of the college itself, because it would be an assurance to the public that there is no danger of drifting into undue expenditure. It would be a protection to the minister also, because there are always plenty of people anxious to serve the country at a sufficient salary,

and, if there is no limit the minister will be under constant pressure to increase the expenditure.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I said I have no objection to following the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Tisdale). In looking over the history of the present law, I find that in the Royal Military Act as first passed there was no restriction of this kind, but there was a restriction as to the salaries of the professors. The Act provided :

> The salary of the commandant shall be not more than $3,000. And the salaries of the professors shall be not more than $2,000 each.

That law, which was passed in 1875 or 1876 was re-enacted when the statutes were revised in 1886. But in 1893 the law was changed and the maximum for the commandant was fixed at $3,200, instead of $3,000, the restriction as to the other professors was removed, and a limit of $26,000 was fixed to the total expenditure on this account. I think the amount that we shall require at this moment will be about $30,000, and I am willing that it should be fixed at that. Or perhaps, while we are about it, it might be better to make it a little more—say $35,000. Would there be any objection to that

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. minister knows best what he intends to do.

Mr. DANIEL. Last year the salaries of the superior staff cost $30,248.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then, $30,000 would not be enough.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not make it $35,000 and leave it at that for a while ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. If $35,000 would be acceptable I will move to amend the resolution in that way.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me that we are proceeding without knowing anything at all. The minister tells us that he was limited to $26,000 under the law ; the next moment he admits that he has spent $30,000. How can that be ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will understand that I did not spend any money that was not voted by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. But I understand the minister to say that there is a restriction in the law by which he is not allowed to spend more than $26,000 ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But each year the Supply Bill has voted more. Of course it was not consistent with the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, what the minister asks parliament to do in voting supply was to repeal that clause of the Act.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Practically.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not suppose that he ever told parliament that that was what he was doing, for I think that if he had done so, parliament would have told him that before asking for more than was allowed by law, he should seek the repeal of the law fixing the limit. But the main point is this : The minister says he wants more money. What does he intend to do with it ? What has he been doing up to the present time ? How far does he propose to change the military college either as to the scope of its work or the efficiency of its work ? If he intends to change the scope of the work and come into competition with universities and colleges, I do not think that that is a thing we ought to do. If for the military side of the work it is necessary to have more assistance, that is a fair matter for us to consider. I can readily understand that the limit was put there in the first place because there was a good deal of opposition to the government running a collegiate institution and a good deal of suspicion that it would involve too great expense. Consequently, no doubt, in the discussion it was generally agreed upon that a work such as was outlined at that time could be done with a certain sum of money, and that was fixed as the limit. I would like to know from the minister how many professors he has in the college, how many branches he is teaching and what he proposes to do in the way of extension requiring more money. We ought to know this before we are asked to amend the law so as to allow larger sums to be devoted to these purposes. I think there is a limit beyond which we are not justified in going. We have other universities in different cities—one of them in Kingston itself. These are able to cope with all the work of civil education—if that is a proper name for it. We have colleges that are well equipped ; and it is not worth while for us to set up rival institutions. The object young men have in going to the military school is to finish their education with respect to military matters.

How far is it advisable for them to lay the foundation of their education in the other colleges and universities that we have, and then, when they come to the West Point of Canada, if it is that, or meant to be that, have their attention devoted chiefly to the training and education necessary in a technical way towards making them useful for the military purposes of this Dominion ? I understand it is not the purpose in view, or meant to be the purpose, to graduate young men from that institution and to send them out into the various avocations and civil businesses of life. Yet that is what we have been doing. Probably nine-tenths of those who have been put through that institution have gone out and have not devoted their energies to the military line of work, but to some purpose or profession that young men are fitted for by the col-

leges and universities of the country. I think it is time for us to discuss thoroughly and may be to revise our action in this respect. Is it worth while keeping up a military college at large expense to the government simply to train young men for the civil businesses of the country? If it is not wise, and I think we all agree to that, is it wise to educate only those we can use for our military purposes, and cannot that be done for a less amount of money than that which we have to supply for the teaching and professorial work for a general grounding in the other branches of study which are pursued equally well, and may be better, at the universities and colleges? Would it not be wiser for our young men to pursue a certain course of preparation in our colleges and schools that provide the necessary qualification for entrance into the military school, and then finish their military education in that institution? Should not that be the real purpose of the military college? As it is now, I imagine you have professors there who take boys from the common school and teach them mensuration, trigonometry and the mathematics—I do not know whether you teach classics or not—and a great many things that the colleges, schools and universities are specially instituted and established to teach. The whole point I am making is: Are we duplicating unnecessarily the work of the teaching institutions of the country?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not see how you can separate the technical education, which is a proper part of a military education, from the other branches of knowledge which are indispensable to the soldier. These young men are taken at a certain age, and if they are to receive their training as soldiers it is necessary that they shall receive, not only a technical education, but that they shall receive also a general education to fit them to take their places in the ranks. I do not think it would be well to teach all the subjects of the higher classes which are taught by the universities, such as classics and so on, but when we take young men of thirteen or fourteen years of age it is indispensable that they should be taught such subjects as mathematics, geometry, geography, engineering and so on. That is indispensable, it seems to me, and I do not see how you can teach one without teaching the other. In addition to that, they must be taught horsemanship and artillery. They are taught those things which essentially belong to the education of a soldier, but they cannot have a complete education unless they also have the other branches of knowledge to which I have referred. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asks: Are we going to train young men for the purpose of being soldiers, and after all train them for civil life? In my judgment, that is unavoidable. Luckily we shall not require all the young men that are turned out of the military college for military purposes. I say luckily, because I hope the day is far distant when we shall have war. I hope we shall never have war, but we have our college—our West Point as my hon. friend calls it—because of the possibility of having war, and the experience of other nations has proved that in the emergency of war if you have in the walks of civil life any number of men who have received a military education you have the best preparation that you can have for the defence of the country. My hon. friend has only to be reminded that at the outset of the civil war the generals who became most efficient in the American army were Generals Grant, Sherman and McLellan, who had received a military education, but who had left the army and gone into the civil walks of life. General McLellan was the manager of a railway, if I remember right; General Sherman, if I remember well, was a teacher in a college, and General Grant had gone into different occupations, but when the country was divided they came back to the army; and of all the men who went into the war, and there was no want of enthusiasm, those who turned out to be at once successful were the men who had had a military training. Let us say that every year we turn out a number of young men who have received a military education. It is an excellent training for civil life. It gives them an idea of discipline and an idea of many subjects that are of the utmost importance to them. Let the contingency of the country being plunged into war arise, and these young men will leave their occupations, come back into the ranks and form the nucleus of the defence of the country. So I think my hon. friend will agree with me that the training that is given in the military college is quite proper and necessary. It is not confined to the technical branches of the profession, but it also embraces all the subjects of knowledge which are as useful and necessary to the soldier as to any other man in any walk of civil life.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend has scarcely given me credit for the idea I was trying to bring forward. He says it is necessary that you should have your military men well trained and well conditioned in other branches of knowledge. There is no difference between himself and myself there. The only difference that there is between us in that respect would be this: Is it necessary for us to do all that in the military college, or is it not possible for us to take advantage of the other institutions of learning in which young men are grounded, and then that they should enter the military college to round off their technical and military education? You might as well say that you must teach everything at the military college from A, B, C up. You have right alongside that college in Kingston a well equipped university—Queen's. There

are men in that institution who teach the arts and sciences, and the practical sciences as well. Is there no way by which there can be a co-operation between the institutions that already exist and your military college, so that you need not throw away or duplicate the work of these institutions ? Is that not possible ? The medical man is trained for his profession, but the medical colleges do not teach all the other branches of a liberal education. These are taught elsewhere, and in connection with his training and his profession, the medical training that is given in the medical college is exclusively in the line of medical knowledge. Of course, a doctor would be a very poor outfit unless he were as well as possible instructed in the elements of a liberal education, but the medical college does not propose to do that, and does not do it. It confines itself, through its experts in special courses, to the making of a doctor out of certain material, and the better the material the better the doctor.

What I am arguing for is this : is it not possible for this military institution to avail itself of the large and generous training afforded in the other institutions of learning, and for it to devote its attention specially to the making of military men. No one doubts that if you have men who have a knowledge of military matters and you do not want to keep them at mimic warfare all the time, it is a great deal better they should be engaged in other avocations of life, while of course they are a great deal better fitted if the occasion should arise, to take their share in the enginery of war. But the very same thing could be accomplished by utilizing the training institutions we have and with which we do not wish to compete, and let the military training establishment be specially for military purposes. The objection may be urged, that those whom you wish to train in the technique of war, you must bring under military discipline when they are young. Other things being equal, I suppose it would be better that you should apply the methods of military discipline from a very early age, but there are disadvantages connected with that. Too much military discipline contracts life in grooves which are not quite advantageous in the general every day rough and tumble of life. While you may sacrifice something of machine like precision because you have not the boys in your hands from twelve to fifteen years of age, yet probably the men as a whole would gain by not being so long under that strict form of discipline. I would like to know what is being done in the military college now ; how much of the work that might be done by other educational institutions, are we duplicating, and is it impossible for us to co-operate with and take advantage of the work done by these other colleges so that in the military college we might devote our efforts chiefly to military training. I do not imagine we are aiming at raising up a phalanx of great generals ; what we do want to get is a certain number of trained young men who will make efficient officers for the militia of the country, and if war ever comes, who will be the more competent to serve their own country because of their military training. We do not want to subordinate the whole of the life of these young men to military work, but we do want to form material which may be utilized if ever the opportunity should arise for actual war, and which can be availed of as directors of that less efficient military education which we give to our militia through the annual drill. It is well worth while considering whether we may not easily go to too great expense in trying to duplicate what other institutions would do for us equally well, and, not in the end to the disadvantage of the men who are turned out from the military college.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I appreciate the position which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) takes. I do not understand that he is against the military college——

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But, my hon. friend seems to think that we could spend this money better by conducting a college which would take young men from other colleges and educate them specially in military subjects after they had acquired a certain portion of their general education. I believe there is a great deal of force in that contention, and I think the time will come when we should act from that point of view, but I do not think it has come yet. If my hon. friend has read the debate which took place when the military college was founded—I happened to be in the House at the time and heard the discussion—he will find that Mr. Alexander Mackenzie who took a very active interest in the matter, pointed out that it was desirable to found a college of this kind, not with the expectation that the graduates would take up to any very great extent military careers, but to secure by a composite military and general education a class of young men who, although they might follow civil pursuits, would be of great use to the country in the event of war. For that purpose every graduate of the military college, whether he enters the active militia or the permanent force, or not, is on the list and liable to be called on as an officer of the King. It was thought, and I think the idea was sound, that the military training and the technical knowledge which the Royal Military College graduate acquired, might prove—and it has proved—of very great advantage to the country. During the last nine years we have taken one step in the direction the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) suggests. Originally the course was four years and the age of matriculation fifteen years ; we have reduced the course to three years and we have raised the age of matriculation from fifteen to seventeen

years, so that thus far we have met the views of the hon. gentleman. I feel we have gone far enough for the present, though, I think later on we may take an additional step. The length of the course in the military colleges in England is two years, and those entering are expected to have a good general education.

Mr. FOSTER. At what age do they enter?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is either eighteen or nineteen years, I am not positive. Some day no doubt we will come to that position. As to interference with the other universities, or as to the allegation that this government is subsidizing a college in opposition to other universities, I do not think there is much in that, and so far as I know the other universities are not in any way jealous of the Royal Military College. They are glad to co-operate with the military college in every way. As a matter of fact, many of the graduates of the military college, after graduating take special courses in engineering and other branches in the great universities of the country. The training which the young men receive at that college is of a special character ; it is calculated to improve them in every way, physically, morally and mentally ; it is invaluable for men who are to follow a military career, but is I believe enormously valuable for men, no matter what may be their lot in life afterwards. I think we can scarcely overestimate the importance of that course. I think we do not sufficiently value the advantage which that college has been to Canada during the twenty-five or thirty years of its existence. As to the future of the college, my hon. friend has asked me very properly what is being taught at the college at the present time. I have here the curriculum, or list of subjects taught.

Mr. TISDALE. Is there a matriculation examination?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, a very severe matriculation examination—indeed, more severe than the matriculation examination in most of the universities, including an examination, I may say, in classics. In the first class is taught : military engineering, reconnaisance, science (including physics and chemistry), civil surveying, civil engineering, infantry drill, artillery drill, equitation, gymnastics and fencing, rifle practice, revolver practice. In the second class: mathematics and mechanics, descriptive geometry military engineering, artillery (theory and construction) of tactics, military administration, military law, military topography, civil surveying, French, infantry drill, artillery drill, signalling, gymnastics, rifle practice, revolver practice, workshops. In the third class: mathematics and mechanics, geometrical drawing, military engineering, artillery, military topography, English, French, infantry drill, artillery drill, gymnastics, swimming, rifle practice, revolver practice, workshops. Many subjects, of course, are begun in the first year and continued during the second and third years. With regard to the advantage of this college to Canada, I regret to say that in the past we have not been able to secure many of the graduates for our own permanent force.

Mr. FOSTER. How many have been graduated up to date?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 400. Unfortunately, owing to the fact that our permanent force did not offer very many temptations to young men who wished to follow a military career, we have not had the advantage of having many of the young gentlemen join that force. But some of them have done so, and a few have reached senior positions; and they are most useful officers in the several departments in which they are serving.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are now actively engaged in that work in Canada ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At present I think there are in the permanent militia force about twenty or twenty-two ; but after the closing of the present term of the college on the 1st of July there will be about forty, owing to the better prospects now afforded of a career in that force, and owing to the fact that a few years ago we carried through this House a pension Bill for the militia, which is now law. Some of those in the second year are likely to be offered positions. So that altogether the record is not too discouraging, and it augurs well, I think, for the future.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the amount expended last year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The expenditure is not so large as it seems, because we are recouped for a very large part of it. The young gentlemen pay so much a year, which goes into the public treasury.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the fee?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A $100 fee and about $200 for supplies—about $300 each. So that the actual expenditure of the country on the college is not more than $65,000 a year; and, after all, considering the work which that college has done, not only in Canada, but in other colonies and in the empire, in the way of making Canada better known, I think we are paying a very small amount of money for the advantages received. My hon. friend has asked me what the salaries at the present moment are. The amount spent yast year was slightly over $26,000.

Mr. TISDALE. What is the reason of this increase ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The increase in the number of pupils. Ten years ago

the number of graduates per annum was about nine ; now it is thirty-four. The number of applications to get into the college last year was over fifty, and only those applicants are admitted who get the most marks. There is therefore now competition for admission. Those who get the highest marks come first. The capacity of the college is about 100, and each year there are about thirty-four vacancies.

Mr. TISDALE. Do you keep the number up to the maximum ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, we have to turn away a large number of applicants. Last year forty-six passed the examination, and we only had thirty-four places. There are ninety-five in the college now.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why should there be an increase in the cost of running when there is no increase in the capacity ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have double the number of students now that we had ten years ago, and are being asked to provide assistant teachers. We have added two or three assistants to the college, who are absolutely necessary.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are the classes so large that you require to have two professors now where one sufficed before ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About nine years ago, when I took office, the college was very much run down, and the number of students was a little more than half what it is to-day. Then the duration of tuition was four years instead of three as it is now. I do not say that there is the same amount of work done in three years that there was in four, but the military training, which was formerly spread over four years, is now limited to three.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How many additional professors have you ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Three.

Mr. FOSTER. How many altogether ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Commandant is Lieutenant-Colonel Reade, imperial officer. Mr. E. V. O. Hewett, imperial officer, is professor of strategy, tactics and staff duties. Mr. H. A. Panet, graduate of Royal Military College, was adjutant, and has been replaced by another graduate of the Royal Military College.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he teach ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. He looks after the discipline of the college. Mr. C. M. B. Dunlop, is professor of artillery, administration and law. He is an imperial officer. Mr. N. A. W. Scott is a professor of military surveying and superintendent of drill and gymnastics, also an imperial officer. Captain H. J. Dawson, is assistant instructor of mathematics. Captain T. V. Anderson, graduate of the Royal Military College, is assistant instructor of civil engineering. Captain E. L. Mozly, imperial officer, is professor of military engineering. Captain J. B. Cochrane, is professor of civil surveying, physics and chemistry. Professor J. E. Martin, is professor of mathematics and mechanics and astronomy. Professor Chartrand, who died, has been replaced by Professor Lanos, as teacher of French. Mr. Lanos was formerly a teacher of modern languages to young gentlemen of the British Navy at Halifax. He was appointed a month after Mr. Chartrand's death. Professor W. R. Butler, formerly of King's College, Nova Scotia, is professor of civil engineering. Professor Alexander Laird is professor of English. Dr. L. K. Kilburn is medical officer. The recent appointments are Mr. Anderson, assistant instructor of civil engineering, son of Colonel Anderson of the Marine and Fisheries Department, a very bright young man who graduated at the Royal Military College, and Mr. Dawson, assistant instructor of mathematics. The total amount paid for salaries is $29,930, out of which is to be deducted $3,163.33 provided by statute and the adjutant, $1,400.

Mr. FOSTER. You have four hundred graduates and have employed at the most twenty-two for military purposes in this country. The others have gone into civil life ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We have a very much larger number than that in the active militia and we have trebled the number employed in the different departments at Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. For the exclusively technical work for which this college was designed, you have out of 400 graduates made use of twenty-two ? You have some others doing clerk work in the department, which is very good if they are good clerks, and if not, they are not made any better because they happen to have gone through the military college.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are doing clerical work in the departments.

Mr. FOSTER. That would be a proper use for graduates of the military college, but no doubt it is work which any well educated clerk could do, because it is routine work more than anything else. The thought that comes to one is this : Out of 400 graduates of this institution, you have between 22 and 40 who are engaged in more or less technical military work in Canada. The institution at present will turn out 34 graduates a year. Now, does not the minister think he has space enough and machinery enough in that establishment to turn out all the military graduates that can be employed in military work, technical and general, in this country and still leave a sufficient surplus as our contribu-

tion to the military force of the empire? What is the purpose of turning out twice as many, or three times as many, if, after their graduation they are simply to be absorbed into the ordinary work of the world? For such work they would be as well trained by other institutions. I think it is an excellent thing that some of those who go through our military college take up the military profession in other parts of the empire and do work in that way for the empire. I do not think Canada loses by that; I think she gains. If war came to Canada, this is the class of men who would come back here, and useful men they would be, too. But, turning out 34 well equipped, thoroughly instructed men every year, it seems to me you are educating all that are needed for our own service and providing all the surplus that is necessary. So, if there is an idea that because there are more applicants you must enlarge your classes and enlarge your college, I think that you can very well think over the contrary proposition which I submit and with saving of expense. Why not turn attention to making the 34 graduates that you turn out more efficient, more thorough, if they need more thoroughness, and, instead of increasing quantity improve in quality? And there is another point. Here you have a professor of surveying;—that is military surveying, of course. That is a little different from civil surveying—it is somewhat technical. You have a professor of mathematics. Now, mathematics is mathematics whether it is taught in a military establishment or any other, and however it may be applied.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But, if my hon. friend will allow me, it is absolutely necessary for instruction in artillery and engineering.

Mr. FOSTER. But there is no essential difference in mathematics taught in military college and mathematics taught in Queen's University or anywhere else. These schools and colleges are doing this part of the work of education and can be relied upon to do it. Then you have civil engineering, and to that the same statement applies. Then you have a professor of physics and chemistry. These branches are taught equally well in other institutions. You have a French teacher and an English teacher. For French, English, mathematics, physics, chemistry and civil engineering you have instructors and professors in the military college; and all these branches are taught at least equally well in other institutions. I go further and say that they are taught better. You cannot put a French teacher into the military college to give what time he can to boys who enter at seventeen years of age and expect him to do much in teaching them French. He may keep up the French they have, he may even help those who are English to learn a little more French. But French, English, and these other branches can be more competently taught to young men in the colleges and universities and schools than they can by the casual and fragmentary work which is possible on these lines in a military college. Putting all these together, it seems to me that, with proper co-operation the military college could be the means of much more efficient work in its own line. By providing a rigid examination so that only those could be admitted who were well grounded in the branches taught in other institutions, you would have classes of young men who would devote their attention particularly to the military side of their education. If that all means that you get young men even at a riper age, it would do no harm. I think eighteen would be a better age than seventeen. The reason why many of the boys who graduate at a military college do not apply themselves to military life is that they have not the military taste. I do not know whether that taste is born in a boy or not; but I doubt very much that it can be educated into any large proportion of the youth of this country. When a boy has reached the age of eighteen he knows whether his bent is towards a military life or not. If he then makes the choice of entering the military college, it is fair to assume that is because he has a liking for military life, and probably, an aptitude for it; and this is the class of young men who will be the most apt, the most easily instructed and the most efficient graduates in military science. This, evidently is what the English people think. Their military colleges take boys at nineteen years of age. I imagine, though, I cannot speak by the book, that when these applicants come to the military colleges at nineteen, they must be very well grounded in the other branches.

How favourably Kingston is situated for such a work as I have indicated. The military college is alongside one of the best educational institutions we have in Ontario or in the Dominion. Co-operation would be so easy and, so would be the increasing of the limit of age and making the course, if anything, a litle shorter. That may be a matter for very careful consideration. It may be that three years is not too long for a young man to devote to work upon the military side of his education. I think there is something in the view I have tried to present regarding the educational side of the question. Now you have, I suppose, about 30 per class.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 32.

Mr. FOSTER. The professor teaches military matters to a class of not less than thirty. Would not a larger class be better? For instance, in teaching strategy, how to avoid your enemy, how to get on his weak side, how to deploy—can he not do that better when he has thirty or forty than

when he has only fifteen? He gets up nearer to army conditions. Then the professor of artillery can just as well instruct forty pupils as ten, and do it with a great deal more vim, as he has more inspiration. The same way with military surveying. He takes his class out, I suppose, and teaches them military surveying. It seems to me therefore that your professorial staff ought to take care of an average class of about thirty. Each class, I suppose, would average about that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About thirty-two or thirty-three. I would like to add a word. I do not differ seriously from the view of my hon. friend, except that, as I have already said, I think there was something in Mr. Mackenzie's idea that it was desirable to educate a class of young men, not only fitting them for the ordinary duties of life, but carrying along with that a special and technical military education. My hon. friend has not referred to that point which I made; but he agrees with me that at the time when Mr. Mackenzie spoke there was something in that idea, and we have consequently a large number of men in this country engaged in civil pursuits whose names are in the militia list, and who took that course, and would be very valuable men in the event of stress. My hon. friend argues that we should go still further in the direction in which I have taken one step, by reducing the length of the term one year. He also proposes—I do not understand that he wishes it to be done at once, but that eventually we may take young men at a greater age, say eighteen or nineteen, with higher acquirements and higher qualifications, from the high schools and universities of the country, and give them a military education alone. I am inclined to agree very much with that view.

Mr. FOSTER. Founded upon the broader elements.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly. No doubt the present college will be sufficient for many years to come to accommodate all the students we will have. But for a time at least, we must go on as we are now. When we reach the point to which my hon. friend refers, it will be necessary to do as is done to-day in the military college in England, and as is done at West Point, and apply a test. When a young man enters the West Point Academy he binds himself, enters into a solemn obligation, to join the army of the United States and serve therein for twelve years.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, because they have an army.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Well, we have a permanent force, and we could require our young men to join either the permanent force, or the active militia, or the imperial army. And there is a point that was overlooked, namely, that the British army offers to the cadets of the Royal Military College I think seven commissions annually, and during the whole time of the existence of this college, I think an average of seven per year have received commissions. During the war in South Africa I think there were over eighty graduates of our Royal Military College taking a creditable part, and some of them a very noble part in that war. But to come down to the point before the committee. Some of the professors are now underpaid. We have reached our limit of $26,000, and I would like the committee to grant a further sum of $4,000, making the limit $30,000. I think that would enable us to increase some of the salaries that require to be increased, and to add one or two men to the staff.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister can do that now if he pleases. I never could see any reason why you should put a limit in the statute and bind yourself to so much or to so little, because you have to get it voted by parliament.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was my idea, but some of my hon. friends opposite wanted to fix a limit.

Mr. TISDALE. How many graduates are now in the imperial army?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think over 100.

Mr. TISDALE. It is only just to the college that that fact should be stated; because when the college was started one of the objects was to educate some of our young men, not for service in Canada solely, but also to serve in the imperial army and thus to keep up a connection between the mother country and Canada. I understand there have always been more applications by young men leaving the college than the commissions offered. I notice in Colonel Reade's report that he recommends that every young man, immediately on graduating, should either obtain a commission in the imperial army, or in our permanent militia, or should serve three years in the volunteers. I think something of that sort would be well worthy of consideration, especially as the college has now reached the point when you have more applications than you can receive. I think the time has now come when you can gradually begin to impose conditions. My hon. friend from North Toronto has suggested several improvements. You would have to raise the standard of matriculation if you carried out the suggestions he has so ably expressed, and in a good many of which I concur. We want to teach in that college as few things as possible that are not purely military, we want to make good military officers. Mathematics no doubt

are indispensable, to a certain extent, so far as they have a direct application to some of the arms of the force. We know that every year the evolution of arms makes it more important that military officers should have a knowledge of all the branches which go to form a technical education. But, beyond that the only way that I can see to increase the efficiency and economy of the department is by gradually eliminating all the education that is not directly or indirectly military from the college. There is a good deal to be said in favour of the argument of establishing a maximum and that would regulate to a large extent the number of professors. I think that a request for $4,000 more is not an unreasonable one and probably in another year it might be well to take up and consider at more length and with more knowledge the requirements of the college on these lines.

Mr. DANIEL. Before the motion is carried, I would like to ask the hon. minister to explain a little more definitely in regard to the mode of admissions to the Royal Military College. As I understand it, a few years ago a certain number was apportioned to the different provinces of Canada, so many to Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces. I understood the hon. minister to state definitely that admissions were entirely by competition and the marks obtained by examination, so that now there are no numbers apportioned to different localities in Canada. Otherwise, I may say that I was very much pleased with the statement of the minister in regard to the Royal Military College. I have always taken a very great interest in that institution. I do think that our permanent forces do not receive the benefit from that college which they ought to receive, and I was rather under the impression that the government did not encourage these young men to go into the permanent militia, as the fact of their being graduates of the Royal Military College did not give them any advantage over any other young man whom the government of the day might wish to appoint. I think that is so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, it does give them an advantage.

Mr. DANIEL. I take it, however, from the statement of the hon. minister that so far from that being the case, it was rather difficult to get these young men to take positions in the permanent militia, because the permanent militia did not offer a very prosperous career to a young man. I am very glad indeed that the conditions have changed, so that these young men now, inasmuch as they feel inclined to embrace the military profession, do look forward to commencing that military career in our own permanent militia force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In reply to my hon. friend first in reference to the apportioning of vacancies in the college among the different provinces, I would say that I do not think that was ever the rule or the practice, but I am inclined to the view that it might be a wise thing to do. I happened to be at West Point the other day, and, among other things, I learnt there that the disposition of cadetships was territorial, or that it was among the different states—a certain number to each state, of course subject to competition and nomination. Certain prominent people, senators or the members of the House of Representatives have the right to nominate candidates for admission to West Point, but if the nominees do not pass the required examination then other nominees are put forward. I think there is something to be said in favour of territorial distribution. In that way you have in the college representatives from every part of the country, and you are leavening the whole country with whatever advantage may come from those highly trained and highly educated gentlemen. At the present time that is not the law. I think it is worth while considering, subject, of course, to the provision that a competitive examination must be passed as far as the particular district is concerned. In reference to the other inquiry which my hon. friend made, I said that the permanent force of the past did not seem to offer a tempting career, and hence young gentlemen from the Royal Military College did not apply for admission to it. There was no pension law. A man might go on serving his country until he became too old or reached the age limit, and he would then be allowed to go out on the street without any provision being made for him. That has been changed. We now have a pension law. The Royal Military College graduate has this advantage over any one else that he can receive a commission at once without any further examination, whereas an applicant from the ordinary walks of life or a college must pass a technical military examination before he can receive a commission.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 169) to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT—PERMANENT FORCE.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Militia Act, and to provide that the permanent force may be increased to five thousand men.—Hon. Sir Frederick Borden.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The provision

made for the permanent force in the Militia Law which was passed last session is for 2,000 men. The original provision was for 1,000 and during the last session it was increased to 2,000. Although it is not expected that the limit of 5,000 will be reached for some time, I thought it was desirable, while making the change, that power should be taken to increase it to 5,000, and I will give some explanation in detail as to why this is proposed to be done. The committee is aware that an offer was made by this government some time ago to the imperial authorities to relieve the War Office of the responsibility of maintaining the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt, and that that offer was accepted. The strength of the garrisons at Esquimalt and Halifax is something like 2,500 men, so that it will be necessary to have an amendment to the Act to enable us to increase the strength of the permanent force. The strength of the permanent force at present is about 1,200 and our limit under the law is 2,000. We must get authority to increase the strength to enable us to provide garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt.

Mr. TISDALE. That will take 2,500 men ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, but I am informed by General Lake that probably a less number would be sufficient. In addition to Halifax and Esquimalt there is to be a depot at Montreal and a depot at some point in the Northwest Territories, to be called the Strathcona Horse. This matter has been discussed on two or three occasions and provision is being made for the erection of the necessary buildings. In addition to these two new depots, when the new provinces in the Northwest are organized it will be necessary, if we are to seriously undertake the problem of defence for the whole of Canada, to add some depots in these new provinces. I have a statement here showing that approximately a strength of 5,000 permanent force will be required some time in the future. I do not mean to say that at present it is intended to go beyond the depots now in existence with about 1,200 men, the depot at Montreal with probably 200 men, the Strathcona Horse depot with 100 or 125 men, and the Halifax and Esquimalt garrisons. I do not say it is the intention to go beyond the establishment of these depots at the present time or perhaps for some time to come, but I do say that if we are to carry out the idea of becoming responsible for the defence of this country, it will be necessary to make provision for about 5,000 men in the permanent force.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the Strathcona Horse depot be in one of the new provinces ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Which one ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Alberta.

Mr. FOWLER. At what point ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am not able to speak positively but the officers of my department report that from a strategic point of view it should be situated either at Calgary or Medicine Hat; probably Calgary.

Mr. FOWLER. What about Manitoba ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We already have a large depot in Winnipeg. I will read the statement I have here because there is no object in keeping it back. This statement comprises the whole of the depots ; those proposed as well as those now in existence.

Cavalry—three squadrons Royal Canadian Dragoons and six squadrons Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles. Each squadron numbers 150 men so that the total will be 1,350.

Artillery—Royal Canadian Horse Artillery; three batteries of 133 men each. Total 399 men.

Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery—five companies of 220 men each. Total 1,100.

Engineers—Royal Canadian Engineers, three companies 100 men each. Total 300.

Infantry, Royal Canadian Regiment, ten companies of 120 men each. Total 1,200.

Canadian Army Medical Corps ; details divided among the different depots. Total 150.

Canadian Army Service Corps ; details divided among the different depots. Total 150.

Canadian Ordnance Store Corps ; details divided among the different depots. Total 150.

That makes 4,800, and it includes all now in existence and those proposed. The distribution of the above mentioned units of the different corps will be as follows :

Royal Canadian Dragoons ; one squadron each at Toronto, Ont, St. John, Que. and Fredericton, N.B. At St. John, Que. and at Fredericton, N.B., the Royal Canadian Dragoons would replace the infantry regiments which are at present in these depots.

Mr. FOWLER. You will continue the depot at Fredericton ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, but for cavalry instead of infantry.

Mr. FOWLER. Will there not be some discussion as to that ?

Mr. DANIEL. They have already been moved.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The infantry have been moved to Halifax, but there will be a cavalry corps substituted. The infantry at St. Johns, Que., will be moved to Montreal and a cavalry detachment established at St. Johns, Que.

Mr. FOWLER. I would point out to the minister that as Sussex, King's county, is being made a military post and a great deal of money is being spent there—some of it wisely, although not all—it would be well to make Sussex the headquarters of this cav-

alry regiment. It is really a military town at the present time, the military camp is held there every summer ; it is the site of the new rifle range, and in order to round out the whole establishment and make it complete Sussex should be made the cavalry depot.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am afraid my hon. friend wants the earth.

Mr. FOWLER. We will supply the earth if you give us the men.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will have to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) to confer with the member for York (Mr. Crocket) and when these hon. gentlemen come to an agreement I will carry it out.

Mr. FOWLER. I am afraid we would not agree.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I hope the committee will accept my statement when I say, that what I am reading here is absolutely and entirely the result of conferences between the military members of the military council. I am told that from a strategical point of view Fredericton is an important point at which to have the cavalry station. Later on we may be able to have a cavalry depot at Sussex.

Royal Canadian Mounted Rifles : one squadron in Manitoba, at Winnipeg, three in Alberta, and two in Saskatchewan.

Mr. HERRON. Not a full regiment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A squadron numbers 125. There is a squadron at Winnipeg now.

Mr. FOWLER. There are no Mounted Rifles, outside of these, west of Lake Superior ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. Artillery : Royal Canadian Horse Artillery —two batteries in Ontario, at Kingston ; half a battery in Manitoba, at Winnipeg ; and half a battery in Alberta, probably at Calgary.

Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery : maritime provinces—two companies, at Halifax; British Columbia—one company, at Esquimalt ; Quebec—two companies, at Quebec city.

Royal Canadian Engineers : maritime provinces—one company at Halifax ; British Columbia—one company, at Esquimalt ; and one company distributed among the different depots.

Infantry : Royal Canadian Regiment : maritime provinces—four companies, at Halifax ; Quebec—two companies, one at Montreal and one at Quebec city ; Ontario —three conpanies ; one at London, one at Toronto and one at Fort William ; British Columbia—one company at Esquimalt ; Manitoba—a detachment ; Alberta—a detachment.

Canadian Army Service Corps—distributed.

Canadian Army Medical Corps—distributed.

Canadian Ordnance Store Corps—distributed.

The above distribution is based primarily upon the instructional requirements of the active militia as they will finally be distributed throughout the Dominion, and, secondly, upon the garrison requirements of the defended ports of Halifax, Esquimalt and Quebec. They are also generally in accord with the organization contemplated for defence purposes. This is signed by General Lake.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister how he proposes to defend the city of St. John, New Brunswick ? I notice that in this scheme of defence there is no mention of that important port. Whether the minister thinks the local volunteer militia are quite sufficient for all ordinary and extraordinary purposes of defence I do not know ; but I notice especially that there is no artillery organization put down for the city of St. John. As I understand, under the original scheme of placing the permanent artillery forces of this Dominion, it was intended to put a battery of artillery at the port of St. John. So far it has not been done. I notice that the minister stated that the location of these forces is in his idea, and I presume in that of the Council which advises him, a proper distribution for defensive purposes. I cannot agree with that. I am not a military man, but I know that the port of St. John is an important point in that portion of the Dominion—that it is at the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is one of the termini of the Intercolonial Railway, and it commands on the Atlantic coast one of the important entrances to the Dominion ; and if this scheme, which the minister has outlined this afternoon, is seriously put forward as one for locating the defensive forces of the Dominion from a military point of view, I do not think he has been happy in his choice when he entirely ignores such an important point on the Atlantic coast as the harbour of St. John.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. During the discussion of the militia estimates I shall perhaps be able to give my hon. friend some information on that point. As I said a moment ago, this paper, which I have read, has been handed to me and is signed by the chief military adviser of the government, General Lake, and I am inclined to think that on general principles it is sound and that he has signed it only after very careful consideration. I think some provision for increased artillery is to be made at St. John ; I know that a new field battery is to be organized there, under the command of a prominent citizen and friend of the hon. gentleman, with the latest up-to-date guns. Whether any detachment of the permanent force will be placed at St.

John, I do not know; I infer not. But later on, if the hon. gentleman renews his question, I shall be able to give him what information I have.

Mr. DANIEL. Has General Lake ever visited St. John?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, yes. He was formerly here for five years, and has been all over the country.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention to fortify any of these seaports—the port of St. John, for instance—so that the local garrison artillery would be able to defend the port in case of attack by a hostile fleet?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe that some work has been done in the way of ascertaining what guns would be necessary at certain points, and of placing these particular points in readiness for receiving the guns. My hon. friend knows that in modern warfare fortifications, in the old sense of the word have become almost entirely useless. Take for instance the walls of the city of Quebec. The method of protecting important centres is now by a system of masked batteries, having guns in readiness but not placing them in position until they are required for use. That is the scheme proposed with regard to Montreal. It is not necessary to advertise to the world where your guns are to be placed or in what manner it is intended to defend an important position of that kind. Some arrangements have been made with reference to St. John, but it would not be desirable to state exactly what is being done although I would be glad to give my hon. friend the information in my office.

Mr. FOWLER. Have any steps been taken to strengthen the seaport of St. John? Has any engineer gone there to examine and locate the different points where the fortification works should be put?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That has been done.

Mr. TISDALE. Has the hon. minister the correspondence between the War Office and his department regarding the taking over by this government of these two places?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) moved for the papers some time ago and his motion carried. The correspondence was not concluded, and the other day I asked him in the corridor whether he wanted those portions of the correspondence that had already taken place or would he wait until the correspondence was concluded. I said I would prefer waiting, and he said that was quite satisfactory to him. I have been expecting daily an answer with regard to the expenditure involved and so on, and it would be convenient to postpone the discussion until the supplementary estimates are brought down, when I shall lay all the papers on the table.

Mr. TISDALE. In an evening paper I see it is stated that there is correspondence going on regarding the postponing of the taking over of these points.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We expect to take over Halifax the 1st July, but Esquimalt may continue as at present for a year, except that instead of our paying the British government one-half the expense, as we are now doing, we propose to pay the whole expense next year, and in a year from July next take over the responsibility and control of the Esquimalt garrison. The force at Esquimalt is about 350, including artillery and engineers.

Mr. TISDALE. I understand the hon. minister prefers to postpone the discussion on this as well as the whole question until he brings down his supplementary estimates, and then it may be discussed to the fullest extent.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be a large item in the supplementaries to provide for the taking over of these garrisons; and when that comes down, I propose to lay all the correspondence on the table and have a general discussion.

Mr. TISDALE. Does the hon. minister propose to explain the reduction of the training force or does he want that to stand?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. When we go into Committee of Supply at eight o'clock would be the most convenient moment to discuss that matter.

Mr. HERRON. Can the hon. minister give us the particulars regarding the distribution of the mounted rifles at Alberta and where the different headquarters of the troops are to be?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I gave Calgary as the point where I thought the Strathcona Regiment will be located and also a half battery of artillery. There will be two more squadrons of mounted rifles ultimately in Alberta, but I am not able to give the points where they will be placed.

Mr. HERRON. There is a good deal of trouble in the southern part of that country over military matters, and we should have some explanation of that later on.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it the intention of the hon. minister now, or when the supplementaries are down, to explain the policy of the government regarding the defence of Canada? We have been hearing a good deal about what Canada should do in connection with sharing the expense of the navy of the empire and whether it should take upon itself the whole burden of its own national defence. I think we are com-

ing now to a time when parliament should be informed what is the mind of the government. Right on the heels of the departure of the British navy from Halifax, as its winter station, comes the news of one of our Canadian vessels being held up in Uruguay and its crew being jailed ; and so far nothing has been done, that parliament is aware of, to see that these people are released. Now, I do not know whether the one has anything to do with the other or not. Of course, the members of the government do know. But I think it is now time that parliament should at least, be given some idea of the policy of the government with regard to the defence of Canada and with regard to this country taking part in Imperial defence. I would like to ask the minister whether, either on the supplementary estimates or on this item he intends to inform us of the policy of the government on this very important question ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. On the broad question to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Daniel) refers any announcement, I believe, should be made by the Prime Minister. But I may inform the hon. gentleman that I propose to discuss at some length the policy of the government and of the Militia Department as to the development of the militia in the Dominion, as to the question of the defence of this country on land, and as to the maintenance of the civil power. That I shall be prepared to discuss, and I shall be very glad to have my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) and as many others as are interested take part in the discussion.

Mr. DANIEL. Will that be on the supplementary estimates?

Mr. TISDALE. As I understand it—the general discussion on the militia has been held over, so that we can discuss any branch of the question that we please. And the minister himself will make the general announcement.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and agreed to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 170) to amend the Militia Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication from the Governor General's Secretary :

Office of the Governor General's Secretary,
Ottawa, June 6, 1905.

The Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General will proceed to the Senate chamber on Wednesday, the 7th instant, at three P.M., for the purpose of giving the Royal Assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. HANBURY WILLIAMS, Colonel,
Governor General's Secretary.

SUPPLY—REDUCTION OF THE ACTIVE MILITIA.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply. He said : Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to make the explanation which was asked for yesterday with reference to the late reduction of the establishment of the active militia. A good deal has been written in the newspapers under a misapprehension, and in order to make my explanation clear I will begin by defining what the word 'establishment' means. Establishment means a list showing the numbers in each rank which any corps is authorized to maintain on its roll. The strength of a corps means the actual number which, at any given moment, happens to be borne on those rolls. Establishments may be peace, war or training establishments. The establishment list of February 23rd, 1904, gave peace and training as identical, and war in a separate column. This would have been correct for a central camp of instruction, which was then in immediate contemplation ; but for the annual training of the present year, when the central camp of instruction has not materialized, while the peace establishments have remained actually the same, the training establishments have been somewhat reduced for lack of facilities which a central camp would have afforded. The point is that there has been no material change in the peace establishment which was fixed in February, 1904. But owing to the reasons I have just stated, it was found desirable to reduce the peace establishment for the present training, and that is what has been done. I will read a memorandum to which I referred yesterday, which has been prepared for me by General Lake, Chief of the General Staff :

From the Chief of the General Staff to the Hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence.
Establishments.

With reference to our recent conversation concerning the statements which have appeared in the public press alleging large reductions in the establishments of the militia, I submit the following explanation of the reasons which, in the opinion of the military members of the

Council, were sufficient to justify the action taken.

The establishments authorized by the Governor in Council on 23rd February, 1904, were drawn up, it is understood, under the personal supervision of Major General Lord Dundonald, after careful consideration. They included both 'peace training' and 'war' establishments. The former with which alone we are concerned, were working out upon the assumption that by the time they came into force a central camp of instruction for the militia would have been acquired and equipped, at which facilities would exist for training such portions of these 'peace training' establishments as had been added to the previously existing establishments of units for the purpose of preparation for war.

The establishments of the 23rd February, 1904, must, therefore, if they are to be properly understood, be read with special reference to this assumption. As is well known, the central training camp is not yet selected. It will probably be chosen at no distant date, but though it may be hoped that it will be in running order, at least partially, in time for the training season next year, it was out of the question that it should be ready for this summer. The Militia Council had, therefore, to consider what establishments should be adopted for the present training season. In deciding what these establishments should be, two considerations had to be kept in view. The first was that the 'peace training' establishments of the 23rd February, 1904, which appeared to be based upon carefully considered principles, should not be disturbed more than could be avoided; and the second, that, in view of the many other urgent calls for expenditure for militia purposes, strict economy should be observed, and no greater expense should be authorized than was evidently essential for military efficiency. It was, therefore, decided as a general policy to adopt such portions of the 'training' establishments laid down in the lists of 23rd February, 1904, as were really necessary for training purposes with the units, and to omit all details which could not be defended upon this ground. The training establishments promulgated in general orders of the 9th May, 1905, were based upon these considerations. There appear to be several omissions and typographical errors and one or two inconsistencies in the general order as published. A further general order amending it in these respects is now in course of preparation.

Reference has been made to the need for economy, in view of other urgent militia services requiring attention. Apart from the question that all administration should be economical, the Militia Council had to face the urgent requirements of an expansion of the militia in Manitoba and the new provinces of the Northwest. The great influx of population into these regions, including as it does, a large proportion of aliens, has made it imperatively necessary to widen the extent of the militia organization of that part of the country, both for the preservation of internal order and for the fostering among that population of a Canadian national spirit. Some suggestion has been made in the press that the reduction complained of in the training establishments has been the result of the Canadian offer to take over the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt, as it has been hinted that in a spirit of false economy the government have wished to meet the expense of the garrisons of these fortresses by cutting down the militia. So far is this from being the case that the policy embodied in the new training establishments was actually decided upon in principle before the question of offering to take over the responsibility of Halifax and Esquimalt was officially raised.

As regards the alleged hardship imposed upon the corps which had already filled up the ranks of both officers and non-commissioned officers, and had commenced training before the promulgation of the new training establishments, it may be stated that the Militia Council was aware that in certain city corps the appointments had already been made, and, what is more, that the annual training had already commenced before those corps were made acquainted with what was contemplated. Realizing the difficulty in which these corps might find themselves, you, as the Minister in Militia Council, had already submitted to His Excellency a general order authorizing the training and payment for annual drill of all officers, non-commissioned officers and men who had already commenced training before that date. It was also fully intended that consideration should be given to any cases of individual hardship brought to notice, or to special difficulties which might result from the working of new training establishments.

Finally, I venture to suggest that if you should think fit to make a public statement dealing with this question, it would be well to lay stress on the fact that the Militia Council, with yourself at its head, have in view a definite policy for the future of the militia, a policy which contemplates a considerable expansion of the force and its better adaptation to the defence requirements of the country, towards which they are steadily working. The elaboration of such a policy must necessarily take time and the full effect of measures decided upon cannot immediately be made apparent, but the decisions taken by the Militia Council are taken with that policy in mind, and it is hoped that final judgment upon the general question may be deferred until it is possible to outline that policy in greater detail.

(Sgd.) P. LAKE,
Chief of the General Staff.

5th June, 1905.

I will only add one word more. That is to read the general order referred to in this memorandum as having been issued in May by which those corps which had begun their annual training were permitted to go on with the same establishment which had been adopted in February, 1904.

These are the words of the General Order:

The officers and non-commissioned officers above referred to——

This is only a portion of it——

—of the corps reserve of city corps having already commenced training for the financial year, 1905-6, will be permitted to complete training and draw pay. In future special arrangements for their training, as members of the corps reserve, will be promulgated in general orders.

There has been no change in the establishment, but this has been done: Certain officers who were not required, who were supernumerary, have been placed in a column by themselves still connected with the corps, but not to be called upon for active duty until a central camp is

established in which they can be instructed and in which they can take part or until they are specially called out each year.

Mr. TISDALE. I confess I do not exactly understand the summary. I do not think the hon. minister gave any statement of the strength of the establishment and what proportion are to be drilled. I would like to show what in numbers the change really is. The establishments, except those referred to by the hon. gentleman, as I gather from that statement, will be removed into a column by themselves, and it is understood that without a special order of some sort they are no longer to be called upon. That will leave the original establishment as I understand it except those which are attached from the reserve the same as they were before ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. TISDALE. Then I want the total number of the establishment. How many thousands of all arms are there ? I notice in the summary for 1903-4, the following statement :

Officers..	3,567
Non commissioned officers..	7,516
Men..	31,400
Horses..	5,636

That is the complete establishment, as I understand ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is that the militia report ?

Mr. TISDALE. That is the Militia Report for 1904. The statement also shows a considerably less number trained.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. From what page is the hon. gentleman reading ?

Mr. TISDALE. Page 26.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The total establishment of February, 1904, which is the basis of this whole question was 46,043. It is proposed to drill this year something over 43,000, and the difference is chiefly in officers and non-commissioned officers who were added in order to be trained for the contemplated expansion of the smaller company into the larger company. They are not struck off the role ; they are on the establishment ; they are simply placed in a column by themselves and notified that although they will drill this year, so far as the city regiments are concerned, in future they will not drill until authority is given for them to do so, and that will probably not be until the central camp is organized when the money necessary to train them will be properly expended.

Mr. TISDALE. Then, all this talk in the papers about the reduction in the rank and file of the establishment proper, has no foundation whatever.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very little.

Mr. TISDALE. It makes a difference of only 3,000 all told ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Exactly.

Mr. TISDALE. There were statements in the newspapers to the effect that the number of each regiment, except the city regiments, was to be reduced, and the militia force was discussing that very warmly.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have a letter here from the Adjutant General and I would like to give my authority, because I can only speak from information which I received from the department. This is addressed by the Adjutant General to the Chief of the General Staff :

Referring to your minute of the 2nd instant, herewith is a detailed statement showing the differences between the establishments authorized by the Governor General in Council on the 23rd of February, 1904, and those set forth in the special general order of the 9th May ultimo, together with the specific reasons for each item of difference. 2. In the training establishments, 1905, officers' servants should have been disallowed in all instances.

That is a case in which there was a mistake made in favour of the regiments, so to speak.

In the training establishments, 1905, officers' servants should have been disallowed in all instances in accordance with the settled policy that all men proceeding to camps of instruction should be thoroughly trained as soldiers, their being included in the artillery establishment was an error. 3. The addition of officers, servants and batmen in establishments authorized on the 23rd of February, 1904, was an entirely new departure, as in previous years officers made their own arrangements for servants in camp. It has, however, since been decided to add the same number to all arms for training for the present year and orders to that effect are about to be promulgated.

Possibly that is one of the points mentioned in the newspapers.

4. Your attention is especially invited to the following omission, namely : bands and sergeant trumpeters. Both these items were omitted in the training establishments carefully prepared by Lord Dundonald for the past year and it was in consequence considered inadvisable to place them on the establishment for training for the present year until the matter of permanent establishments for the entire force which is now under consideration has been finally approved of.

I may say just here that I have been in the habit of going to camp with my regiment for the past twenty-five years, up to five or six years ago, and it was the invariable rule that the strength of the band was deducted from the regiment so many per company.

Mr. TISDALE. They were left on for the purpose of pay though.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So they are now. This memo. continues :

In regard to the infantry the changes given in this schedule are these affecting the regi-

ments having a normal establishment. 6. City corps will in addition under the provisions of a general order of the first instant relating to corps reserve, be permitted to train all officers and non-commissioned officers shown as for employment at regimental or company base. 7. It is regretted that in the preparation of the establishments of city corps some errors have been made which will be at once corrected in a special general order.

I have still another letter covering this one which was just read, and which was sent to me by the Chief of the General Staff :

Ottawa, 5th of June.

Dear Sir Frederick,—I have at last obtained the Adjutant General's official statement of the differences between the two establishments, and I send it up to you, together with the general order which passed the Militia Council on the 30th of May, which I regret to say was accidentally omitted from what I gave to Panet for you this afternoon. On looking into the question of corps having special establishments——

This applies to four or five corps in the cities who complain the most bitterly, because really the excitement in the newspapers has been confined entirely to the city battalions.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman is slightly misinformed as to that, because the matter took such a wide range that the rural battalions began to get uneasy too. They certainly got the impression that they were to be cut down, at all events in regard to the drill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know that has been stated.

On looking into the question of corps having special establishments, I find that, in addition to the normal (so to speak) infantry establishment of 30 privates per company, city corps were allowed two stretcher bearers per company, total 32. General order No. 81, of June, 1904, authorized 19 privates per company extra for the 1st, 10th, 48th and 66th regiments, and 7 extra per company for the 13th regiment. This addition was reaffirmed by General Order No. 12 of January, 1905. Hence the 1st, 10th, 48th and 66th regiments should have 51 privates per company, while the 13th should have 39. It appears that the two stretcher bearers per company were accidentally omitted from the training establishments just promulgated, but, except for this omission, that training establishment gives both the normal regiments and these special regiments, which I have just mentioned, exactly the same number of privates per company which they had before its issue.

(Sgd.) PERCY LAKE.

So I think I may venture to hope that the difficulty is practically over, for the present year at least, and while there have undoubtedly been some errors made, they have been chiefly misprints and typographical errors, which have now, as I understand, been corrected.

Mr. TISDALE. I hope the hon. gentleman will not misunderstand me. I am as anxious as he can possibly be to have this matter cleared up, so that the man in the street will understand the situation ; because an impression had gone abroad that a very serious change had been made or was about to be made. From what one could see in the newspapers, and from any expressions from the force which one had an opportunity to hear, it would have had a very bad effect upon the force. That is the reason I wished the matter to be cleared up. I understand now, from what the hon. gentleman has read, that the establishments, whether special or ordinary, are left alone, and that the only changes contemplated were the additions that would be made when the central camp arrangements were carried out.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is exactly the case.

Mr. TISDALE. Assuming that to be so, was the general order which the hon. gentleman quoted from as promulgated under Lord Dundonald in reduction of the establishment, as it previously existed ? I ask that question because there were some camps organized where a very limited number were called on to drill. They were called skeleton camps. If I understand aright, that arrangement was only for one year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Two years.

Mr. TISDALE. After that the full camp force, if mustered, would be drilled and paid. That is so now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, almost precisely the establishment which was in existence before there was any skeleton drill in camp.

Mr. TISDALE. That is very satisfactory so far, and I am sure it will be a great relief to the force to understand it fully. That is for the present. Now, I think the minister should be prepared to go further and tell us what is to happen in the future ; because one of the most injurious things to a force such as our active militia is any tendency to frequent changes. I think a bad system well worked out is better than a good one which is constantly changed ; because changes cause uncertainty among the officers and others interested, who have to a large extent to supplement the expenditure of the government. The keeping up of a force of this nature depends altogether, as it should, upon voluntary action, and they should be informed whether any changes are contemplated, and, if so, what they are. While the minister has removed in a satisfactory way all question about the standing of the establishment, he has qualified his statement by saying that that is the principle of the department for the present. Do I understand him to say that it is in contemplation, after this year possibly, to make a reduction ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. If I may be allowed to interrupt my hon. friend,

I would call his attention to the memorandum in which General Lake says that he hopes that the public will be patient, because we are working out a general scheme or policy for the militia which cannot all be put forward at one time; and I infer from that statement that the establishment which now exists is the establishment of which he approved, and the establishment which is to be continued.

Mr. TISDALE: I do not propose to-night to go further than to get a full understanding of what, if any, changes are to be made in the force; because I understand that it was arranged that a full discussion should take place later on under an item in the supplementary estimates, and I would prefer to discuss this at the time the minister makes his general statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The understanding between the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and myself was that a large item should be retained in the main estimates on which a general discussion could be held.

Mr. TISDALE. There are two items on capital account, and we might hold back one of those, so as to give other hon. members, who are not here and who desire to take part in the discussion, an opportunity to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble seems to be that when we are ready the hon. minister is not, and when he is ready we are not. So far as I am concerned, with my large knowledge of military affairs, I would be glad to have the minister go right on and make his full statement, but there are some tyros in military matters not present who would be disappointed if we went on with this discussion.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We seemed to do very well this afternoon.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we were too amiable. Better reserve one of the items in the main estimates until the end of this week or the beginning of next when we shall have possibly a fuller House.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that some of the corps have been in the habit of recruiting over strength. In the past, it has been the practice of the government, I believe, to recognize that over strength by the issue of the extra clothing and pay and drilling either in camp or at local headquarters. Will the same practice be continued?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am informed that as regards pay there has been no exception to the rule. In some of the city battalions, ambitious officers have had a larger number than that allowed, but no extra charge was involved as regards pay. Extra clothing, however, was issued. So far as the rural battalions are concerned, there has been no over strength except in the case of a few battalions a few years ago which had ten companies each instead of eight. Three or four years ago a regulation was passed, reducing the number of companies to eight in all the militia, and I believe to-day there is only one rural battalion which has more than eight. In my own county my own battalion was reduced from ten companies to eight. There are certain regiments which for many years have been allowed over strength. One of these is the 66th of Halifax, but that has been over strength since its organization. Also the Queens Own, of Toronto, the 13th of Hamilton and the Prince of Wales of Montreal. In the latter case two regiments were amalgamated upon the understanding that while the strength of the one would not be equal to that of the two, still it would be larger than the normal establishment. That, however, is an exceptional case, and I am not in a position to say off-hand what our policy will be with regard to it.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Royal Military College, $90,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the intention to dispense with the English officers and replace them by Canadians?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not at present.

Mr. BERGERON. Why not if we are training officers at our militia college?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Only for the reason that it is very desirable to have as officers men actually in the army and who have had practical experience. It is difficult, perhaps, to find Canadians who measure up to all these conditions. We have in the imperial army a number of Canadians, graduates of the Royal Military College. I have a very strong hope and expectation that we shall have from among these not only professors for the college, but a commandant as well—perhaps not immediately, but in the future.

Mr. BERGERON. Under the system inaugurated a few years ago of retiring colonels of the militia after five years' service, we are bringing to the head of the regiments a number of young men, while many are retired while still young men and capable of further service. I am repeating now some remarks I heard on Saturday at a review in Montreal. Of course colonels who are retired, many of course, have some line of business which they wish to follow. But it may happen that some of these men with a taste for military life, might show the qualifications to occupy some of the positions in our military college or in connection with a permanent force. I think it would be quite in accord-

ance with the policy announced by the Minister of Militia that such positions should be offered to these men wherever possible. These men are Canadians—they are Canadians all through. They have made sacrifices for the country—for we know that a man at the head of a battalion must sacrifice both money and time in the performance of his duty. Therefore, I would ask the minister if it would not be possible and advisable to offer some of these men positions in the military college that are now filled by imperial officers? It would be a good thing for the service, and would be an inducement to such men to fit themselves for their work as head of a battalion because in so doing they would fit themselves for a career in connection with the military service.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The suggestion is certainly worthy of consideration. And I have no hesitation in saying that there are men who have occupied the position of colonel commanding a regiment in Canada, who would be fit to fill such a position as the hon. gentleman refers to. But, with all respect for the ability and experience of men who have commanded battalions, I must say that I do not think the number who could qualify to fill such a position is very great. The head of the military college is a most important and responsible position and requires very high qualifications. The man who holds that position must be a man of first-rate education in every respect, and especially a man of good education and of experience in military matters, But I think there are men coming up now in our permanent force to whom the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) would apply. I know of more than one man in the permanent force who would be quite capable of filling that position as well as it can be filled. And I think the time is coming when we must consider that point seriously.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not suggest that any of the men to whom I refer would be fit at once to be the head of the college. But they might be given positions from which they could advance in that direction. If it is the policy as I understand it to be, to give positions to our own men where possible—and it is a policy I approve, for I do not see how we can expect sacrifices from these men if the only prospect held out to them is to be colonel for five years and then drop out—it seems to me here is the opportunity to carry out that policy. I was glad to hear what the Minister of Militia said because it is in line with the view that I myself have been urging.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In that connection I might say that arrangements have been made by which officers of the permanent force will have the privilege of attending the staff college in England—two going each year. The staff college course is two years. Therefore, in future we shall always have four officers attending the staff college for educational purposes. The examination to enter that college is a very stiff one, and the age limit is thirty-five years—none of greater age are allowed to enter. And the imperial government has offered to give officers of the Canadian permanent force who pass through that college creditably temporary employment in the imperial army. And surely there can be no question that from among these men we shall in future be able to select men who will suitably fill the professorial chairs of the Royal Military College.

Mr. FOWLER. If the imperial government is giving positions to Canadians in the imperial army, we ought to be willing to offer a position or two to imperial officers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are doing it.

Mr. FOWLER. But I understood that some objection was raised to that. I fail to see any good ground for that objection. It seems to me most important that the man at the head of the Royal Military College should be a man thoroughly equipped for his work; and it does not make any difference whether he is a Canadian or an Englishman, or an Australian, so long as he is a British subject. I understand that a number of the professors in the military college are Canadians.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. None of the military professors.

Mr. FOWLER. But the others are?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are all Canadians.

Mr. FOWLER. Perhaps it is better to have the commandant a gentleman who is in close touch with the imperial army, but I think that some of the military professors might be taken from our own permanent force if they have the special education.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not understand my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) to object to that. He suggested that we might have some Canadians to fill these positions. In this connection there is another observation that I might make. It is in contemplation to make an arrangement by which we may have exchanges, through the war office, of imperial officers for Canadian officers. So, if we have a place to offer to an imperial officer, a similar place would be offered to a Canadian officer when we have members of our permanent force qualified to fill the places. This will be carried out as soon as we have officers who have passed through the staff college. But it is a sine qua non—and I think quite properly so—

that our officers shall pass creditably through the staff college.

Mr. FOWLER. As I understand it, no imperial officer can fill one of these positions unless he has passed through the staff college, and certainly no exception should be made. So far as my observation goes one government has never been niggardly in offering young Canadians opportunities to secure positions in the imperial service.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is a pretty large sum of money—$90,000. Will the minister give us a statement of the details which make it up ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As I explained a large part of this money is paid back.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I heard that statement made, but I did not hear definitely how much was paid back.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The actual cost is $65,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Give us the details of that $65,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The superior staff pay, estimate for the next year, that is the year we are considering now, is $30,000. The actual amount paid last year was $29,300, an increase of $700. The subordinate staff pay is $10,000, the same as last year. Clothing and clothing allowances, $10,000, the same as last year. Messing, that is supplying food, $13,000, the same as last year. Fuel, $5,000, $700 more than last year. I think some additional rooms had to be heated. Light, $100, same as last year. Printing and stationery, $4,000, $500 more than last year, more students, I suppose. Washing, $1,800, same as last year. The additional number of students do not seem to require any more washing. Advertising, $1,100, $100 more than last year, and $12 less than the year before.

Mr. BERGERON. Advertising what?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Royal Military College is advertised in some of the magazines and in the special issues of some of the larger newspapers.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not do one bit of good.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think it does. We try to keep it down to the lowest possible limit, but my hon. friend knows how difficult it is to resist the blandishment of our friends of the press. All this advertising is done in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I will make this proposition. When we were discussing this question before, the minister professed himself willing to let this Military Council steer

matters with a view to efficiency and economy. Let him submit that matter of advertising to the Military Council and abide by their decision as to whether they will spend $1,200 next year for that kind of work, especially after General Lake's plea for economy. I know how it comes about. Some little paper gets up a Christmas edition and comes to the minister and asks for an advertisement of the military college. Now that does not bring one student; in fact, to a sensible student seeing it advertised in that way, it is rather a damper than otherwise. The minister says he has more applications already than he can fill. Now let the minister do with that the same as he is doing with his drill shed sites—I am not speaking now of Kentville, I suppose that was started in before—let it go to the council, and if they say that it is necessary in order to make a thorough and efficient military system in this country, let him spend the money on advertisements and prop himself up by the council, giving them the responsibility.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is my hon. friend serious in that?

Mr. FOSTER. I am perfectly serious. I know how hard it is to impress upon my right hon. friend any idea of economy with other people's money.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But would he advise the Military Council to come down from high matters of strategy and defence to petty local patronage of that kind?

Mr. DANIEL. I see that one of the magazines is called 'Types of Canadian Women,' that got $50. I do not know whether it would bring many students.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think if I showed the hon. member for North Toronto the list of magazines, he would not disapprove of it. A good deal of this money goes to college quarterlies, to college magazines, and one is the 'Canadian Magazine.' I think the Montreal 'Gazette' got out a special number and contained an advertisement. We have given this irrespective of political considerations. We have done it in some cases, I admit, to assist a college newspaper, and in that way we have attracted the attention of students in the other colonies. But I have no objection to accepting the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and perhaps it will help me in resisting applications, because it has taken a good deal of my time, I confess, to keep this item down to the point at which it is now.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. gentleman's explanation does not satisfy me. He seems to think that because an expenditure is the same as it was last year it must be all right. I do not think that is any reason at all.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I merely stated the fact casually. My hon. friend can draw any conclusion he likes. Now I will finish the list. Transport and travelling expenses, $2,000—if my hon. friend will permit me to say it, the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Transport for what?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. To pay the expenses of the cadets to and fro when they return home. We also pay the travelling expenses of the professors when they are on duty.

Mr. FOWLER. What travelling do they do?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They sometimes go to Montreal and Toronto to attend meetings of the universities, meetings where engineering and scientific matters are dealt with. Sometimes the commandant or a professor might want to visit West Point academy; sometimes they are called here on business connected with the college, to confer with the department. There are twelve professors.

Mr. FOWLER. Have they all occasion to travel?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The principal part of this expenditure is for the cadets.

Mr. DANIEL. I find that the amount paid last year for the travelling expenses of the cadets was $629; so that the larger amount is not for the cadets.

Mr. FOWLER. What are the tuition fees ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. $100 a year.

Mr. FOWLER : You charge a student a tuition fee of $100 a year, and under those circumstances I cannot see how it is that you pay his travelling expenses. It does seem to be an anomaly. I could understand if you give him free tuition that you might carry him to college and take him back home again ; but when you charge him a tuition fee, why should you pay his travelling expenses ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose it is no answer to say so, but we are simply continuing the conditions which have existed for thirty years.

Mr. FOWLER. Does it not seem rather absurd ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I confess that I have not looked into it personally.

Mr. BERGERON. I know some cadets who have gone to the college and returned home again whose expenses were paid by themselves.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They are all treated alike. There is a regulation.

Mr. FOWLER. How many cadets are there ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 95.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you pay the travelling expenses of each to and from his home ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So I am informed.

Mr. FOWLER. I think there must be something wrong about that. I think the travelling expenses must be paid when the cadets are taken away somewhere. How many times a year do you transport them to and fro ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Once.

Mr. FOWLER. You bring them to the college and send them home ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Send them home.

Mr. FOWLER. One trip ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. If you pay the expenses of one trip, I do not see how it is that you do not pay the cadet for his holidays as well. I think you had better get the Militia Council at this college, and see if they cannot wipe out a few of these anomalies.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At what page of the Auditor General's Report does that appear ?

Mr. DANIEL. Q—91. There were only travelling expenses paid for fourteen cadets last year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Those were the graduates. I quote from the Royal Military College regulations, regulation No. 22 :

> An allowance for travelling expenses at the rate of four cents a mile for the number of miles beyond 500 necessarily travelled between the headquarters of the military district in which he resides and the college will be paid to each cadet at the time he is first admitted, and a similar allowance for travelling expenses to the headquarters of the same military district will be paid to each cadet who has completed the full period of the college and obtained a certificate of good conduct. No allowance for travelling expenses will be granted to those who reside less than 500 miles from the college.

That seems a reasonable and proper provision.

Mr. FOWLER. That is not the same proposition that was explained to us a moment ago.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The object is to put a man living in British Columbia, or in some other distant portion of the country, on the same footing as the man living in Montreal.

Mr. FOWLER. That is an altogether different thing. It was equalizing the difference between distant and near points.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this mean bringing a cadet to the college and paying all his expenses back home after his course is over ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is only at the beginning and the end. In addition to that, I am reminded that the expenses of the professors are paid to and from this country, and my hon. friend will see that is quite an item.

Mr. FOWLER. That will scarcely account for this large amount. You are not changing professors every year.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. One or two change every year. They do not all go out at once. There is one going out this year and another going out next year, and so on.

Mr. BERGERON. Although this is a standing vote, it may not all be spent in one year ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It may not all be spent in the year. In the coming year I think that three are going out. The expenses of cadets attending annual camp are paid, and sometimes cadets are sent out to do work for the college. They go to McGill University annually to compete with some of the students there, and we pay their expenses. Every dollar of this expenditure is accounted for and is scanned by the Auditor General.

Mr. BERGERON. Has it always been like that ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It has been the same from the beginning. My hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) wants some more information, and I want to satisfy him in regard to the vote for equitation. That is a new charge. It only began last year, when a special vote of $5,000 was taken. That is for teaching young men to ride. The reason for this vote being taken is this : Formerly the horses of the artillery were used, but it was found very inconvenient to interfere with the artillery operations, and it was decided that it would be very much better to construct stables and let the college own its own horses. I think myself it is a very much better regulation.

Mr. DANIEL. How many horses have been provided ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Eight.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the department bought horses, or are they rented ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. This is only a provision made this year. Horses will be bought. As a matter of fact, they have not yet been bought.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not want the hon. minister, on that advertising business, to take laurels to himself that are not altogether warranted. I notice by the payments that no Conservative publications have been favoured.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Last year must have been an off-year.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is likely a sample of most of the years. The Book Lovers' Library gets $60.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the purpose of getting very valuable and ready, up-to-date books for the students. I have no objection to that at all, because it is really an advantage to have them get a circulating library. The 'Canadian Mining Review'——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is not a Liberal paper.

Mr. FOSTER. That is for the pure purpose of science, I suppose, $3 ; Halifax 'Chronicle,' which, I think, is pretty well determined in its politics, gets $50. The Montreal 'Herald'—well, there may be some doubt about the Montreal 'Herald,' but I have no doubt that $50 will fix it all right. Then there is the Ottawa 'Daneborg,' $30 ; that is a concession to outside neighbours, and no doubt that brings many a student to the college who would not otherwise find his way there. The 'Free Press' may be a semi-independent paper, but it does not often show it. The 'Parliamentary Guide' is, of course, not in politics, although the particular gentleman who provides it has some very strong ideas of political life, $50. The 'Rideau Press' gets $200. What is the 'Rideau Press' ? That seems to be a special paper. That must have a very wide circulation. Why should the 'Rideau Press' get $200 when a servant of so many years' standing and so faithful as the 'Free Press' only gets $50 ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think that was an accumulation for several years. I had some doubt as to whether I should give authority to pay the bill and it was finally compromised. The advertisement has been withdrawn.

Mr. FOSTER. Was that cut down by the Military Council ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am responsible for that.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the Rideau Press?

Mr. BERGERON. It is the paper called 'Events.'

Mr. FOSTER. Why should it appear in the Auditor General's Report under the pseudonym of the 'Rideau Press ?'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I suppose that is the form in which the bill was rendered.

Mr. FOSTER. The Quebec 'Daily Telegram' has $10 added to the general $50,

and of course the bright rays that come from the 'Soleil' entitles it to $80, or more than half better than the 'Free Press' or the 'Herald.' Then there is the 'Military Gazette;' there might be something in that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not think any one in charge of that has been friendly to me.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there is the good Toronto 'Globe.' I hope the minister will add a little to the 'Globe' for this year. The peculiar service it has been performing of late; the way it swallowed itself in order to convince the government that it is friendly to it, deserves at least an addition of $10 if the Military Council would only pass it. Then there is 'Saturday Night.' I am afraid there is no hope for 'Saturday Night.' 'Saturday Night' has seen its last $50 from the Military Council, but I suppose the Toronto 'Star' will continue to have its $50?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not too bad that.

Mr. FOSTER. No; they all have a political complexion.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Oh, my, no.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should you advertise in the 'Parliamentary Guide?' I did not think any one reads that except members of parliament and their wives?

Mr. FOSTER. It is to inform the members of parliament.

Mr. FOWLER. Surely the members of parliament know about the Royal Military College. This publication known as 'Events' and appearing here under the alias of the 'Rideau Press' is the property of the same individual who edits the 'Parliamentary Companion, so that this gentleman got $250.

Mr. BERGERON. 'Events' is not published any more.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it dead?

Mr. BERGERON. The payment ceases because the paper itself ceases.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The payment ceased last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the $200 a contribution for funeral expenses?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the paper is still published I am told.

Mr. BERGERON. I don't think so.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was published last week.

Mr. BERGERON. Has the Minister of Militia any information to give about the selection of a site in Montreal for a military school? We hear a great many stories on the street, but I would like to have something authoritative from the minister?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will be glad to give my hon. friend all the information I have on that matter. As my hon. friend knows the government of Canada own a property in Montreal now known as Lafontaine park, and which was purchased by the British government many years ago for about £40,000. Some years ago this property was leased to the city of Montreal and on about half of it trees were planted and work done to make it into what is now a beautiful park. The other half was reserved for military purposes but the city has the management of that part as well, the militia retaining the right to use it as a parading and training ground. It is about 35 acres in extent. My own view, and the view of the majority of the military men in Montreal was, that this was the proper place to construct the buildings for the new military school. I am informed however, that 30 acres of land would not be sufficient. The government also own a property known as St. Helens Island, a portion of which has been leased to the city but the larger portion is now used for military purposes. It is proposed by the city of Montreal to acquire either one or both of these properties, and an offer was made to the government to give in exchange for them other properties which might be suitable for the establishment of a depot. My own view is that it should not be done in that way. I think we should do in Montreal what we did in Toronto, namely, sell our property at a fair valuation and buy such property as may be recommended by the military authorities. The city of Montreal has asked me to receive a deputation to discuss this question; I had a telegram only to-day and I expect there will be a deputation here some time this week. That is all the information I have and all that I can give. No site has been selected. A number of sites have been looked into, but I have not the slightest idea at this moment what site will be selected nor do I know whether or not an agreement can be reached between the city and the government as to the price to be paid for either or both of these properties. I have no hesitation in expressing my own opinion that we should not give up entirely that portion of Lafontaine park which we retain control over. While I would not erect the buildings there I think the right should be retained to use it as a parade ground for the active militia of the city whenever it may be required.

Mr. BERGERON. I am very glad to hear the statement made by the Minister of Militia, and I trust the deputation from the city of Montreal will wait on him as soon as possible, because I strongly favour the idea of having a military school and a permanent corps established in Montreal so

that the regiments in that city and its vicinity may be afforded facilities of instruction. Would my hon. friend say what is the school he intends to have in Montreal when the question of site is decided ? How many men will be there, and what is going to be done there altogether ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be a company of infantry to begin with. I think there will also be a company of garrison artillery, but of that I cannot speak positively at present. There will be a certain number of engineers, of course.

Mr. BERGERON. How many men altogether ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Between 200 or 300 of a permanent force.

Mr. BERGERON. And the different officers of the battalions in that district will go there to train ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, whenever they require to do so.

Mr. BERGERON. So that there will be altogether probably 300 or 400 men ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would think so.

Mr. BERGERON. What will become of the infantry school in St. John ? I understand that it will be devoted entirely to cavalry ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. At St. John there will be stationed permanently a squadron of cavalry—120 men and horses.

Mr. FOWLER. Under this item I would like the minister to provide me with some information in regard to the new rifle range which is being built at Sussex. For instance, who is the inspector of the rifle range, what are his qualifications for the post, what will his pay be, and how much time is he supposed to devote per day to the inspection? When the armoury was built at Sussex, the inspector of that work was a person who had no qualification whatever for the position. He was not a builder or contractor in either stone work or wood work, but a merchant tailor. I trust that the minister has taken the precaution in this particular case to procure a man for the position who has some qualification for it, and therefore I would like him to say who is appointed?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot remember the name, but it seems to me that the gentleman appointed is a lawyer, a prominent member of the militia, a very good rifle shot, and one who has devoted a good deal of time to that branch of the work. I may be wrong, but I will bring the information which my hon. friend wants.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. FOWLER. The minister may be right as to the profession, but he is wrong as to the qualifications. He has evidently been misinformed. I would like him to say who recommended the gentleman. Was it the person who has the patronage of the county?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The officer of the department is supposed to have satisfied himself as to the fitness of the man before recommending him. However, I will look into this case and give my hon. friend all the information I can.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like also to be informed as to the length of time the contract is supposed to occupy. The minister will remember that the building of the armoury took about four times as long as the contract provided for. The contract price was $4,000 and there was something like $1,900 paid for inspection.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That must have been done in the Public Works Department.

Mr. FOWLER. It was. I do not assume that the minister did that, but I want to warn him.

For manufacture of reserve ammunition at Dominion arsenal, $75,000.

Mr. DANIEL. I see that the $75,000 purchase 3,000,000 rounds of ammunition, making the charge 2½ cents a round. How does that price compare with the price of ammunition of the same kind he has been in the habit of purchasing? Does the country make anything out of this manufacture, or is the price the same, or more, or less?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The only way in which we could arrive at correct information in regard to that would be by comparing the cost with the price in England; because it would not be fair to compare this ammunition with ammunition made by the trade in Canada. This is a very different article. It is a special article made up to a certain strength, very carefully prepared, with the greatest possible precaution. I am told that the cost is less than the English price, or certainly not more, and much less than the cost in the United States.

Mr. FOWLER. I think it was stated last session by the minister that he was going to have another of these cartridge factories established. Does he propose to provide for that in the estimates?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I said last year was that I thought the time had arrived for the establishment of another cartridge factory, but I would favour the idea of its being constructed by the trade. I said that there were people in England who had been making inquiries, and that I felt disposed to consider a pro-

posal which I expected to get from them, provided they would agree to manufacture in Canada all the explosives which we would require for our own factory, and which they would use in their own. Negotiations have been proceeding, but they have not materialized very much. I hope that within six months the matter will have reached a business point.

Mr. FOWLER. The idea is that they may come here and establish it?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, at or near Ottawa.

Mr. DANIEL. I see that the total amount expended on this factory is nearly $225,000. How much ammunition does the minister get?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About nine million rounds. There will be a further vote of $65,000 in the supplementaries for next year. Nine years ago the amount manufactured was 1,500,000 rounds.

Mr. FOWLER. At how much increased expense?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The cost is $25 a thousand rounds and it used to be $30. Working extra hours, the capacity to-day is easily twenty million rounds. We can actually manufacture twenty million rounds, but without any difficulty nine million rounds, working hours nine a day.

Mr. FOWLER. Are these sent to the stores in the different districts?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you keep a reserve supply in the different districts all the time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The largest reserve is in Quebec. It is not desirable to say too much about this, but I can assure my hon. friend we are looking after that matter, and there is a proper reserve at every point where it is likely to be required.

Mr. FOWLER. At the time the scare was on about the Welland canal, there were no cartridges within fifty miles of the spot.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That was the old Snider-Enfield cartridge. I do not think that will occur again.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this the Lee-Enfield ammunition?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, the new Ross rifles take the same cartridge, number 303.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that rifle is defective.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Experts who have examined the rifle, mark II, which is an improvement on the first, say it is one of the best, if not the best, in the world. We have added to mark II many improvements which have been the result of experience.

Mr. FOWLER. I am glad to hear that the government made a contract with Sir Charles Ross to manufacture another rifle to replace rifle number 1, which was defective.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is scarcely a fair inference. The original rifle compared very favourably with the imperial service rifle, but since then changes have been made and we have a rifle which cannot be excelled.

Mr. FOWLER. What did you do with the rifles already made?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. A thousand rifles were issued to the Mounted Police and 500 to the Marine and Fisheries Department, but none had been issued to the militia. The chief change is in the back sight so there is very little difficulty in placing the new sight upon the mark I rifle. I have a telegram saying that after the 1st July, rifles will be issued at the rate of from 100 to 150 a day.

Mr. FOWLER. I have seen some criticisms of that rifle.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There were very severe criticisms of the first rifle and those criticisms I submitted to Colonel Cotton. Colonel Cotton went himself to Quebec to institute a most searching investigation, and he says that in every case the criticism was not fair, and rifle mark two is free from all the defects mentioned in that criticism.

To promote dairying interests by advances for milk and cream, to be recouped out of the proceeds of sales of such butter and cheese, to be placed to the credit of the consolidated revenue fund, $40,000.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This stood over at the request of the hon. member for St. John who wanted an explanation of the method of dealing with those advances by the Agriculture Department. On looking up the item, I find that the amount of $4,000 in the public account has nothing to do with this vote. That is a special sum sent to my department by the Orange River Colony government to pay for some live stock purchased in Canada to be sent to South Africa. The item happened to be, at the end of the fiscal year, in the hands of the government, and thus appeared in the public accounts. With regard to the $40,000 all this money is available on a special credit given by the Auditor General. The account is kept quite distinct from the ordinary business of the branch.

When revenue from the sale of butter is received, it is deposited to the credit of the vote of $40,000. For every dollar which is paid out of this vote, an equal sum must be, and is, returned to it. The amount may be expended two or three times over in the season. There is a statement in regard to this in the Auditor General's Report, page D—101 governing credit and debit account. It will be seen here that although the vote was only $40,000, the expenditure was $126,062.43—that is, the amount was paid out nearly three times over. The revenue was $156,320.76. This apparently extraordinary condition is due to the fact that a large amount had been paid in on account of sales of butter. The account runs for the season and not for the fiscal year, and the balance as on 1st July appears in the Auditor General's Report. But that balance will be entirely misleading as regards the season, because it appears right in the middle of the season for which the money is used by the department. But, of course, the statement of the account has to close at the end of the fiscal year. The revenue credited to this account does not appear in the public accounts, because the money is never actually expended, and the vote itself is not shown as an expenditure against the Agricultural Department in the public accounts. Page 33 of part 3, Public Accounts ending 30th June, 1904, shows the total expenditure for the Commissioner's Branch, Agriculture and Dairying, to be $219,993.70. This is the expenditure of the vote of $220,000. There is no item in the public accounts reports as to this $40,000 vote. I believe this is a full explanation of what my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) desired, and therefore I would ask the committee to pass the appropriation.

Mr. DANIEL. My attention was called to the statement in the Auditor General's Report and I have looked it over. The balance to the debit of the account amounts to $10.63 which has been placed to the credit of the department. But I notice a rather peculiar thing with regard to it, and that is that this is not a statement for one year or one season, but includes the summer season of 1902, the winter season of 1902-3, the summer season of 1903, the winter season of 1903-4 and the summer season of 1904. The revenue for the winter season of 1903-4 and the summer season of 1904 was $23,610 and the expenditure $20,420. And that would make a difference of $3,190 for one year.

Mr. FISHER. The items of 1902 and 1902-3 appear because some of the payments for butter which had been sold in those seasons was not received until after July 1st, 1903. This is the explanation given me by the accountant.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. DANIEL. Another reason for the increased revenue is that in the summer season of 1902 there appears a revenue from Innisfail of $1,167, and no expenditure.

Mr. FISHER. That is a case such as I explained—the receipt of money for butter sold in 1902, the money coming in after the end of that fiscal year.

Mr. FOWLER. What is this money used for ?

Mr. FISHER. This is placed at the disposal of the department to make advances to the patrons of the creameries we run in the Northwest. The whole matter was explained last night, but I had not a full explanation in answer to the question of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel).

Mr. FOWLER. Does the minister propose to continue this work after the establishment of the new provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. I think we will close up the work there within the next year or two.

Mr. FOWLER. And hand it over to the new provinces as was done in the case of the eastern provinces ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, as soon as they are able to take it over.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—THERMOGRAPH RECORDS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FISHER. I beg to lay on the table a supplementary return to an order of the House dated 20th March last, relating to Thermograph records used in the transportation of perishable products in cold storage and the contracts entered into with steamship companies for installing cold storage. I may explain that I am not laying every contract on the table, but I am giving specimens of the contracts. The other contracts are exactly similar to those included in the return.

Mr. BARKER. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow, I expect the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will be here. We may take one or two minor Bills ; then go into Committee of Supply, taking up the estimates of the Departments of Trade and Commerce and Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 7, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows :

Mr. Speaker, I beg to inform you that His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate chamber.

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that His Excellency the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bills :

An Act for the relief of Edward Norman Lewis, a member of the House of Commons.

An Act respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Anthracite Coal Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.

An Act respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Dominion Central Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Hamilton, Galt and Guelph Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to 'The Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.'

An Act respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Central Railway Company of Canada.'

An Act for the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.

An Act for the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.

An Act for the relief of George Dance Harper.

An Act respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906.

ST. MAURICE VALLEY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU moved :

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 18th Report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders that portion of the 49th rule which limits the time for receiving petitions for private Bills be suspended as regards the petition of the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company, presented this day, and that the said petition be read and received forthwith.

Mr. FOSTER. Why is this necessary ?

Mr. BUREAU. A charter was obtained last year by which the company have the right to cross the St. Maurice river at Point du Chevalier. Since then they have made surveys and they wish to proceed with the construction of the road, but they find that it will be impossible—not impossible but it will cost three times the amount to cross there that it will to cross below that point, and the amendment to the Act asks leave to cross the St. Maurice river about three miles below the point indicated in the charter obtained last year. They are going on with the construction and unless that amendment is obtained they cannot cross the river and expropriate land or have the rights on that side of the river which under the charter they have on the other side for this distance. There is no objection to the Bill by any person and it does not affect any interests in the country at all.

Motion agreed to.

PILOTAGE ACT AMENDMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 171) to amend the Pilotage Act. He said : This is a Bill to place the pilotage of the district of Quebec, below Quebec and to the Gulf of St. Lawrence on a similar footing with the pilotage above Quebec, between Quebec and Montreal.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. Were tenders called for the Tignish breakwater ? If so, when ?
2. What were the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender ?
3. Whose tender was accepted, what was the amount of same ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform my hon. friend that tenders have been asked for, but the contract has not yet been given, and it is not customary to give information until the contract has been awarded.

POST OFFICE AT LESSER SLAVE LAKE.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY—by Mr. Foster—asked :

1. When was the post office established at Lesser Slave Lake ?
2. From what railway point are mails forwarded, what is the distance covered, and how often do these mails arrive ?

3. What other post offices have been established in the Territory of Athabaska, and when were they first opened ?

4. How many letters were received and despatched from Lesser Slave Lake during the last four years ?

5. What was the revenue collected and the expense incurred in connection with the Lesser Slave Lake post office ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General :

1. 1st June, 1903.

2. The railway point from which mails are forwarded to this office is Edmonton, which is 318 miles from Lesser Slave lake. The immediate point of departure for the mails for Lesser Slave lake is Athabaska Landing, which is 105 miles from the railway at Edmonton. The service is once per month.

3. Lesser Slave lake has been in operation for some time, and three other offices were authorized in February last, viz.: (a) Spirit river, (b) Peace river crossing, (c) Vermilion. In addition to the service thus in operation for the service of Lesser Slave Lake, there are two trips made annually to the far north, beginning at Lac la Biche, which gets its mails from Edmonton via Fort Saskatchewan, Whitford and Saddle lake, and ending at Fort Resolution, passing through the following settlements in Athabaska, viz.: Fort McMurray, Fort Chipewyan, Smith Landing and Fort Smith.

The Royal Northwest Mounted Police are also taken advantage of in their patrol trips. They carry a mail bag with them and undertake the conveyance and delivery at the first regular post office they come to of all matter handed to them.

4. As no record is kept of matter mailed at an office, this information cannot be given.

5. The revenue of Lesser Slave Lake is as follows : 1903, $20 ; 1904, $66.13. The salary of the postmaster is $30 a year.

The expense in connection with the service is as follows : For the monthly trip from Athabaska Landing to the post office at Lesser Slave Lake and to Peace river crossing, which is not a post office, $125 a trip or $1,500 a year is paid. For the service to the far north, which extends into the McKenzie district, $525 a trip or $1,050 a year is paid.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INFANTRY CORPS.

Mr. BELCOURT asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to reduce the establishment of the infantry corps throughout Canada ?

2. If so, in what manner, and what will be the effect of such reduction ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) will accept as an answer to the question the statement which I read to the House yesterday, which has been published very largely in all the newspapers, and which is the best answer I can give.

TRADING STAMPS.

Mr. MONK asked :

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation during the present session upon the subject of trading stamps ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). A Bill is being prepared, but I have not finally accepted the terms of the Bill, as I have not been able to get access to the judgment of the court of appeal which was rendered recently affecting a case of this description.

YUKON TERRITORY—APPOINTMENT OF MR. F. T. CONGDON.

Mr. THOMPSON asked :

1. Has Mr. F. T. Congdon been appointed legal adviser to the Yukon Territorial Council or Commissioner ?

2. Will he be permitted, in addition, to practice his legal profession privately ?

3. Has Mr. Congdon also been appointed a member of the Yukon Territorial Council ? If so, in whose place ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Congdon has been appointed legal adviser to the Yukon Territorial Council. He will not be permitted to practise his legal profession privately. He is not a member of the Yukon Territorial Council.

SUPPLY—HALF-BREED SCRIPT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Just before we go into committee, I might ask the right hon. Prime Minister, in reference to the matter brought up yesterday or the day before, as to the issue of patents in the west to those holding half-breed scrip.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Upon inquiry I am informed that three patents have been issued all told. The minister has not given any orders for the discontinuance of the same, but owing to the fact that all the available labour in the department is employed preparing information for my hon. friend no more patents have been issued.

Mr. FOSTER. About what time may we expect the information and the papers that were asked for ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say to-day. I am sorry to say I did not ask about that.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, it is not necessary that they should all be brought down at once. If they were brought down as they are prepared in different sections it would answer—each section should be complete—

that would give an opportunity for examination, but I want to say that before we go on with the estimates of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) we must have these papers, and I hope they will be expedited as much as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

ATLANTIC AND LAKE SUPERIOR RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. H. B. AMES. Before we go into supply, I would like to ask the minister in whose department it lies, if we may shortly expect the return which was asked for by myself and recorded in this House on the 27th March last in reference to payments made to the Atlantic and Lake Superior Railway Company. It is now over two months since that return was ordered and it has not yet come in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will inquire about it.

YUKON TERRITORY.

Mr. A. THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into Committee of Supply, I would like, with your permission, to draw their attention for a short time to the conditions which exist and the reforms that are needed in the Yukon Territory. Before, however, going into a discussion of this question, I may be permitted to state exactly the position I occupy politically in this House. I am here Mr. Speaker as an independent, and when I say that I mean it in the broadest sense of that term; that is, I am independent of every political party, and if we had in this House, as they have in the House of Commons in England, cross benches, I would be sitting there. At heart I am a Conservative, but I was elected by the united support of the Conservatives and the most influential section of the Liberal party in the Yukon, banded together under the name of the Independent Yukon party. This party, representing a very large majority of the electors of the Yukon, was successful in electing me as their representative. I, therefore, hold myself in this parliament absolutely independent, and while it is perhaps a difficult role to fulfil, I intend to follow it consistently during my term of office here.

Having said this much, which I think it is necessary to do before I go into the discussion of this question, I will now ask the House to follow me very shortly in what I have to say about the Yukon. I find, Mr. Speaker, in discussing with private members and gentlemen in this House that there is an immense dearth of information in regard to the Territory which I have the honour to represent. So much is this so that I feel it necessary to go somewhat into details that otherwise might not be necessary to give the members of this House an understanding of that country and the conditions that exist there. In the first place, let me say that this Territory is bounded on the south by British Columbia, on the east by the Rocky mountains and the 136th meridian, on the north by the Arctic ocean and on the west by the Alaskan boundary line from Mount St. Elias to the Arctic ocean, which was determined by the treaty of St. Petersburg in 1825 as the 141st meridian. From Mount St. Elias to the sea the boundary line, as you know and as hon. members well know, has not altogether been settled yet, and was very recently the occasion of international dispute between the British Government and the United States. The area of this Territory is 197,000 square miles, of which 151,000 square miles are within the watershed of the Yukon river. To give you an idea by comparison how large the Territory of the Yukon is, I will just mention—and I do not want to offend my hon. friends from Prince Edward Island when I do so—that it is sixty-six times the size of Prince Edward Island. It is nine times as large as Nova Scotia, it is seven times as large as New Brunswick, it is three times as large as the New England states, it is one-third larger than the United Kingdom and about the size of France. This Territory is watered by the great Yukon river, which has a total navigable length of 2,300 miles. The St. Lawrence river system from the west end of Lake Superior to the mouth of the St. Lawrence, is 2,384 miles in length, and remember, Mr. Speaker, that the St. Lawrence is not open for a very great deal longer period during the year than is our own Yukon. The St. Lawrence river itself is 755 miles long. The total length of the Peace and Mackenzie rivers is 2,350 miles, but there are only 1,200 miles of that system that are navigable. The Mississippi river is 1,330 miles long. The point I am making by these observations is that this great river, which empties into the Behring sea and drains the Yukon Territory, has a navigable length that is equalled by very few rivers on the continent of America. Two thousand three hundred miles from its mouth to Teslin lake, steamers of greater or less draught can navigate that river for five months in the year. The Yukon river was named by an officer of the Hudson Bay Company who went in there from the interior of British Columbia and the Northwest Territories in 1843.

His name was Campbell. He simply coined the name from the Indian name of the Yukon river, giving it the English accent; and since that time the river has had the name of the Yukon, and the territory has taken the name of the river. In 1847, the Hudson Bay Company established Fort Yukon at the mouth of the Porcupine river now in Alaska. In 1848, the Hudson Bay Company established Fort Selkirk at the mouth of the Pelly river, now in the Yukon Territory. This fort was destroyed by fire in 1852, but was

rebuilt by the Hudson Bay Company in the same year; and from that time until the sale of Alaska to the United States the Hudson Bay Company divided with the Russians the whole fur trade of that country west to Behring sea. The district now known as Alaska, then owned by the Russians, was sold to the United States for $7,200,000 in 1867, at which time the Hudson Bay Company retired from the region, and they have not entered it since. Gold was discovered or first mentioned in the English writings of the time in 1868 by a man named Whymper, writing from Fort Yukon. In 1873, Harper and McQuesten went into the country to trade. In 1878, the Chilcoot Pass was first crossed from the Pacific ocean by a white man going into the interior. Up to that time communication was always obtained by means of the interior river routes with British Columbia and the North-west Territories. In 1881, gold was found in small quantities in the Big Salmon river, a tributary of the Yukon. In 1883, the United States government sent an exploratory expedition there headed by Lieutenant Schwatka. He camped where Dawson city is now situated, and photographed the slide and the mountain behind the city. In 1885, some mining was done on the bars of the Stewart river, a tributary of the Yukon. In 1888, coarse gold was first struck on Forty Mile river. In 1887, the Canadian government sent Dr. Dawson in with a survey party, and he surveyed and reported upon the Pelly and Lewes rivers. Mr. William Ogilvie, who afterwards became the commissioner of the Yukon, went in the same year to define the 141st meridian, which is the boundary line between the Yukon Territory and Alaska; and in 1888, Mr. R. S. McConnell went in on an exploring expedition. For the next few years, until 1894, reports evidently reached our government that a considerable trade was growing up in the territory, and that the trading companies all belonged to the United States. In 1894, the Dominion government sent to the territory to report on its trade and other conditions Inspector Constantine, a member of the Northwest Mounted Police. Constantine found that there was a considerable trade done, estimated the value of the gold output of that year at $300,000, collected $3,248 in duties from the trading companies, and returned to Ottawa. The report of Inspector Constantine to the government was such that they considered it necessary to organize the territory and to send him back in the following year with a squad of twenty men of the Northwest Mounted Police, and the report says that he was to represent the Canadian government in all its functions. Mr. William Ogilvie went in with Inspector Constantine at that time, again to further define the 141st meridian. Hon. gentlemen will understand what a difficult task was assigned to Inspector Constantine, and I wish here to pay a tribute to him. I do not know him, I never saw him, but he wrote indelibly on the history of that country the impress of his manhood, in giving to the miners of those early days a sample of Canadian justice. They harbour nothing but the very kindliest feelings for this man Constantine. They say that in those early days, when he had practically the government of the whole territory in his hands, he did what everybody acknowledged to be right. This was in 1895. Everything went on as usual for another year, when something happened which electrified the world. In July or August, 1896, gold was discovered in rich quantities in a hitherto unknown and unprospected portion of that territory. Up to this time no gold had been found on the stream which has since become famous the world over, and which by the way has done its share in advertising Canada and Canadian institutions throughout the world; I mean the Klondike. In 1895, an intrepid Nova Scotian named Robert Henderson was prospecting on a stream tributary to the Yukon, about twenty miles above the Klondike, and found some prospects. In the following year he crossed a small divide into the Klondike basin, and made some further discoveries, which were fairly good pay, but still not very rich. His supplies running out, he went to Forty Mile to buy more. On his way, he crossed the mouth of the Klondike river and there met an Englishman named Cormack fishing with some Indian associates. He told Cormack of his discovery on the stream which is now known as Gold Bottom. Cormack was interested, and went with two Indians to see what Henderson had in the way of prospects. He was not very well satisfied, and came back, thinking that Henderson had not enough gold there to make it worth his while to work it. On his way back Cormack and his two associates stopped for lunch at midday, at a creek now know as Bonanza; and while there, the story is that Cormack was lying down after lunch, when one of the Indians took a frying pan, which every prospector in that country carries, and strolled down to the beach of the small stream running past them and panned some of the gravel, and to his intense surprise discovered a rich prospect. They dug further and found more gold. They realized that they had made a good discovery and they staked a claim in each. They immediately put off to Forty Mile, where Inspector Constantine was, recorded their claims, came back, sunk a hole to the bed rock, and found the rich pay of discovery claim on Bonanza creek, which has yielded since that time close on $2,000,000, that is, on the 1,500 feet which Cormack and his two associates took up under the law at that time. The

miners of the district, when they heard of the discovery and saw the gold, rushed to the new find. They staked claims on Eldorado, Hunker and other creeks, and prospected during that fall and winter. They took out some gold during the winter. Of course, at that time they could not market it in the Yukon; they had to go to the Pacific coast, they went down the Yukon river to its mouth, where they took ship and went to Seattle or San Francisco, where the press agents saw the gold and heard their story. The press spread the report, and the world went mad. In 1897 and 1898, we had in the Klondike region one of the greatest gold rushes of modern times. People came from all over the civilized world; Dawson city was built in a few months; fortunes were made and lost quickly; and from that time to the present a steady stream of gold has come out of that country, and it will continue to come out for years to come if we get a little help from this government to encourage this great industry. Since 1896, we have produced in the Yukon over $120,000,000 of gold. It is hardly possible for the ordinary mind to grasp that fact; but when I convert that amount into pounds or tons avoirdupois, the average mind will realize what it means when I say that it amounts to over 242 tons avoirdupois, sufficient to load twelve freight cars carrying twenty tons each, you will have some idea of the quantity. Just now in the library I saw in a book on metals that gold may be drawn into a wire so fine that 500 feet of it will only weight one grain. Well, I made a calculation, and I found that following one grain to every foot of wire, the Yukon has produced since 1896 gold enough to encircle the globe twenty-nine times.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it not a fact that the discovery made by McCormack and his two associates was practically made in the district where Henderson discovered the course of gold, and did they not learn the fact of the course of gold being there through the information they got from him?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not think my hon. friend is exactly right. I never heard that Cormack and his associates discovered gold on Bonanza creek through any previous discovery on that creek by Henderson; but they were drawn to Bonanza by the fact that Henderson had made the discovery at Gold Bottom and it was on their return from Gold Bottom to Dawson that they made this discovery. The credit, however, is still due to Henderson of having made the first discovery of gold, although he did not find it in any such quantities as the Indians and Cormack did. We would be derelict to our duty if we did not do something to secure in his lifetime that man Henderson in comfort. In the state of California, I am told you will find everywhere monuments to Marshall who discovered gold there in 1849. We are now only at the beginning of the great gold output in the Yukon; and while the Dominion government has very properly provided for Mr. Henderson by giving him a position there, the Yukon Territory must sooner or later, in some more substantial way, repay him for the great discovery he made in 1896. This territory, which I have the honour to represent, is producing more wealth to-day per head than any other section of the civilized globe. But here and throughout this country, men have formed ideas with regard to the climate there, which are entirely at variance with the facts. So much is this the case that I feel bound to refer briefly to the climate of the Yukon so as to dispel if possible some of these false impressions, and also because I am convinced that we have a country there in which profitable business will be done and gold produced for hundreds of years. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) very kindly entered into the spirit in which I spoke to him of the agricultural fertility of that region, and he sent out this spring some seeds for fodder particularly, as well as some roots, so that we might do a little experimenting this summer and see if we cannot raise some of the fodder and other things which we are now importing at great expense. Hay and oats, when I left the Yukon, were selling at six cents per pound or $120 per ton, and they fetch nearly these same prices throughout the entire year. To show you that the request I made to the Minister of Agriculture to send seeds to the Yukon was a very reasonable one, I shall briefly refer to the report of Mr. John Macoun, assistant director and naturalist of the Geological Survey, who gave evidence before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization in 1903. Mr. Macoun said:

> What an official visit to the Yukon revealed.
>
> Last year our acting director, by direction of the Minister of the Interior, suggested that I should go and examine the Yukon country for the government, and I went. I would not go from here until late in June, for the reason that I had been in northern countries, and I told our director: I am only going to waste my time by going so early, for nothing can be growing.' I did not leave until the latter part of June, and I reached Dawson on the 10th July last year.

Mr. Macoun had previously said that Dawson is over 20 degrees north of Ottawa:

> When I reached there I found red currants, blueberries and strawberries perfectly ripe on the hillsides on the 10th of July. Well, of course, I was more than astonished. There is a rose that grows there that we know as rosa acicularis, and on the 3rd of June last year I found it with the first flower expanded at Aylmer, Quebec, nine miles from Ottawa. It happened that Mr. Tyrrell's brother, James Tyrrell, was out on the hillside at Dawson on the 2nd of June, and he found the same species in flower there, one day earlier than it was

here. To me it was an enlightenment. I had gone there with preconceived opinions of what I had heard, and this was a revelation indeed. I want to show you gentlemen what the flowering of that rose here and at Dawson meant. The same amount of heat had to be poured down on both districts to produce like results. When I reached the country I found the rose hips red and getting ripe when I thought they would be only starting to bloom. That gave me something to think about, and I turned to Mr. Tyrrell and said: 'Mr. Tyrrell, what is the cause of this flower blooming earlier here than in Ottawa?' Here is his answer. He said: 'Mr. Macoun, it is the long day and the great amount of sunlight.' I said: 'You, Mr. Tyrrell, were up at Chesterfield Inlet, on Hudson bay, and found plants that indicate perpetual frost, and still you were not as far north as here. If it was the sunlight, why does it not at Chesterfield Inlet as it does here' You see, the matter was simple. I was not going to accept this man's dictum or that man's dictum; I knew that for every effect there was a cause. Let me go back to the coast now, and we will see what I am talking about. On the coast from below Wrangel, that is down near the border of British Columbia, the great glaciers come down from the mountains to the sea, and as you go up Lynn canal the mountains come down to the sea, and you will see the glaciers starting at the mountain summits and coming down to the sea, and actually flowing into it. If you look at the map you will see that all the coast range from Wrangel northward is very high, and in all the bays and inlets there is much ice, and glaciers of immense size enter the sea. There is a great tract of country there under great glaciers and partly covered with eternal snow. In this region rise Mount Elias, Mount Logan, Mount Fairweather, rising between 16,000 and 20,000 feet above the sea. Well, the people coming up the coast believe the interior is like that, and from the erroneous opinions which have prevailed, but here is the remarkable fact, that no glacier ever was at Dawson, that Dawson has never been covered with an ice cap as it has been here, that no one of our geologists has ever discovered glacial action at Dawson or within 200 miles, or I may say within 300 miles, of that place.

The wondrous shelter belt that protects Dawson.

I stood at Dawson and turned south, and I found by the map that this mass of mountains towering 20,000 feet into the air covered with glaciers and constant snow lay between Dawson and the sea. Now, we know that the Pacific in that part and northward is almost constantly covered with fog, and the atmosphere is at the point of precipitation, and as that moisture comes into contact with these mountains, it comes down in snow, causing the glaciers. The air passing over the mountains, relieved of its moisture, descends on the plain in the interior, as a dry warm wind. This is the result of two causes, the want of moisture and friction caused by the descent of the air to the plain. So that if you wish to call it so, the conditions at Dawson are those of a perpetual chinook in the summer time.

That will be a revelation, I am sure, to hon. gentlemen. He goes on with a lengthy report with which I shall not trouble the House except to give a couple of extracts:

Mr. THOMPSON.

Spring may be said to open towards the end of April, the last zero temperature of winter occurring about the 5th of April.

That is better than Ottawa.

May with an average temperature of 44 degrees is by no means unpleasant. The 23rd May is the average date of the last frost in the spring.

I am sure that is a revelation to hon. gentlemen.

Observations of rain and snow have until the close of last summer been very fragmentary, but it is probable that the summer rainfall near Dawson is usually between 7 and 9 inches, and that the total snowfall of autumn and winter is between 50 and 60 inches. Dawson being situated near the river with high hills or mountains on all sides, is well protected from the winds, and a feature of the town, and indeed of the neighbouring country, is the long periods of calm weather which occur.

You see, Sir, Mr. Macoun was sent specifically for this purpose, so that his report is more valuable than any verbal report could possibly be.

I examined the gardens in the valley of the Klondike and the Yukon, early in July, and found everything growing luxuriantly and wonderfully vigorous. On the 5th August I examined the gardens in the Klondike, and I have that noted in my book for future reference. I found cabbage cut then, that on weighing were found to be from 3 to 5 pounds weight; these were being sold in the city.

Potatoes had also grown; in fact everything was growing beyond anything I had ever seen here.

Speaking of wheat, he said:

I took a couple of heads and sent them to the experimentalist at the Government farm here who has charge of the seed germinating process, and he sent me the report that he had planted one hundred grains. The whole hundred grains grew and made a remarkably vigorous growth; in other words there was not a weak seed in the lot, and there was not a failure, and what was more they vegetated very quickly.

Mr. FOSTER. That was wheat which had been raised in the Yukon?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. One of the members of the committee asked:

Do you think there will be no difficulty in ripening wheat in the Yukon?

And his answer is:

When I came home, I said there was nothing doubtful but wheat. Since I came home, I say there is nothing doubtful about wheat.

Mr. Speaker, that means a great deal for Canada. It means that the area of our wheat country is very materially increased. Further, on the 13th July, Professor Macoun found nasturtiums and sweet peas in flower and the next day an eastern rose bloomed. In his official report of his investigation Professor Macoun speaking of this species of rose—rosa acicularis—says

that it was gathered in flower on June 2 at Dawson city and adds:

Last spring Dr. Guillet, of Ottawa, and myself had been noting the flowering of all species at Ottawa, and this species was first detected in flower in Queen's Park, Aylmer, Quebec, nine miles from Ottawa, on June 3rd. This one simple fact shows the progress of the spring at Dawson better than a whole series of elaborate statistics, because statistics do not give the amount of heat and light given out in 20-22 hours a day.

It bloomed one day earlier at Dawson than at Ottawa.

The 15th of July was spent in the Klondike valley, and here also new revelations awaited me. The islands in the river have been cleared of brush and trees and in their stead gardens have been established in which vegetables of all kinds come to perfection. From these gardens the citizens of Dawson are supplied with rhubarb, radishes, lettuce, onions, turnips, beans, parsnips, carrots, peas, cabbage, cauliflower, Scotch kale and many other pot-herbs. Everything was in an advanced stage and gave certain promise of a large crop.

Being asked as to fruits, he gives the opinion that small fruits will grow there.

Now, I am going to refer very briefly to the words of a man whose name is revered in this country, whose fame is secure for all generations, but one who, though a Canadian, is perhaps, better known abroad even than in Canada. I refer to Dr. Dawson. Dr. Dawson was sent to explore the Yukon territory in 1887, years before the rush to that country took place. Before I finish I wish to show the House what Canada has lost in Dr. Dawson's death. His prophecies have since been wonderfully fulfilled. After referring to the journey to the Yukon, he says at page 20:

Taking into consideration all the facts which I have been able to obtain, as well as those to be derived from an examination of the natural flora of the country, and the observed advance of vegetation, which, in the absence of actual experiments, are capable of affording valuable data, I feel no hesitation in stating my belief that such hardy crops as barley, rye, turnips and flax can be successfully cultivated in the Yukon district as far north as the former position of Fort Selkirk, near the 63rd parallel, or in other words about 1,000 miles north of Victoria. Taken in conjunction with the physical features of the region, this means, that chiefly within the drainage area of the Yukon, and for the most part to the north of the 60th parallel, there exists an area of about 6,000 square miles, of which a large proportion may—and doubtless in the future will—be utilized for the cultivation of such crops, and in which cattle and horses might be maintained in sufficient number for local purposes. . . . I do not maintain that the country is suitable for immediate occupation by a large, self-supporting agricultural community, but hold that agriculture may before many years be successfully prosecuted in conjunction with the natural development of the other resources of this great country, of which by far the most valuable portion lies to the east of the line of the Alaskan boundary.

Even at that early day—1887—Dr. Dawson anticipated the discovery of gold which occurred in 1896. He speaks of the discoveries in the Cassiar and other streams in northern British Columbia, and proceeds:

Discoveries similar to these may be expected to occur at any time in the Yukon district, the generally auriferous area of which already proved is very much greater than that of Cassiar. Scarcely anything has been done as yet even in the Cassiar district toward the search for or providing of metalliferous veins and practically nothing in the Yukon district, but there can be no reasonable doubt that such deposits exist. The present activity in mining enterprise in the southern part of British Columbia——

You see how he figures it out.

—will, before long, spread to this northern region also, and then, if not before, its valuable character as a portion of the metalliferous belt of the continent will be realized.

The Yukon district with the northern part of British Columbia, measured from the vicinity of Dease lake to the intersection of the Pelly (Yukon) with the 141st meridian, comprises a length over 500 miles of the Cordillera belt of the west, which, wherever it has been examined, has been found rich in minerals and particularly in the deposits of the precious metals. The width of this particular part of the Cordillera belt is also great as it appears, so far as our explorations have gone, to extend from the coast to the eastern ranges of the Rocky Mountains in the vicinity of the Mackenzie river.

Here is a point most important to Canada:

This portion of the Cordillera region, together with that of the more southern part of British Columbia, gives an aggregate length of between 1,200 and 1,300 miles, almost exactly equal to the same metalliferous belt contained by the United States, and in all probability susceptible of an eventual mining development equally great.

And Dr. Dawson was a geologist and spoke by the book. He speaks of the quantity of timber and indicates that coal is likely to be found. And to-day, in Dawson city, we are using coal that Dr. Dawson, in 1887, foresaw that we would use in that territory. Speaking of the isothermal lines, he said:

The lines, in particular, which would represent the mean summer temperature would assume in the far northwest approximate parallelism with the Pacific coast, instead of tending to follow lines of latitude. It is needless here to recapitulate the well known causes which produce this remarkable difference in climate, but lines as already approximately drawn upon the maps, represent in a generalized form the aggregate of influences which, working together produce at the site of old Fort Selkirk on the 63rd parallel of latitude in the upper Yukon basin, an attractive landscape, decked with well-grown forests and with intervening slopes of

smiling meadow, while in the same latitude in Hudson strait we find, even at midsummer, merely a barren waste of rocks and ice.

And here is another comparison to which I wish to refer :

To instance a region which reproduces the general conditions of the Yukon district and adjacent northern portions of British Columbia we must turn to the inland provinces of Russia, to which allusion has already been made in connection with climatic features. The province of Vologda, in European Russia, appears to offer the nearest parallel. It is circumstanced relatively to the western shores of Europe, as is this district to the western shores of the North American continent. Its area is 155,498 square miles, situated between the 58th and 65th degrees of latitude. The climate in both cases is a continental one, in which severe winters alternate with warm summers, and the actual degrees of cold and heat, so far as our information goes, are not dissimilar. There is no very heavy rainfall in either region, such as we find near the western coasts bordering on the Atlantic and on the Pacific respectively. The agricultural products from the province of Vologda are oats, rye, barley, hemp, flax and pulse. The mineral products comprise salt, copper, iron and marble, but the precious metals do not appear to be important, as in the Yukon district.

Horses and cattle are reared, and the skins of various wild animals, as well as pitch and turpentine, are among the exports. The population of the province is stated at 1,161,000.

Concerning this province of Vologda, the following facts will be of interest:

Agriculture is the chief occupation, and cattle breeding. In 1897 they had 243 thousand horses, 549 thousand cattle and 419 thousand sheep. Government has from 150 to 200 factories of woollen and linen fabrics, soap, leather, candles, glass, iron foundries, brick kilns, distilleries and salt works, and it supports a population which, in 1897, was 1,365,587 souls. Latitude 61-65 north. English settled in Vologda in sixteenth century, and it was a great centre of trade.

And, Mr. Speaker, that province of Vologda, in northern Russia, in practically the same latitude as our Yukon territory, has to-day a population of 1,161,000 souls, and if a province can do that in Russia our province can successfully do it in Canada. He makes one practical remark here :

To-day it may well be characterized by the term which has been employed in connection with the Mackenzie basin, a portion of 'Canada's great reserve.'

I will not trouble the House with any more from Dr. Dawson, but his opinion is concurred in by Professor Macoun. But I want to refer to one paragraph used by another gentleman, just as competent to speak upon the climatic conditions of the Yukon, I refer to Dr. Stupart, whose office is in Toronto, and who is the head of the Meteorological Survey of Canada. He gives a very fitting answer to those who have erroneous views with regard to the winter in the Yukon, for he says :

Ice usually begins to run in the Yukon river about the second week in October, but it is not until quite the end of the month, or early in November, that the river is frozen fast.

This, Mr. Speaker, is important, because I am continually asked here: "How is it that you live in the Yukon, I should think you would be frozen to death there in the winter time." Well, this is the reply taken from Dr. Stuparts report :

The temperature on the average, during a winter, falls to 20 degrees below zero, or lower, on seventy-two days ; to 40 degrees below, or lower, on twenty-one days ; to 50 degrees below, or lower, on seven days ; and to 60 below, or lower, on two days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the observation of any one individual winter, it is the consensus of observations covering six winters, and it corrects the wrong impressions with regard to the cold in the Yukon, better than I can.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any way of knowing when these two cold days come ?

Mr. THOMPSON. No, but I can tell my hon. friend that he may be cock sure they will come. But when they do come, it is not half as cold there as it is here with the same temperature, because there we have practically no moisture in the air, and it is not much colder at 60 degrees there than it is at 45 degrees here, so far as human endurance goes.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Is it cold when you have an election there ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, we had a memorable election there last December, when it proved extremely cold for some people. We have very little snow there. When I left there on the 15th February, we had about eight inches of snow, and that represented all the snow that fell up to that time. We have no thaws at all in winter.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn your attention to some methods of mining. The great industry in that territory is placer mining, and I would like to refer to the methods used in extracting the gold from the gravels of the Yukon. Gold is found as dust or nuggets. Gold dust ranges from the finest gunpowder up to sawdust, and from that on. It is graded in nuggets that weigh from a few pennyweights up to several ounces. But the great majority of the gold is won in dust, what is called dust, but it is like coarse gunpowder. This gold is found in gravel. This auriferous gravel overlays a very large area of territory. It is covered by a vegetable sediment which miners call muck, a sort of black clay. Beneath the gravel is a bed rock. There are hill gravels and creek gravels; but in a general way you find first of all muck, next gravel, next bed rock. The richer portion of the pay is usually found in the lower part of the

gravel overlaying the bed rock. The miner cuts a hole in this muck or black clay, with an axe down to the gravel. Then he piles cordwood over the whole, sets the wood on fire, for this muck and gravel is frozen down to the bed rock. He sets the wood on fire, thaws some of the gravel, hoists it out, puts in another fire, and repeats that operation until he gets to bed rock. When he gets to bed rock he tunnels by some process east or west, north or south, taking up the gravel by that means. He hoists it up and in winter time, usually piles it in a dump, and leaves it until it thaws in the spring. That was the primitive method used in the Yukon, and it is the method largely used now. There is another method, however, and that is by using steam power. The miner sets up a small boiler and conveys the steam through pipes and rubber tubes to a machine which he calls a 'point' which he drives into this bank of gravel. He turns on the steam, and thaws the gravel for four or five feet, and is thereby enabled to take out more gravel in a given time than by thawing with wood. He hoists this up with a steam hoist, dumps it by a self-dumper into a dump, which is of a conical shape, and one sees these rise all over the country in the winter time. There is another method used in the summer time, and that is a steam shovel, such as is used in a railway cutting. The shovel raises the gravel and throws it into a washer, where it is put through a series of washings to extract the gold. Still another method is by the use of hydraulic power, where the water is thrown under great pressure against a bank with a force of two or three hundred pounds, dislodging a large quantity of gravel. The methods of washing the gold are practically the same, that is, it is done in accordance with the laws of gravity. Gold being of greater specific gravity than any other metal, it sinks at almost the point where it is thrown into the sluice box. These sluice boxes are placed along the claim, and a stream of water is poured through them, now the gravel is thrown into the box, and the water rushing through that box carries away the gravel and leaves the gold. That principle is the one which you will find throughout the whole of the industry, the gold is separated by its own specific gravity. In this sluice box, which is about a foot wide, there are what they call riffles. These are small poles in the bottom of the box between which the gold naturally falls. The large pieces of gravel are run off by the water, the small pieces of gold sink down in the interstices beween these poles. To make these riffles they use railway rails, rocks and small round spruce poles. Now you can understand, Mr. Speaker, how important it is that we should have plenty of water in this industry. For the miner, water is a prime essential in the Yukon. Without water the miner cannot extract the gold in any paying quantity. Wood is also a very important article, and we are having a railway built in there now, and I expect to see a larger quantity brought in there than has been for two or three years past, because this railway is opening up large tracts of wooded land from which we could not formerly get wood on account of the expense of hauling. I have thought fit to go somewhat into detail in this matter so that hon. members of this House would appreciate the requests I have to make and the explanations to which I may refer to later on. We are a territory and as such we must come to this federal parliament for absolutely everything pertaining to our territory and to our one industry. This parliament and this parliament alone can give us the things that we need to foster and encourage this industry of ours.

I wish to refer briefly to some things which we need and to some things which parliament can give. The first and foremost need, the foundation, in fact of the industry in the future, is a code of mining laws. Up to the present time we have had no laws in the sense that we make laws in this House; this industry of ours has been governed and guided by regulations which have passed during all the years for laws. These regulations are passed by Order in Council and have the effect of laws passed by parliament except that they are changeable by the same body that made them, the Governor in Council, and not by parliament. I need not tell you how important it is that any industry, if it is to thrive, must have for its foundation a stable set of laws, and I know it has been found difficult to compile these regulations and formulate them into laws. I also am convinced that they are considering this matter, that successive commissioners have considered the matter, but it is still in abeyance, we still have our regulations and we have no laws. To show you that what I am talking about is not a political question but a question far above the plane of politics so far as the Yukon Territory is concerned, I shall refer briefly to the acceptance of my predecessor, the present Senator J. H. Ross which he sent to his constituents in the Yukon when he ran for Parliament. It will be remembered that Mr. Ross was our commissioner there previous to the time he ran for parliament. He said:

> I was engaged in an endeavour to revise and codify not merely the mining laws, but all the laws applicable to the Yukon when my illness interrupted the work.

Unfortunately it did.

> I think this work most essential in order that the laws may be fixed, clear and certain. With respect to the mining laws I propose to have them codified and then submitted to representative miners for criticism, alteration and approval in order that they may, as far as pos-

sible, meet with the approval of the mining community.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is the circumstance that the regulations are temporary in their nature, made by the Governor in Council or is it the imperfect character of the regulations which is complained of, or both ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is really both, but the one thing of all to which we really object is the instability of those laws, the fact that they have prevented from coming to our territory capital that otherwise would have come. You cannot get capital invested in this country or any other country unless you have for that capital a set of sound and just laws.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these regulations changed with considerable frequency ? Have many changes been made from time to time in them so that you do not really know what laws to expect in the immediate future ?

Mr. THOMPSON. In reply to that it is only fair to say that they have not recently been often changed. I do not know that they have recently been changed at all, but in the early days of the camp when the eyes of the world were directed to that spot, when capital sought investment there they were changed and they were changed to the detriment of the territory. Latterly they have not been changed as frequently, I do not know that they have been changed at all, but the fact remains that if you take a Klondike proposition to a capitalist in this or any other country, the first thing he will ask is : What is your title ; have you a stable title or not ? and whenever he sees the title we have to a placer claim in the Yukon he says : I cannot afford to take the risk ; there are other countries, there are situations even in Canada where I can get an investment under a more suitable set of laws. That is the one difficulty. I wish, and the people of the Yukon wish, that these regulations, many of them good, the majority of them good, shall be incorporated in an Act of parliament passed by this House, and thereby become law which cannot be changed except by this House. Then the people of the Yukon will feel that underlying this one great industry of ours we have a stable and just set of laws upon which the future of the country is based, and under which I have no doubt and they have no doubt we shall progress.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all those regulations made at Ottawa or are there some of them that are made by the commissioner or assistants in the Yukon itself ?

Mr. THOMPSON. All these regulations are made here at Ottawa, and before I sit down here I am going to submit that this parliament should give us the right to make our own mining laws. At the present time they are made here in Ottawa. We have no power in the Yukon to make or to change those laws. To show you how jealously this privilege is guarded by other provinces which had the status of provinces previous to their entry into confederation, I shall refer you to the provinces of British Columbia and Nova Scotia. Do you suppose that when British Columbia entered into confederation she would give to the federal parliament one jot or tittle of her right, to make her own mining laws ? Not much. Do you suppose that when Nova Scotia entered confederation she would give this federal government one right, even the smallest right to change her mining laws ? No, Sir. She jealously guarded these for herself, she kept them and she has evolved year after year a system of mining laws which is suitable to her but which might not be suitable to this province or to Ungava or to Mackenzie or to British Columbia. The point is that every province and territory has distinctive conditions which make it imperative that mining laws should be made for that territory or province and for it alone. There may be great principles that underlie the mining business, but in detail the laws must be worked out for each section of the country. This is not a political question with us in the Yukon. Every man in the Yukon, whether Conservative or Liberal, is unanimous upon this question, that these laws should be incorporated finally in an Act of parliament and made unchangeable except by parliament. Previous to their final passage they should be taken to the Yukon and submitted to the people there who were earning their living by taking gold from the ground. They should be submitted to these people and their best opinion with regard to what is best for that territory should be obtained. A few days ago I had the opportunity of speaking here with the premier of Nova Scotia, the Hon. Mr. Murray, upon this question. I knew that in Nova Scotia they have some good mining laws, and I said to him : How did you evolve this system of laws ?

His answer contains exactly the germ of the idea which I have in respect to the people of the Yukon Territory. Speaking in regard to the coal mining industry, which I will take for the purpose of the illustration, he said : It has taken us years to evolve these laws and to bring them to a condition in which they are satisfactory to the coal miners of Nova Scotia. I said : How did you do it ? He said : We asked the coal miners to meet us in convention ; that is to send their representatives to meet us—speaking of the government—and we would send our representatives to meet them, and they would sit at a table and discuss this question, exchange ideas and come to some general understanding which would be incorporated into an Act of the legislature. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that that is sound, that there is no better method of arriving at the best

ideas to incorporate into a mining code than that very same method and that is what I am asking this government to do—to send a man to the Yukon Territory. Let me say that I have discussed this question with the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and he has entered into the spirit of it. I feel that in this matter I have a duty to perform and I wish to discuss this and other questions in the fullest and freest manner. What I want the government to do is to send a man to the Yukon Territory, there to investigate the conditions underlying this industry, who will consult the men producing gold, who will get their ideas, who will consult with the members of the Yukon Council, our legislature there, and from all these sources compile information which he can bring down here and incorporate into a set of laws which will be passed by parliament, which will stand for years to come for the Yukon Territory and which will more than anything else help us to get capital to develop the industries of that country. So much for the mining laws.

Mr. Speaker, there is another question that affects us and affects us very materially in the Yukon, and that is the export tax on gold. Originally we had to pay ten per cent royalty to the Canadian government on every dollar's worth of gold over $5,000 which was produced by any individual in the Yukon Territory. That was an exorbitant tax, so great a tax that there are few industries and few countries in the world which could live under it, and rich and all as was the Yukon, it became in time too great a drain. The government reduced it to five per cent, cut it in two, with the same exemption of $5,000. This went on for some time and then, when my predecessor the Hon. Mr. Ross was commissioner, or shortly after, the royalty was removed and an export tax of 2½ per cent was placed on the output with no exemption. Every dollar of gold that is now produced in the Yukon pays 2½ cents to the federal government.

Mr. FOSTER. That is exported.

Mr. THOMPSON. Exported from the Yukon ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. But exported into Canada as it should be and as I am going to show. That is the point ; it must be exported to Canada. Why should we pay duty on gold going into Canada ? However, I will discuss that later on. This export tax is 2½ per cent and it covers the whole product. Now, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago, when we were producing from $20,000,000 to $22,000,000 annually in gold, when the camp was prosperous, 2½ cents on every dollar's worth of gold produced was not excessive; the burden was easily borne, and if these conditions existed to-day the people would not object, but unfortunately, times have somewhat changed. Our output has fallen to $10,000,000 a year and yet an output of $10,000,000 a year is producing more gold and more wealth per head than any industry is producing in any other country in the world. But, I say that this export tax is pressing to-day a little more hardly upon us than it did four or five years ago. We in the Yukon do not object to taxation. We know it is necessary to be taxed in order to keep up our government, but I submit this proposition that in view of what the Yukon has paid to the federal treasury since 1896, in view of the advantage to Canada of the Yukon to-day in the way of a market it would be wise and expedient for the Canadian government to remit for a term of years this tax of 2½ per cent on every dollar of gold taken out. I have asked the Prime Minister to abolish it completely and he says he cannot ; but if you will not abolish it completely, remove it for ten or even five years until the enterprises there begin operating and until our gold output is on the up grade again which it will be in a very few years. At the present moment, although we are producing this $10,000,000 a year, these, comparatively speaking, are lean years, and it is during these lean years that we require relief. Remove it for three years if you like and it will be an assistance. Last year this tax gave the government $250,000. We produced approximately $10,000,000 in gold. What is a quarter of a million of dollars to a government like ours whose income is $60,000,000 a year and whose income very shortly will be $100,000,000 a year, because there is no doubt in my mind that the progress that we have started on in Canada will not stop until the income of the government is away beyond $100,000,000 a year. Here is a territory that is struggling along and while a quarter of a million does not make much difference to the government of the Dominion it makes an enormous difference to the people of the Yukon, and so I ask, that, if this tax cannot be abolished, it be remitted for a term of years or until we get on the up-grade again in the output of gold. What do they in the great republic to the south of us ? Do they tax gold ? No. And remember we are lying side by side with the district of Alaska, the people of which are engaged in the same business we are in, in placer mining, and their government does not put one cent of a tax upon the output of gold. Further than that they give a larger claim in Alaska than we do. The result is that we find that our miners are being drawn off to the district of Alaska where they can get a larger claim and where they can mine their gold without a cent of taxation. You all can understand how that will militate against the progress of the Yukon.

We have very nearly paid our way since 1896. If the Yukon field force charge and

the Mackenzie & Mann charge were taken from the charges against the Yukon up to the end of June, a year ago now—I am speaking from memory and I am not quite sure of the facts—our accounts would very nearly be square. If I remember correctly at that time we had overdrawn, so to speak, or we had cost the federal treasury more than we had paid in $1,200,000. It cost the Dominion government $750,000 to put the Yukon field force there and it cost $450,000 to settle the Mackenzie & Mann bill. Add these together and they make $1,200,000, and I think I am correct when I say that if you remove these two items up to that time we had almost paid our way. It may be asked how the government would be repaid if this tax were removed. Well, they would be repaid in the very best manner possible for Canada ; they would be repaid in trade and commerce. We would have in that country, instead of the few thousand people that we have to-day, with some of these restrictions removed, a large influx of miners. The country would go ahead, we would consume more Canadian products which would be a good thing for Canada, and although the government would not get the direct taxes that are paid to-day, indirectly, Canadian producers would get larger prices and sell larger quantities of Canadian goods in the Yukon.

If that is not done I have another proposition to make and it is this, and I submit to the people of Canada that it is a reasonable one. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) asked a moment ago if that was an export tax. Strictly speaking, this tax of 2½ per cent on our gold is not an export tax, because the gold should not be exported out of Canada but it should be brought here to Ottawa.

If you will not take the export tax off the gold going out of the territory, then put it on the gold going into the United States, so that all our gold will be retained in Canada, instead of going across the line to build up American cities, as it is doing to-day. Of the $120,000,000 of gold produced in the Yukon Territory since 1896, I venture to say that not more than $20,000,000 has been left in Canada, while $100,000,000 has gone to the United States. That gold should be kept in this country.

Another obstacle, though rather a small one, to the progress of this work, is the assessment work required on the claims. At the present time a miner has to do $200 worth of work on his claim to keep it for a year. He does not object to that ; but in addition he has to pay the government $2 to get from the government official a certificate that the work has been done. This is only a small matter, and yet it retards the industry that much. I would ask the government to let the requirement of $200 of assessment work stand as it is, but to remove this $2 certificate fee ; and if it is necessary to have a certificate, let the government official go to the claim and give the miner a certificate there, instead of requiring the miner to come to the government office, as he has to do at the present time, and take two witnesses with him, to have the assessment work recorded.

Before I left the Yukon I called a convention of the miners, and asked them to give me as nearly as possible a statement of some of the more essential things which they thought were required for the Yukon, and they did so. It was held at Gold Bottom on the 11th of February, four days before I left. This is one of the things they asked : that the certicfiates of work fees be abolished, and that license fees be reduced to $5. This refers to the abolition of these certificates. The license fee at that time was $7.50. I am glad to say that when I submitted this to the Prime Minister, who was Acting Minister of the Interior when I arrived, with other things which I submitted to him in a memorandum, he saw the force of this suggestion, and at once had this fee reduced to $5, something which the people of the Yukon appreciate very much. It was also decided that creek claims should be increased to 500 by 2,000 feet, hillside claims to 500 by 1,000 feet, and all others 500 by 500 feet, with four posts. These are larger claims than we have in the Yukon at the present time. We have claims of 250 feet up and down the creek. The gold is usually found in creek bottoms, which are from 50 feet to a quarter of a mile or more in width, and the hillsides adjoining the creeks very often contain deposits of gold. The present creek claim is 250 feet by 2,000, 1,000 feet on each side of the base line. The miners ask that it shall be 500 feet by 2,000 feet, double the size. That may seem, to gentlemen acquainted with placer mining, rather large ; and on a rich creek it would be large. But we have creeks that are not as rich as Eldorado and Bonanza, creeks on which machinery has to be placed before the gold can be extracted ; so that if a man has a claim of only 250 feet, all he has after his operations is his mining machinery and a small bank account, if he is not in debt. If he had 250 feet more, in many instances he would have a comfortable nest egg left. The reference to four posts is to obviate litigation, which has been the curse of that country. Fractional claims have cost that country perhaps more than any other one thing in connection with the delimitation of claims. If a man has to place a post at every corner of his claim, there will be no doubt where the end or side lines are, and a great deal of the litigation of the past will be obviated, I hope, in the future. In regard to leaseholds, it was decided that the present system is good enough, with the addition of the absolute right to renew. This shows that we do not kick at everything. At the present time the gold commissioner, who is the head of our mining court, may

under the regulations, though I do not know that he has ever done it, refuse to a man the right to renew. In the matter of grouping, it was decided that the requirements of representing the groups should be that the representation work must be such as will work to the development of the whole group. The law now allows us to group eight claims and do the work on any one. I think as a principle that is very good; but the work done on this one claim should be done with a view to develop as much as possible the whole eight. A miner was considered as entitled to have the right to abandon one claim and resume all rights upon that creek or in that district. That is, if he locates a claim, and finds, after prospecting, that it is no good, he wants to have the privilege of giving that claim back to the government, to whom it would probably be of more use than to him. The Yukon regulations regarding tailings, tunnelling, drainage, &c., should be amended to include the British Columbia laws of 1901, section 48. I am a layman, so far as the legal profession is concerned, and I am not prepared to discuss this question from a legal standpoint; but men who have studied them say that they have good regulations in British Columbia in reference to this, and I think it would be wise to incorporate them in our code. It was decided to adopt the Northwest Territories Irrigation Act. Water is the great desideratum in the Yukon. It is necessary to have water and at low cost, to mine these gravels. Our water is gradually being pre-empted by speculators applying for water rights. I am not very well acquainted with the Northwest Irrigation Act; but, as I understand it, it is this. Where water is available for irrigation purposes, a man is not given the right to take water from a certain stream to irrigate a certain piece of land, unless he proves to the Minister of the Interior that he is a bona fide investor, that he has the capital to carry out his scheme, and that when it is carried out, it will be not only good for him, but good for the surrounding country. What we really want in the Yukon is to make it impossible for these speculators to get these water rights and hold them.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that largely done now?

Mr. THOMPSON. It was done considerably last summer. Of course, it is permitted by law and is perfectly legitimate, and last summer when people saw, as they have been seeing for some years, that water has become very valuable, some speculators covered many of these water rights for a term of years, rendering it impossible for other men, who might be bona fide investors, to get these water rights, which are becoming of greater value year by year.

Mr. AMES. By what authority are the water rights issued?

Mr. THOMPSON. By the Gold Commissioner in Dawson. I am not positive whether they have to be referred to the Minister of the Interior or not, but I do not think so. I think the Gold Commissioner in Dawson has the absolute right to accept or refuse.

Mr. BELCOURT. Under regulations.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course. These regulations to which I have referred are operating in the Yukon and are sent to our Gold Commissioner, who is head of our gold court there; but I am just giving parliament the ideas of the miners themselves, in convention assembled, of the things they need:

It was considered the prospector should be allowed to take and hold ground for ninety days by prospecting continuously without recording.

The prospector is the man to whom we owe that $128,000,000 in gold. If he had not preceded the population, we would not have a Klondike or a Yukon, and it is necessary, in order that further discoveries may be made, to encourage the genus prospector. Unfortunately, he has, to a very large extent, left and gone to other fields. He is a migratory man always, in every country, but I am anxious we should do everything possible to retain that class of men. He is a man who will take upon his back food for a few days, a frying pan, a shot gun, a little ammunition, and go out in the wilderness and prospect there day after day and week after week until his food supply runs out. Then he will come in for more and go out again. It seems to be a fever; there is a strange fascination for these men to go out and discover new gold districts. I am anxious that we should make things as easy as possible for the prospector and give greater inducement to him to go and discover new fields. For, in that vast territory, there may be a hundred Klondikes. It will be strange if there are not other deposits of gold there, because we are right in the auriferous belt, which runs from California to Cape Nome. Take a map of the western section of this continent and lay a ruler upon it, and you will be surprised to find that from California to British Columbia, to Yukon and Cape Nome, is almost a straight line due north, showing that we are really in the auriferous belt, and that further discoveries may be made at any moment in the Yukon. It therefore occurred to me that it might be possible for us to aid the prospector in this way. First, charge him no fees. Give him an absolute free claim from the time he stakes until he sells. Make the man who buys pay; but so long as the prospect is held by the individual prospector himself, give him a free claim without royalty or fee of any kind. More than that, if the prospector should discover a new creek, that creek immediately becomes a revenue bearer to the government. Claims are staked on it. In

order for a man to hold a claim he must first buy a license, which costs $5. To that we do not object. We ask the government to protect us, and are willing to pay for the protection. We do not object to the $5 for a mining license, and in order that a man may hold a claim he must have that license. But I would not have the prospector charged for fees or mining license or any royalty on his claims. All the other miners, however, who came after him and staked upon the creek he discovered would have to pay to the government the usual fees; and I submit it would be good policy to give the prospector half those renewal fees for a term of years, or say until he has a bonus of $10,000. How would that work out? At present that country which he is prospecting does not give the government a cent, but the moment he makes a discovery the government begins to get returns. Is it not fair then that the government should, for a term of years, divide those returns with the prospector who made it possible for them to get anything? I am not wedded to this, but wish to do something that will induce the prospector to go out into the wilderness; and in the absence of anything else, I have thought out this scheme. The first year he gets nothing, the government gets it all, because it might be a fake discovery, and I would not encourage that. Another thing, if a man holds a claim and has to put on his representative work and wants to renew at the end of the year, that costs $10. I do not object to that. The first year the prospector gets nothing; the second year, if the claims are no good, these men who hold them will not renew them, but if they are good they will renew them, and the prospector would get half these renewals until he gets a cash bonus of $10,000. That is one method of helping the prospector and inducing him to go into the country and discover and open up large areas.

It was decided we need mining inspectors, but that they be elected by the miners on each creek, and that the Mounted Police do the desired work formerly done by the inspectors.

All the inspectors except two were discharged last fall, and the miners think that others should be elected. Their idea is to elect them as is done in Australia and some other country. These men get together and elect the man they think most suitable to inspect their claims. That is a matter I suggest in passing, to the government.

It was decided that all royalty or export tax be abolished and the British Columiba Hydraulic Lease Law should be adopted.

They are a unit on the question of abolishing the export tax. Formerly, where it bore only on the rich man who produced $5,000 and over, but now it bears upon the poor man. It bears upon every dollar you raise from the ground, and that is why it is so obnoxious. We would be willing, in any event, that it should be remitted for a term of years, if not permanently. One of the things that occupy our attention in the Yukon individually and collectively is the lien law. In that country, where labour is valuable, a workable lien law is very desirable. We found it very difficult indeed to frame a lien law that would be workable. We did frame one and passed it through the Yukon Council, but the court decided it was ultra vires. The only thing for us to do then is to ask this parliament to pass a lien law which will be operative in the Yukon. The difficulty is this. As I understand the principle of such a law, it applies against the labour of a man who is working upon something and making it more valuable by his labour. The product of his labour, so to speak, is attached by a lien law. But in the Yukon the thing is unfortunately reversed, and the man's labour decreases the value of land upon which he operates. These men work all winter, the dumps of gravel are washed up in the spring and their contents reduced to a very small quantity, and it is very easy to convey that from the claim. The consequence is the miner who had worked many weary months when he goes for his pay finds that there is no pay for him and that the claim perhaps does not even belong to the man for whom he worked. It is most unsatisfactory. A lien law which would enable a lien to be put upon the gravel in the dump seemed to be the only way out of the trouble. We did that, but, as I say, the courts decided that it was ultra vires. The title we have from the government is only a lease-holder's title, and we could not attach a lien to this lease-hold, because it had to be renewed year after year and at best was only a leasehold. I submit this to the government for their consideration, and hope that they will solve the problem for us.

Now, I wish to refer very briefly to one of the most important problems we have to face and that is the disposition of our gold. We have one product in the Yukon for export and that is the gold—absolutely we have nothing to export except the bullion. Therefore it is important to us that we should get the full value of our product when we market it. Gold fluctuates very little in value and its difference in value in different places is very little. Allowing for charge of transportation, it has the same value whether in the Yukon, in London or in South Africa. This being the case, the miner should get as near that fixed value as possible. He should not be under the necessity of selling his gold as if it were cord-wood, or hay or any commodity whose value fluctuates. At the present time, he sells his gold to the banks; and the banks make a profit on every ounce—and in some cases they make a fairly good profit. I do not want to say anything against the banks;—they have done a good work for that country, but they are making too much money out of our gold. What do other

countries do? They buy the gold. The United States government buys all the gold that comes to them; and so does the British government and the French government. And I believe that Russia and Australia do the same. And Canada should do the same. There is no reason why our Canadian government should not buy every ounce of gold we produce in the Yukon. It is a pretty good thing to have a few millions of gold lying around, whether for a country or for a man.

Just in passing, let me congratulate Canada on the fact that she is going to have a mint. I do not know of any one thing that the Canadian government has done in the last decade which will have a more widespread or more beneficial effect upon the world at large regarding Canada and upon Canada herself than the fact that we are to coin our gold. I do not believe it is possible for a nation to do anything that more clearly gives it the stamp of nationhood than the issue of its own gold coins. I do not believe that the Transvaal republic did anything in the course of its career that did as much to give it a standing amongst the nations of the world as the minting of its own gold coins. Mr. Speaker, I shall never forget the moment when, in London, I saw for the first time an Australia sovereign. That coin told me more about Australia than a hundred bank notes could have done. It told me that Australia had a civilization; that she produced her own gold, and coined her own money, and stood upon her feet in financial affairs. I am sorry that Canada had not a mint years ago. I believe we would have had it years ago if the banks were not opposed to it. Of course, they are opposed to it, for every five-dollar gold piece in circulation means one less five-dollar note to put out by the banks. I am glad that the Finance Minister was able to tell us that the foundation for the mint was already laid and that shortly we shall have it in operation. In California to-day it is difficult to get paper money—I speak particularly of San Francisco. Go into a business house in San Francisco and ask for paper money, and they begin to wonder where you have come from. They say: We do not use paper money; we are afraid of it; we have the gold. In England they have comparatively little paper money—the smallest is the five-pound note. The money of the common people is the gold. Let us have fewer five-dollar bills and in their place our own five-dollar gold pieces. I do not know how it is with others, but I certainly feel richer with a twenty-dollar gold piece than I do with a twenty-dollar bill. Australia had a mint in Sydney as early as 1855, and another in Melbourne in 1872 and another in Perth in 1897. And even Newfoundland has had a two-dollar gold coin for years. Yet, Canada, though the premier colony and the brightest gem in the British crown has no gold coin of her own. Our mint is not yet ready. But we in the Yukon are ready; we are producing $10,000,000 or $11,000,000 of gold a year. —and we have to sell it to the United States. Why should it not come here to Ottawa?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, I have a proposition to make to the government. Suppose our government proceeds to make money—that is, they put upon our gold 'the guinea stamp,' to use the poet's phrase. My proposition to-day is that they should issue government certificates for our gold. We will take these certificates and use them for money, selling the government say $10,000,000 of gold per year. Here is a scheme for the Finance Minister to consider. Canada to-day is paying through her savings banks 3 per cent per annum to the people for their deposits. Here is $10,000,000 a year which the government may have for not one cent of interest—simply the issue of certificates which we will use as money in the Yukon. I would like to have it explained how it is that, if that were brought into effect, Canada would not save $300,000 a year in interest. There is a nut for hon. gentlemen to crack. I see my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) is cogitating over it to see if there is anything behind it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the Minister of Finance would like to see something behind it.

Mr. THOMPSON. He will have $10,000,000 of gold behind it. What more does he want?

Mr. HENDERSON. But if he deposits the gold in the vault what about the interest?

Mr. THOMPSON. There would be no interest—we would use the certificates.

Mr. HENDERSON. Perhaps it would not work out exactly that way.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, it is something for my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to think about.

Mr. HENDERSON. I agree with you.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am glad to find even one man to agree with my position. To me it seems feasible, but whether it is feasible or not, we are sure the government should buy our gold. This gold should not go to the United States, it should remain in Canada and help build up our own cities. Eventually no doubt, as the Finance Minister said the other day, the government will buy our gold; but in the meantime the miners are losing a good deal every year. The assay office is in Vancouver, whereas it should be in Dawson where the miner could go with his gold, put it on the counter and have it weighed by an official and get full value for

it on the spot, instead of allowing a middleman to make something out of the exchange. I hope the government will do that before long. This gold question is a very interesting one to me, I have thought and read a good deal about it; and I do not see anything against the government hoarding this gold until the mint is completed. The Finance Minister told us the other day that the Dominion government had to have 25 cents worth of gold on every dollar up to $30,000,000 given out, making $7,500,000. If my memory serves me right, he told us that the total circulation of the Dominion government was about $47,900,000. For every dollar above $30,000,000 the Dominion government had to put up dollar for dollar in gold. Now if there was $47,000,000 in circulation, that meant that he had $17,000,000 in circulation dollar for dollar in gold, and $7,500,000 as against the $30,000,000, making a little more than $25,000,000 in gold which the Dominion government had to keep on hand. So you see this gold proposition is not a new one with the Dominion government. As the Finance Minister pointed out, our circulation has vastly increased. I will read what he said, which will be found in the 'Hansard' of May 17:

Mr. HAGGART. That includes the reserve the banks are obliged to keep in Dominion notes?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, they have to use these notes to a considerable extent. The amount of our circulation has been increased very much. In 1890, the Dominion notes in circulation were something over $15,000,000; in 1895, $19,000,000; in 1900, $26,000,000; in 1901, $27,000,000; in 1902, $32,000,000; in 1903, $39,000,000; in 1904, $41,000,000, and on April 30, 1905, $47,900,000. Up to a certain sum we keep 25 per cent. We changed that sum a year or two ago. Up to a certain sum we keep 25 per cent and after that we keep dollar for dollar, so that for the larger part of our circulation we have gold to correspond.

The result being that our circulation in 1895 was $19,000,000 and in 1905 it is $47,900,000, nearly three times as much. This is an argument that the government should buy the gold and keep it as against the dollar for dollar they have to get from some other source. Now what does Russia do? Russia in many things is not far advanced, but in some other things she is pretty well advanced, and one of them is her treatment of the question of a gold reserve. During the present war Russia wanted to raise a loan, and she went to France and Germany to get it, chiefly to France. The first loan went off all right. Time wore on, and she wanted to raise a second loan, but she did not get on so well with that, and the consequence was that she had to make known to the world that she had millions and millions of bullion in the vaults at St. Petersburg, and she invited the press representatives of the world to go there and see it for themselves, to take a photograph of it, and let the people see that it was there. I have in my hand a picture showing the gold in the Russian vaults, and a statement:

During the past few days the Russian government has been inviting representatives of the press to view $60,000,000 worth of gold in the vaults of the bank of Russia, in St. Petersburg. The whole Russian gold reserve amounts to $131,000,000.

Yet, they were borrowing gold in France.

It is distributed over St. Petersburg, and in provincial banks and certain foreign banks. The object of holding so large a sum in reserve when the Russian debt is a heavy burden, is supposed to be to influence the public of the world of finance, and thereby exercise an influence on the money market.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that it would not hurt Canada's credit if we had $20,000,000 or $25,000,000 of our Yukon gold stored in Ottawa, or in the banks of Canada. What did Russia do when she wanted this loan? I have here a quotation from the London 'Times.' The London 'Times' appeared to be incredulous about her store of gold, and Russia challenged the 'Times' to send a representative to investigate. The London 'Times' did not send a representative but, the 'Daily Mail' did send Mr. Henry Norman, M.P., with his kodak to take a picture. I find this despatch from London about it:

London, Thursday, March 23.—The 'Times' has received a telegram from M. Kokovtseff, Russian Minister of Finance, calling attention to a recent article in the 'Times,' in which it was said that 'Russia's gold reserve is a colossal Humbert safe, the vaunted millions in which are unconsciously lent by her dupes for their own deception.'

The minister invited the 'Times' to send a personal representative to St. Petersburg to verify the reserve in the state bank's vaults, and to send trained assistants to assist him.

The 'Times' replied, declining the invitation, and pointing out that its statement depended upon its context. It concluded by saying: 'The point is to what extent Russia can draw upon her reserve without impairing the state's credit.

That is what the 'Times' said. Now the 'Daily Mail' accepted the challenge and sent a Mr. Hands, and this is what he found:

C. E. Hands, the St. Petersburg correspondent of the 'Daily Mail,' says that he has inspected the Russian gold reserve which the 'Times' refused to do after it had been invited to make an examination by the Russian Minister of Finance. Mr. Hands says he found it a 'supremely uninteresting, tedious and depressing spectacle' of bags of coin and gold ingots. He did not make any attempt to test the amount beyond selecting a bag and proving that it was full of ten-rouble pieces, but he adds 'it is perfectly clear that an immense amount of gold is stored in the vault.' He is satisfied to believe that there is £25,000,000 there.

Now that is what Russia does when she wants a loan, she opens these vaults and shows the world that she has the gold, and the consequence is that France put up more money. It may not be good finance, but I would like some one to show why it is not

good finance, even if we have not a mint, for the Canadian government to buy our gold and store it up so that the gold will remain in Canada instead of going to the Republic. There are other countries in the same position. I saw an article the other day stating that the government of the United States will have 15 tons of gold in their vaults at the end of the present fiscal year. So you see I am not advocating anything new, it is something of the first importance to the people of the Yukon, because every ounce of gold they procure they have to sell for less than what they should sell it for, and would sell it for if this government bought it. Now I said in the early part of my remarks that water was a prime essential for the miners in the Yukon.

A short time ago the government appointed a commission to inquire into the concessions that existed in the Yukon. That commission was composed of Judge Britton and Mr. Bell. Judge Britton reported for the commission and I have his report here, it is sessional paper No. 142 of 1904. I wish to read to the House Judge Britton's opinion on this water question in the Yukon. He said:

> 1. It is made abundantly clear by the evidence that in the Yukon Territory only such claims as enjoyed water facilities have heretofore been properly worked.
>
> 2. That wherever else gold may be found in that territory, it is there actually distributed in the banks, benches and elevated grounds.
>
> 3. That owing to the difficulty in procuring the necessary supply of water, successful mining has been 'seriously retarded and in many cases made impossible.'
>
> 5. That the extent and value of the deposits of gold in these benches, banks and elevated grounds must remain unknown until water is made available by the construction of hydraulic works, and that parties making advances for the construction of such works must necessarily take great risks with respect to their investments.
>
> A plentiful supply of water, distributed for use in washing gold from gravel and dirt, on such terms as miners, whether working individually or in or for companies, is the great need of the Yukon Territory.

That is the conclusion at which Judge Britton arrived after investigating the condition there. This is the way it impressed him. He was taking evidence, but he was so satisfied that he makes this remark:

> For the purpose of dispensing with further evidence upon a matter so clear, it was, with the approval of all present, formally noted at one of the meetings that it could be considered as established that there is a very large amount of gold in the district, comprising the beds, banks, valleys, slopes and hills of the Klondike river, of Bonanza, Bear and Hunker Creeks and their tributaries, and in other places in the vicinity of Dawson, and of the places particularly named, and that there is a great scarcity of water available for mining purposes in the district and places named.

Judge Britton was not only impressed with the richness of the country but with its need of water. This is one of the questions that I submitted to the Prime Minister on my arrival here, and I am very glad to tell the House as I told the people of the Yukon that he acceded to my request that a man be sent to make a hydrographic survey of the waters which supply the auriferous region in the Klondike, and the man has gone there, Mr. Thibadeau, and that surveys will be made this summer so that we will have when that information is compiled something to submit to a capitalist in order to induce him to put this water in, for water we must have. I hope that when the time comes the government itself will see fit to put the water in, but in case they do not, we will have some definite information over the signature of a government official that such and such is a fact. Briefly referring to the question of a government water system, I would like to point out to the House that this is nothing new for governments to undertake. The Australian government put in a water system carrying water 328 miles, not the Commonwealth of Australia, but western Australia, which is like one of our provinces. That system carries water 3208 miles, they use twenty-five different pumping stations and pump that water to a height of 1,447 feet and supply the mines of Coolgardie and Kalgourlie. It cost $13,000,000 but it made the Australian desert blossom like the rose, and I am informed that it is turning out, in a financial way, a good investment for the Australian government. Western Australia at that time had less than 200,000 people. Our system will not be more than seventy miles in length and will not cost more than one-third this amount and we have enough gravel in sight to ensure the future of the Yukon for 100 years to come if that is done.

I wish to refer to one other question, and that is a very serious question in the Yukon, the question of concessions. A moment ago I said that the government sent a Royal Commission to the Yukon to inquire into the question of concessions. These so-called concessions are hydraulic leases, they are called concessions as that is a convenient term. Hydraulic leases were granted by the government to various people in the Yukon, and let me say that I believe this system of concessions has always been a curse to Canada. Years before we had a Canadian government, the British government gave probably the greatest concession ever given in Canada, to the Hudson Bay Company in 1670. That company controlled practically one-half the northern half of this continent for 200 years, and then we Canadians had to buy the company out in 1870, to pay them money and they still retain one-twentieth of the whole of their tract. The Conserva-

tive government gave the Canadian Pacific Railway 25,000,000 acres of land which is untaxable for all time to come, a concession that is wrong, I do not care who did it. The present government gave concessions in the Yukon to different parties—although I hope not for all time to come—which have proved a curse to that country and will always be a curse to it until they are removed. This fact was so impressed on the government that they appointed a Royal Commission to investigate that question and with your permission I shall refer you and the House and the country to what Judge Britton found when he went to the Yukon. Under the heading :

Hydraulic leases attacked.

Judge Britton enumerates the following concessions :

1. Lease No. 9, comprising a tract of land situate between Adams creek and Fox gulch, on the left limit of Bonanza creek, having a frontage of 1½ miles, issued in favour of C. A. Matson and associates, and known as the Matson concession.

Right in the very heart of the richest gold-bearing district in the world.

2. Leases Nos. 2 and 8, comprising a tract of land situate between Boulder creek and Fox gulch, on the left limit of Bonanza creek, having a frontage of 55 claims, issued in favour of J. J. Doyle and associates, and known as the Doyle concession.

3. Lease No. 5, comprising a tract of land commencing 2½ miles from the mouth of Bonanza creek and extending up that stream for a like distance, issued in favour of the Hon. E. H. Bronson and C. C. Ray, and known as the Bronson and Ray concession.

These gentlemen live here in Ottawa.

4. Lease No. 18, comprising a tract of land commencing about 1½ miles from the mouth of the Klondike river, thence up stream for a distance of 6·72 miles, issued in favour of M. J. Boyle, and known as the Boyle concession.

5. Lease No. 10, comprising a tract of land situate on Quartz creek, a tributary of the Indian river, in the Yukon Territory, having a frontage of 3½ miles, and known as the Quartz creek concession.

6. Lease No. 1, comprising a tract of land, situate on Hunker creek, below the mouth of Last Chance, having a frontage of 2½ miles, and known as the Anderson concession.

7. Lease No. 33, comprising a tract of land, situate on Gold Bottom creek, a tributary of Hunker creek, issued in favour of C. J. Hermann, and known as the Hermann concession.

8. Lease No. 30, comprising a tract of land, commencing at the mouth of Miller creek, a tributary of Sixty-mile river, and extending up stream a distance of 3·38 miles, issued in favour of the North American Transportation and Trading Company, and known as the Miller creek concession.

He says:

There have been granted, in all, since the opening of the Yukon Territory, 40 hydraulic leases. Of these 13 have been cancelled, and 27 are standing. Of the 27, 8 have been attacked. Only 2 others were mentioned as likely to be attacked, and no one interested took the trouble within the time given, to formally lodge any complaint as to those.

He discusses the various concessions and refers to the mining regulations and proceeds :

The matter was treated in the larger way, ignoring placer claims when they formed a small part compared with the large quantity of gravel ground which it was alleged could be worked only by hydraulic methods. There certainly was not, in the earlier days after the opening of the territory, sufficient care on the part of the officials in the territory to see that the regulations were strictly complied with. . . . . It will be seen by a perusal of the lease that the conditions are exacting and carefully drawn, with the manifest intention of protecting every interest connected with the mining industry. Under these circumstances, it has apparently been thought best to accept as representation work, work done by placer methods instead of insisting upon work by hydraulic methods.

Now, there is the gist of the question. These are so-called hydraulic leases. They should be worked and worked alone by hydraulic methods, but there is not to-day in the Yukon a single one of these concessions operating by hydraulic methods, and the government, as the judge points out here very clearly, has seen fit to accept work done by ordinary placer methods as work done by hydraulic methods. What is the difference ? The difference is this : A man gets forty or fifty acres of mining land in a concession on which he does $5,000 worth of work. I will work a placer claim of 250 feet beside him and I have to do a great deal more work than he has to do in proportion and he has many privileges that I have not. It is not these concessionaries who have given us all this gold. I venture to say that they have given us only a very small proportion of the product of the Yukon. The small individual miner is the man who has produced this gold and he is the man from whom these leases have taken ground right in the very heart of the richest areas in the Yukon. Judge Britton condemns that practice. Unfortunately there are terms in most of these leases whereby a double construction can be given to them. They may be construed to mean that the concessionaries do not absolutely have to work by hydraulic methods, and that is the loophole through which the concessionaire has always crawled. He says further :

All these questions are beyond the scope of my commission as affecting the rights of parties respecting any particular concession, but are of importance for the consideration of the department upon the question of benefit or injury to the mining industry of the territory.

Here is this pregnant sentence :

The fact of these large concessions existing no doubt has a bad moral effect.

Why ? He discusses that.

A miner, on the look out for a placer location, makes a discovery, and upon application, finds that his ground is not open, because it is within the territorial limits of a concession. This annoys him, and he spreads what he calls his grievance far and wide, creating dissatisfaction among miners. Others, without attempting to prospect or locate, say they cannot, because all the ground is covered by concessions, and men who never were and never intended to be miners join in the cry against concessions.

That is his opinion: Then he offers some suggestions:

In reference to the benefit or injury of hydraulic concessions, I think it proper to make the following suggestions:

Here they are:

That placer work or 'preparation' work should not be accepted in lieu of what can properly be called hydraulic work, or hydraulic operations. An annual expenditure of $5,000 is very small for such large areas. If the conditions are not complied with, the lease should be cancelled.

Here is another important point:

The regulations define the width of an hydraulic mining location as one mile, but where it is situated in a valley, the location may extend in width to the 'limits of the valley,' if so ordered by the minister.

They may extend these limits to the limit of the valley.

A very liberal construction has been placed upon the expression 'limits of the valley,' as it has been held to mean from 'summit to summit'——

These valleys are 400 to 500 feet deep with mountains and hills on each side of them:

—as it has been held to mean from 'summit to summit' of the watershed on either side. I think that too wide, wider than the regulations were intended to authorize. Such locations should not extend beyond the summit of the first or lower hill on either side. It is too much to say that 'limits of the valley,' in defining a location, should include a succession of hills and valleys between, leading up to the summit of the watershed. The regulations should be amended.

He proceeds:

These hydraulic concessions would be more beneficial to the mining territory if they were considerably smaller——

They cover acres and acres and miles.

—or the conditions should require a much larger annual expenditure than $5,000.

In coming to the conclusion mentioned before, that in certain cases lessees had complied with the conditions of their leases, I did so because it was proper to consider, and I was bound to consider, the interpretation which the department had placed upon 'representation work' upon all the hydraulic concessions.

Now, just in regard to this question I would like to show very briefly a very small section of the argument which was submitted to Judge Britton, and which, I suppose, influenced him somewhat in making up his mind. I will not read it all. It was by the advocates who presented the case of the board of trade before the commission. This statement shows how many miles are included in a concession, how many placer claims would be worked in case these concessions were thrown open, and how much revenue the government would get from this ground from which now they practically derive no revenue. It says:

If the above estimate is correct the government would receive in entry fees when concessions are thrown open $23,000; 5,130 men would be given employment, and calculating gold at $15 per ounce, $9,618,750 would be produced on which the export tax at pressnt levied would be $240,468.87. If these same men chose to buy imported goods for themselves and families it may be fairly estimated that each would pay $100 into the customs, making $513,000 more. The revenue to the government in renewing 1,215 claims at $12 each would be $14,580, while the claims restaked would be 542, bringing $5,420. With an adequate water supply on fair terms these estimates are too low. But summarized they stand thus:

Fees receivable by government on opening above concessions	$ 23,000
Fees on claims renewed at end of first year	14,580
Fees on claims restaked at end of year	5,420
Export tax	240,468
Customs (subject to 75 per cent reduction on account of consumption of Canadian goods)	513,000
Total revenue receivable at end of first year	773,468
Reduction on account of use of Canadian goods	384,750
Actual revenue receivable at end of year	388,718

These figures are the opinions of the gentleman who argued the case for the board of trade before Judge Britton's Commission and they may not be absolutely correct, but they have in them a very large grain of truth.

This, Mr. Speaker, is no party question. I will refer very briefly once more to the platform of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Ross, and I find that the platform he ran upon and the platform he was elected upon contains this plank:

Resolved, That a policy should be adopted which would prevent the obtaining of concessions for hydraulicing, except in places where the dirt is of such low grade that it could not profitably be worked by other methods, and that before any hydraulic lease should issue, notice should be given by the applicant by publication in the newspapers of his intention of applying for such lease, so as to enable protests to be entered against the granting of the same; and that the owners of hydraulic concessions already granted should be compelled to carry out the strict terms of their leases, and that in default of their so doing their leases should be cancelled.

That is what Judge Britton says also. This was a plank in the platform of the Hon.

Mr. Ross when he was elected by the Yukon people to represent them in this House ; and my own views are even stronger. This land, in the very heart of our gold bearing district is locked up ; the government gets no revenue out of it, the people get no employment, and the men who own these concessions play the part of the absentee landlord in Ireland. They do not reside there ; they reside in Ottawa or somewhere else. Messrs. Bronson and Rae live in Ottawa, they hold thousands of acres which do not produce a dollar, and they have not employed labour in the past commensurate with the acreage which they have. There is nothing to be gained by the government or the people from having these leases perpetuated. The system is wrong. Make these men carry out the terms of their leases, or throw the ground open. If the government are legally bound to these men, and must stand by the contract, then they should require them to work the ground hydraulically, so that there will be no doubt that labour is being employed and that the gold is being taken out of the gravel. But now nothing is doing. These leases are lying there dormant. I suppose the rent is paid and the representation work amounting to $5,000 a year, is done to the satisfaction of the government. But the thing is wrong ; these men should not be there at all. This ground is in the heart of our gold-bearing district, and if they had not possession of it, the miners would have a chance of prospecting it and taking it up if they found that it was good enough. This question of concessions is affecting the Yukon Territory, I believe, more than anything else. It has damped the ardour of the people there. They find it difficult to go on and prospect with these blankets covering the territory. The concessions may be worth nothing, or they may be worth millions of money. We do not know what they are worth, simply because we cannot prospect them.

In almost every other country where there are placer mines, in every country that I know of except the Yukon, quartz mining is carried on. At the present time no gold is being won from quartz in the Yukon, although there are many prospects, and one mill is ready for operation. People have found it difficult to interest capital in the quartz mining of the Yukon. If to-day we had a population deriving their livelihood from that industry, hon. gentlemen can understand what a difference it would make in the stability of that country. Placer mining is more or less unstable, while quartz mining is stable. The man engaged in quartz mining invests his money for years, and the people interested in it would be glad if the government could assist them in some way, such as allowing their machinery to come in free, as some of the mills they require are made in the United States. When mills of the same kind are made in Canada, they cannot be brought in duty free ; but the mills made in the United States are in some instances better suited for the class of ore we have in the Yukon than the mills made in Canada, and our miners would like to be able to bring these in duty free. This is a reasonable proposition. It would not cost the government any money ; it might cost the Canadian manufacturer the sale of a mill or two, but it would give an impetus to the quartz-mining industry of the Yukon. While on this question of bringing in mills duty free, I might refer to another industry which has just been started there, that is, the dredging industry. Dredges are also made in Canada, but as a Canadian it humiliates me to have to admit that better dredges for the Yukon are made in the United States, for some unaccountable reason, whether because they have a larger market or not. In the Yukon we are just on the eve of a great dredging era, and I submit for the consideration of the government that they should remit for a term of years the duty upon mills and dredges made in the United States, which are more suitable for work in the Yukon than those made in Canada. If the government would do this, it would give a great impetus to the quartz mining and dredging industries of the Yukon. It would be also for the benefit of Canada as a whole, because Canada has no better customer to day than the Yukon. We produce nothing but gold. Every man, woman and child there has to be fed and clothed, and Canada supplies 80 per cent of our food and clothes. In passing, I may say that, though we are not producing a dollar from quartz mining, the export duty on gold applies to it as well as to placer gold ; so that while the government are not getting a dollar of revenue from that tax, it militates against the investment of capital in quartz mining. That is another matter which I submitted to the Prime Minister, and he saw the force of the argument, and had that tax remitted for ten years. All these things the people of the Yukon appreciate.

Another question to which I wish to refer is the importation of liquor into the Yukon. There does not seem to be any reason why the people of the Yukon should have to pay $2 a gallon on Canadian whisky brought in there, when it can be sent to Nova Scotia without the payment of a cent. This is another matter which should be brought to the attention of the government. We are Canadians as well as you in other parts of this country, and there is no reason why we should be compelled to pay an extra duty on that article—and we use a fair quantity of it. While we use Scotch and Irish whisky, the great bulk of the whisky consumed is Canadian rye ; and we feel it to be a grievance that we have to pay an extra $2 a gallon on that, while the people of Nova Scotia and the people of British Columbia do not pay anything.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who gets the $2 ?

Mr. THOMPSON. The federal treasury.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are you sure ?

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not speaking by the book, but I think so. At any rate, I know that the money is paid, and that it is wrong to tax any part of this country in a way in which no other portion of the country is taxed. Why should we in the Yukon pay this or any other tax that no other province pays ? There is no right or reason in such an imposition. It is a small matter, and I refer to it only in passing, being convinced that it only requires to be brought to the attention of the government to have the injustice removed.

There is one other question, and that is the question of the Yukon Council, which makes our local ordinances or laws. I submit that there is no principle so deeply imbedded in the hearts of the Anglo-Saxon as that of responsible and representative government. When you trace the history of this race from the time that history first discovers them on the banks of the Weser and Elbe, in northern Germany, down to the present day, you will find running through it that one bright thread. You will find that wherever they are, on any section of God's footstool, they want the right to elect their own representatives to govern themselves. In the year 418, when they were on the banks of the Elbe, they had their Moot hill or sacred tree, around which they gathered periodically to elect their own overseers and settle their own communal affairs. When they went to England you find their earliest effort, an effort which they ever continued, was to have an extended franchise. And when they crossed the Atlantic ocean and landed in the United States they perpetuated the same idea ; and it was because the British government of that day refused to grant them this right, which is bred right in their bones, that it lost the half of this continent, to the British Crown. Then followed their career in Canada Take the province of Nova Scotia, where they laboured against the family compact of that day, which was the weakness of the institutions established by such governors as Lord Faulkner. Take New Brunswick, where the same thing occurred. But fortunately in those provinces the difficulty was settled without an appeal to arms. Such was not, however, the case in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec. How did the struggle for this very same principle there culminate ? It culminated in the rebellion led by Papineau in Quebec and Mackenzie in Ontario. So long as this race is on this sphere, and wherever you will find a section of this race, you will find in the breasts of the people that love of self-government and that desire to elect their own representatives and legislate for themselves. So it is in the Yukon. Although we are 4,000 miles removed from here, there is in our breasts the same sentiment which has animated this race from its dawn down to the present day, and until we get there what we enjoy here, we shall not be satisfied. Trust the people every time ; grant them responsible government, and they will show themselves worthy of it. In our Northwest we have two great territorial divisions knocking at our doors for this same boon, and in a few days they will be in the enjoyment of representative institutions.

Mr. HENDERSON. With a limitation.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am not discussing this question from a political standpoint, but simply the principle of representative government, and I leave party politics to my hon. friend. We are about to grant those two territorial divisions representative government ; and while I do not ask this government to give us in the Yukon what they are giving the new provinces, while I do not ask for provincial government in its entirety, because we are not prepared for that, I do ask that we should be given that government which these Territories now enjoy. It is not responsible government that these Territories have now, but it is an advance on the system we have in the Yukon. Let me tell you what that system is. We have there a legislative body called the Yukon Council, composed of ten members and a commissioner. Five of these members are elected by the people, five are appointed by the government and the commissioner presides. His position is analogous to that of lieutenant governor, except in this respect, that he occupies the dual position of Speaker of our assembly and Governor of the Territory.

Mr. FOSTER. Has he a vote ?

Mr. THOMPSON. He has the casting vote only, which is, of course, very rarely exercised. By that method of government you see that this the Dominion government always holds the power in the hollow of its hand, because it controls the five nominative members and the commissioner against the five elected members, so that should a division ever happen, as it did on one memorable occasion, when the five elected would be pitted against the five appointed, the decision would rest with the commissioner. You see, therefore, that that is not really a representative body. It is controlled from Ottawa, and the time has come when we may, without any fear, I believe, ask the Dominion government to give us greater power. The personnel of this council is composed of Mr. Sinclair, the Gold Commissioner, who is the head of our gold court and has the standing somewhat of a lesser judge ; Major Wood, who is Commissioner of the Northwest Mounted Police, and is like the general of an army with his staff under him ; Mr. Girouard, who is registrar of titles ; Mr. Lithgow, who is comptroller of

finance, analogous to our Finance Minister; and there is Judge Dugas, who is the senior judge of our territorial court, and whose position is analogous to that of the chief justice in a province. I know all these gentlemen personally very well, and I know them to be all estimable gentlemen. They are Canadians down to the ground and good citizens, and in the main have done good work. But every one of these derives his sustenance directly from our federal government and, being human, must necessarily be biased at times and biased against the interests of the people. In saying that I am not uttering one word against these men personally, individually or officially, but I am simply pointing out that in the very nature of things they cannot be relied upon to advise always in the best interests of our people. What I ask is that we should give the people of the Yukon the right to elect the ten members of their council and let the commissioner preside as at present. In case the government should see fit to grant this reasonable request, I think they will not have reason to regret their course. These people are not novices in the art of self-government. Every man in that country went in there as an adept in that respect. Like myself and like you, Mr. Speaker, every man there has been accustomed from his boyhood to cast his vote for the representative he desired in the legislative halls of his province, so that you are not risking any experiment in giving the people of the Yukon these rights. I have sat in that council, and I know that the people there are quite well fitted to select men to represent them in their little local parliament, just as are the people in the other provinces to elect their local representatives.

They are the same race, they are of the same blood, they speak the same language, as the people of Quebec, Ontario, and the other provinces of Canada. I am not asking anything new, but simply that the same right that Canadians have claimed, the right that our forefathers in Canada fought for, shall be conferred upon their sons who reside in the Yukon. You can see what the effect would be. Or, if the government will not grant full elective power, then the alternative would be—and it is only an alternative and can only be adhered to for a short time—to nominate men completely outside the ranks of those who derive their support in any way from the Dominion government. We want the whole number of them elected; but if the government will not concede that, then we are prepared—I think I may say we are prepared—to accept for a time the nomination of men who are outside the government employ altogether.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. THOMPSON.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 150) respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

SUPPLY—THE YUKON TERRITORY.

House resumed motion for Committee of Supply.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock I was discussing the Yukon council, our local legislative body in the Yukon Territory, and showing how necessary it was that we should have a body fully representative of the people to prepare our ordinances, which have the effect of laws. During my argument I referred to Judge Britton's report on the Treadgold concessions. I was interested when reading that report to notice that Judge Britton had found in the Yukon so many new words that he was unacquainted with, that he made a little glossary of them at the end of his report. I mention this in passing to show the House how difficult it is to convey to the minds of hon. gentlemen here things that may be urgently needed in the Yukon. The very terms we use there in discussing some of our commonplace events, are strange to men like Judge Britton and hon. gentlemen in this House. It is not necessary for me to enumerate them. The question of a fully elective council for the Yukon is not a new one there, nor is it one that any particular party has a monopoly of. Every platform that has been framed in the last four years has contained this plank. Again, I refer the House to the platform of the Hon. James Hamilton Ross, and with your permission I will read one of the planks:

> That the convention (that is the convention which nominated Mr. Ross) views with satisfaction the increase of the number of elective members of the Yukon council——

I should say in explanation of that that the Yukon council at first was composed only of two members elected by the people, and that the government two years ago extended the number to five. He went on to say:

> —and urgently recommend that the membership of the council be made wholly elective without delay; and further, that all matters of a purely local character be committed to the council for deliberation and determination.

That is one of the planks in the platform upon which Mr. Ross appealed successfully to the people of that territory for their suffrages; and I have no doubt that, although he is now in the upper chamber, he is of the same opinion to-day. Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing this particular phase of the question, I only have to add that the Yukon Territory to-day is the only territory organized in Canada that is without

a fully representative government. I do not include the Territories of Ungava and Mackenzie, as I do not think they have any organized governmtnt at this time. The other Territories have been married off, so to speak, and there is only the Yukon Territory left. I hope that the government, after considering this matter will see fit to grant the Yukon Territory that measure of self-government which I have advocated.

A few days ago the right hon. the Prime Minister suggested that in the disposition of these Territories remaining after the erection of the two new provinces, they might profitably be allotted to the various provinces that now have representative and responsible government. A few days after that I took occasion to rise in my place in this House and, in the name of the people of the Yukon, entered a protest against its being disposed of in that manner. I did not go into the question extensively then, but with your permission I will do so briefly now. In view of the fact that we have produced so much wealth, that we are producing so much wealth, that we have a population there that is more or less permanent, we feel that we have a future of which the past is only an earnest, and that we we are fit for responsible government. I think it would be an ignominious end of our territorial career to tag us on to the upper end of British Columbia. Neither do I think it would be well from the standpoint of British Columbia, as being the best province, in fact the only one, geographically speaking, to which we could be attached. British Columbia at this moment has all the territory that she can manage, in fact, with all due deference to my hon. friend opposite from that province (Mr. Galliher), she has a little more than she can conveniently manage. The credit of the province of British Columbia is none too good, the government of British Columbia is none too safe, nor has it been as stable as it should be during the past decade. And, Sir, that fact I have just mentioned, the instability of the government of British Columbia, has done more than anything else to check capital coming into that province from abroad, as it would have done immediately after the breaking out of the Boer war. I know for a positive fact that the money markets of the world, at the breaking out of the Boer war, turned to the American continent for safe investment; I know that British capitalists turned their eyes towards British Columbia; and I also know that, because of the labour troubles that existed in that province then, these English capitalists did not invest their money there as they otherwise would have done. Now, Mr. Speaker, we in the Yukon have troubles enough of our own without desiring to graft upon them those of British Columbia.

I said that I had faith in the future of that country and when I say that I am simply reflecting the prophecy of Dr. Dawson in 1887 that he had not the faintest doubt that the Yukon Territory would still be part of Canada's great reserve. I wish very briefly to point out to the House the evidence I have regarding the future of this territory which I have the honour to represent, and in doing so I shall quote first from the Statistical Year-Book of Canada for the year 1904, and show the House what this territory has done in the way of producing wealth as compared with the other provinces of Canada since 1862. I have here the Statistical Year-Book of Canada prepared by our own Mr. Johnston whose name is sufficient as he is very well and creditably known. This book shows the quantities of gold produced by the different provinces. For instance Ontario has produced $2,124,429 in gold; Saskatchewan has produced $293,946; Quebec has produced $295,053; British Columbia, a province that has been mining—well, I have its production here since 1862 and I believe it was mining earlier than that—has produced in that time $90,271,226. Nova Scotia has also been producing gold since 1862 and the inhabitants of that province think they have produced a good deal of gold. I shall show you by comparison that they have produced very little. Their product is $16,728,319. I have given you the figures for these provinces and territories. What has the Yukon done in this time? Up to last year—that is not including the present spring's clean up which I expect will be in the vicinity of $10,000,000—up to the end of 1904, we have produced $118,000,000 in gold. How does that compare with the total output? The total output of gold in Canada since 1862 has been $217,000,000 in round numbers. Over half the gold produced in the whole of Canada since 1862 has been produced by the Yukon and the greater portion of that has been produced since 1896. In nine short years aye, in eight short years, we have produced over half as much gold as the whole of the Dominion including what the province of British Columbia has produced since 1862. Is that not a record that any province, let alone any territory, might be proud of? To show the House the extent of the gravels that we have in that territory I shall quote a letter from Dr. Robert Bell, director of the Geological Survey, whom I asked to measure for me if possible the auriferous deposits, according to the map prepared by Mr. McConnell who mapped that country. His letter is dated May 30, 1905, and is as follows:

Dear Sir,—I have had Mr. Seward, our geographer (in consultation with Mr. McConnell, who has returned from Europe), make as careful an estimate as possible of the acreage of the gold-bearing gravels of the Klondike. Mr. McConnell divides them into the river gravels and the white channel gravels. On the autho-

rity of these gentlemen, there are in the Klondike district 3,940 acres of river gravels and 4,680 acres of white channel gravels or 8,620 in all.

In order to save a written explanation about these two kinds of gravel, I have had these figures marked on the inclosed new map of the Klondike district, which has just been printed and is to accompany Mr. McConnell's last report, which has been in the hands of the King's Printer since last November. The gravels are clearly defined on the map, and with its explanation of colour, &c., you will be able to make out exactly what you want.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT BELL.

The total length of the auriferous portions of the creeks of the Klondike district is about 115 miles, that is in the well-defined portions alone, to say nothing of the Kluane district, in the southern part where creeks known to carry gold extend over twenty-five miles. No man, even if he had the eye of a prophet, could foretell the future of that territory. In an earlier portion of my address I stated that in an inhospitable region in Russia, the Vologda district, is to-day sustaining a population of over a million souls. When one realizes what that means the imagination fails to grasp what the Yukon may be doing twenty-five or fifty years from now. Mr. Joseph McGillivray, a hydraulic mining engineer of extensive experience both in California and in the Yukon submitted for the consideration of the Board of Trade of Dawson, in 1904, a letter, a portion of which I shall read. I am now trying to show the House that this country is not a country of a day, that this gold is not going to peter out, so to speak, in a few months or years; I wish to impress on the House that in the Yukon we have a country that is not a country of to-day, but that with a little help at the present juncture it will be a country of a century and perhaps even more than that. Mr. McGillivray says:

> The following is an estimate of the amount of gravel on these white channel benches alone which measure about 27 miles in length with an average of 1,250 feet in width and 100 feet in depth. This is a very conservative estimate of the depth, as these same benches on Bonanza, Klondike and Hunker are much deeper than that, especially where they near the Klondike, where a depth of 100 feet is attained. Taking this conservative average the estimate is: 27 miles, 142,560 running feet, 1,250 feet wide, 100 feet deep, 17,820,000,000 cubic feet. Therefore 17,820,000,000 cubic by 27 would give 660,000,000 cubic yards.
>
> To compute the time required in which to wash this amount of gravel——

And it is the time, not the amount of gravel, that I wish to impress on the House.

> ——let it be assumed that 5,000 miners' inches of water (equalling 7,500 cubic feet per minute) was brought on to said white channel by gravitation at a sufficient elevation to give a hydraulic pressure of, say 100 feet or more. The efficiency of water in washing should be one miners' inch to every 7 cubic yards of gravel every 24 hours. Each inch is equal to 1½ cubic feet per minute. That is to say, 5,000 miners' inches of water washing 7 cubic yards to the inch every 24 hours would equal 35,000 cubic yards every 24 hours.
>
> As the summer mining season here is short, 130 days is a liberal estimate of the time in which to carry on such work. Thus 35,000 yards per day for 130 days would equal 4,550,000 yards each season.
>
> The time it would take to wash out these benches alone with 5,000 inches of water each season of 130 days, would therefore be 660,000,000 yards at 4,550,000 a year, 145 years and 70 1-7 days.

That is the estimate of the time it would take to wash out gravel benches near Dawson with 5,000 inches of water, something that we have not now and will not have for some time to come. One more quotation from Mr. McGillivray:

> I feel confident there is enough of pay gravel to last for the next hundred years at the rate it could be worked with the water system I have already described. When I say that the system could be put in for $3,000,000, I am stating an outside figure and one which would cover all the expense of installing the electric power plants. This might not be deemed advisable at the beginning of the enterprise; the initial cost for simply bringing on the water to work these grounds might possibly come under $2,000,000.

He was discussing the water system then. He proceeds:

> If this government water supply system should be put in, I see no reason why our annual output of gold should not be increased to $50,000,000 annually, and kept at that amount for many years, and what such a building up of this district would mean to the rest of the Yukon and to the wealth and prosperity of the whole Dominion, I need not point out.

I will not weary the House with any further reference to the extent of the gravels we have there. I just want to show the House now why Canada should help us in developing this vast territory. We are all your own people and we are doing our best in the Yukon to build up Canada and to perpetuate the Canadian interests. We of us who are Canadians have upheld Canadian civilization, encouraged Canadian ideas and fostered Canadian trade. Let me inform you, Mr. Speaker, that we are not all Canadians in the Yukon Territory. A very large portion of our population comes from other countries outside our own. Canada has no better customer in the world per head to-day than the Yukon. I will show you how, as I said before, we produce absolutely nothing but the gold. We have no manufactures; we have no agricultural products. We have to import everything and the people there live well. Every man, woman and child who comes over the White Pass into the Yukon has to be clothed and fed, and every man, woman and child should be clothed and fed by our own Canadian manufacturers and producers. Is there any coun-

try in the world that Canada clothes and feeds ? To-day our people are scouring the world for new markets, establishing consular agencies, of which I quite approve and I only hope there may be more of them when right here at our own doors, within our own Dominion, we have a market, which, if encouraged will prove of greater benefit to Canada than any market in Brazil, the Indies or in the old country. To show you that I am not saying anything that is not an absolute fact I will read an extract from a statement prepared for me by Mr. Bain, of the Customs Department here, and by this extract I hope to show the House what the Yukon has bought from Canada within the last few years. I hold in my hand a 'statement of Canadian and foreign goods entering northern British Columbia and Yukon Territory, via the White Pass and Yukon route, during the fiscal year 1903-4.' I will not weary the House by reading over the different months, but I will give the total which will convey to the minds of hon. members what I wish to convey and that is that in 1903-4 the Yukon Territory bought from Canada $4,034,385 worth of goods. Remember this is not a bartering trade, but it is a trade for which we pay absolutely every dollar in cash and every dollar in gold at that. With other countries you have a bartering trade. It is not so with us ; you send your goods there and get the money. Is that not a market worth cultivating ? Here you have a territory right within our own Dominion which will buy from you over $4,000,000 worth of goods per year and it does not cost you a cent to establish a consular agency there. The people within the bounds of that Territory are only too glad to come here, to Montreal, to Toronto or to the great manufacturing and farming centres of Canada and buy their food and clothing. Every pair of shoes, every suit of clothes, every shirt, every hat, every overcoat, absolutely everything that we use to clothe our bodies and to feed them has to be imported into the Yukon. Nor does it stop there. Absolutely everything we use to work our mines we have to import from the outside. In the early years of that Territory Canada did not get as much of the trade as she gets to-day, but due to the fact that the Customs Department have there a competent and efficient officer in the person of Mr. Busby, Canada and the Canadian manufacturers have, within the last two or three years, received a very much greater percentage of that trade than they did in former years. In 1898 the Canadian people only received 7 per cent of the Yukon trade. Now, in the Yukon we buy 80 cents in every dollars worth that we import into that country from Canada—eighty per cent now as against seven per cent then, due very largely to the fact that we have there men who are alive to the trade of Canada and to the fostering of that trade. We have to-day in Dawson 24 bonded customs warehouses and 5 inland revenue warehouses. Just one quotation more to show you what we have bought from Canada. There are no returns available previous to 1898 although we were doing business there for two years before that time, but since 1898 we have bought $13,976,000 worth and we have paid to the Canadian government in duties $3,412,980. These figures are from the Customs Department, they are absolutely correct and they speak for themselves. That is all I have to say upon the trade of Canada and the Yukon except to impress upon the House and the country that right here in our own Dominion we have a market that can be and should be supplied by our own people. Now I have finished.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before my hon. friend sits down may I ask him if that $13,000,000 represents entirely imported goods ?

Mr. THOMPSON. This is a 'statement showing the value of exports from and goods entered for consumption in the Yukon Territory during the undermentioned fiscal years.' Does that answer my friend's question ?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, that would be imported goods.

Mr. THOMPSON. Altogether, except that some of them may have been imported from the provinces of Canada. As to that, however, I am not quite sure. Since 1898 we have bought very nearly $14,000,000 worth of goods. I say, that I have finished. If I have succeeded in laying before this House and this country the wants of the people of the Yukon I am content. I have come over 4,000 miles to Ottawa to lay before the Canadian parliament the cause of the miners in the Yukon. To me that country has a fascination that is felt by nearly every one who has lived there. But, it has more. It has a future in which I have every hope, and it is populated by a people in whom I have every confidence. They have braved everything in following the fickle wand of fortune. The work they have done in developing that country in the past eight years is simply marvellous ; but it is only an earnest of what they will do if they get some assistance from this government. On behalf of our Yukon population, I appeal to you, not as a party man appealing to party prejudices, but as a Canadian appealing to Canadians for help at the present juncture for the great Yukon.

Mr. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, before my hon. friend sits down I want to ask him one or two questions. During his remarks this afternoon he said that $28,000,000 worth of gold had been taken out of the Yukon. I want to ask him how much the Yukon has paid to Canada since 1896 as royalty upon that gold, and how much the Yukon has cost the country altogether ?

Mr. THOMPSON. I regret that I cannot answer the question of my hon. friend regarding the amount of royalty and export tax which we have paid; but, speaking without the book and from memory, I would say that up to the end of June a year ago we very nearly paid our way, except for the two charges mentioned—$750,000 for the Yukon field force and $400,000 for the Mackenzie & Mann settlement. We bought nearly $14,000,000 of goods and paid nearly $3,500,000 in duty.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much the speech of the hon. member for the Yukon here to-day. It has been a source of a good deal of enlightenment to all of us. Many of the things he has said I heartily coincide with, because I know a good deal about the Yukon country; for, though I have never been there, the province of British Columbia is contiguous to it. But the hon. member said one or two things which, as a representative of British Columbia, I can hardly let pass. If the hon. gentleman knew the people of British Columbia better than he does, he would not consider it a bad province to tie to. I am not prepared to say whether it would be a good thing for the Yukon Territory to be joined to the province of British Columbia; but the Yukon country produces gold alone, while British Columbia is the next largest gold producer of the Dominion, and has solved to a great extent many of the problems presented to any new gold-producing country. The hon. member has made a comparison between the Yukon Territory and the other parts of Canada in regard to the production of gold. Figures can almost prove anything. We have not complete returns of all the gold that has been produced in British Columbia from the first finding of gold in the Fraser river in 1858; because British Columbia did not then belong to the Dominion of Canada, but was a crown colony, and there was not a very accurate record kept of the gold production, so that statisticians can only guess what was taken out. But if we are to believe many of the men who worked in the Cariboo and Cassiar districts in the early days, millions of dollars which were never kept track of were taken to the United States. I fancy that the same thing would apply to the Yukon. There is no doubt that the province of British Columbia has been a very large gold producer. In the comparison which my hon. friend made, he said that the province of British Columbia produced some $90,000,000 of gold while the Yukon produced in its short history $120,000,000. But I would like to call your attention to the fact that the province of British Columbia is the great mining region of the Dominion of Canada. Last year, that is, in the year 1903-4, that province produced gold—and it was almost all placer gold—to the value of $5,373,000, silver to the value of $1,521,472, copper to the value of $4,547,000, lead to the value of $639,000, iron to the value of $6,870, coal to the value of $3,504,000 and coke to the value of $327,000, making in all a mineral production of $16,970,000. In the same year the whole of the rest of Canada produced in gold, silver, copper, lead, iron, nickel, coal and coke, $22,000,000, and the Yukon Territory produced $12,200,000. In the year 1902-3 the province of British Columbia produced $17,000,000 odd, the rest of Canada, $20,000,000 odd, and the Yukon $14,000,000 odd. I have not at hand the figures for last year, but I recollect reading in the report of the Minister of Mines that the province of British Columbia produced nearly $20,000,000, of which $6,000,000 was placer gold. I just mention these facts to show that the province of British Columbia, which my hon. friend has not a very good word for, has added pretty largely to the mineral wealth of this grand Dominion of ours. I am not here to say anything derogatory of the Yukon country. It is a grand country, producing a great deal of gold, and has been the means of opening up great riches to many men in the Dominion of Canada—not to as many as we would like; because Canadians were not the first to go to that country; the Canadian is not a miner. Outside of British Columbia and the Yukon Territory, there is very little gold mining in the Dominion. The more gold the Yukon Territory produces, the more riches there is for Canada; and the greater the mineral production of the province of British Columbia, the greater is the mineral wealth of Canada.

I agree with my hon. friend, that for many years the Yukon will produce a great deal of gold, and the same may be said of British Columbia; and I am of his opinion that it would be infinitely better for the Yukon country—I do not know whether it would be good for the province of British Columbia or not, but I think it would—to be joined to British Columbia and become part and parcel of that province. Out in the Yukon you have a fairly large population as compared with British Columbia, and in the latter province we have also a fairly large population, but spread over a considerable extent of territory, and consequently not as compact as the populations in the other provinces. We have also the same resources as the Yukon, the same class of people, we require the same laws; and if these two were joined together they would be a greater factor in the Dominion than if separate, and no doubt the production of mineral wealth would be greater. The very trouble which the hon. gentleman has pointed out as impeding the progress of the Yukon, namely, the timidity of capitalists to invest their money there on account of its unsettled laws and mining regulations, would be wiped out entirely, because in British Columbia we have, if not the best mining laws in the world, very

good mining laws. We have been mining there fifty years and have solved many of the problems that are still awaiting solution in the Yukon. By the union of the Yukon with our province many of the difficulties there would disappear. With regard to the suggestion of my hon. friend, that British Columbia has not been very prosperous the last few years owing to the unsettled condition of its labour market, I might reply that in my opinion we have not had a very disastrous time in our province. True, we went through some trouble a few years ago, but it was not the unsettled condition of the labour market, nor was it strikes or other labour disturbances which were the main causes. What gave that province the worst black eye it ever had, as far as mining is concerned, was not the unsettled condition of the labour market, nor the paying of too high wages—because you cannot pay miners too high wages in my opinion—but the greed of speculators in eastern Canada, who bought up prospects and mines and capitalized them for extravagant amounts, and then sold these stocks to the general public, although they knew very well it was impossible to pay dividends on the capital floated. That has been the curse of our province, but that has gone by the board to a great extent, and the people out there are once more getting on their feet. Last year we produced nearly three million dollars more than we did the year before. That increased production was due to the fact that stable people were taking hold of our mines and working them for the minerals they contained, and were not depending for their profit on the sale of stocks and the gullibility of the public. We in British Columbia have the warmest feelings for the Yukon. Possibly 'per capita' more money went out from British Columbia to develop the Yukon than from any other part of this continent. We all have faith in that country, the majority of our people know what mining is, they have done their share towards the building up of the Yukon Territory, and the more that Territory prospers the better for our province, and the coast cities in particular. For those reasons, I should be glad to see the Yukon Territory and the province of British Columbia joined together as one province.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER (Kootenay). Representing, as I do, a mining district, I can appreciate to the full what my hon. friend from the Yukon has stated to this House. There are but one or two points in his discourse on which I propose to touch at present. His reference to mining machinery deserves the consideration of this House. My hon. friend said that, not only for placer mining, but quartz mining also, the machinery made by Canadian manufacturers was not equal to the American implements. No doubt that is true, but it is easily explained. Mining in Canada, both quartz and placer, is practiaclly in its infancy, whereas in the United States mining has been going on for a much longer time and on a much larger scale. In the United States the manufacturers, for many years past, have been making mining machinery and have had a large market for it in their own country and abroad. Consequently, they have familiarized themselves with a particular class of machinery suitable to the reduction of certain classes and grades of ore. For years they have been engaged in solving these problems and devising machinery to meet the requirement. In Canada, on the other hand, the manufacture of certain classes of mining machinery has only recently begun. True, for certain purposes, the Rand Drill Company make machinery equally as good as any made in the United States.

But there are other processes for the reduction of ores, and other machines for carrying out those processes manufactured in the United States that are much better suited for the purpose than are our Canadian-manufactured machines. I do not say that in disparagement of our Canadian manufacturers. They are doing very well indeed for the experience they have had and the time during which they have been manufacturing this class of machinery. But the law providing for the free admission of mining machinery not manufactured in Canada should be much more liberally interpreted than it has been hitherto. At the very least this should be the case until time and experience have enabled the Canadian manufacturer to produce an article as good and as well suited for the purpose as that produced by the American manufacturer. There are certain supplies used in mining to which the same principle would apply. For instance—though it may seem a simple thing—candles should be admitted free. In working in shaft or tunnel the miner must use a candle. Now, we have no mining candles manufactured in Canada. Therefore, that is an article that should be on the free list. There are other articles that are in the same category ; and I think that when the commission sits—as I understand it will in the near future—to consider all tariff questions, I will be prepared to furnish them with a list of those articles that are not manufactured in Canada and that, though small in themselves when combined, represent a considerable share of the cost of mining in any part of Canada. There is no reason why these articles should not be on the free list, because their free entry would not involve competition with any Canadian manufacturer. By the free admission of machinery and supplies needed by miners and not manufactured in Canada you can help the mining industry greatly. I believe that, for a time, there was an exemption in the case of mining dredges imported into the Yukon. That exemption was for a year, and, at the end of that period, it was extended for another year.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not now.

Mr. GALLIHER. I suppose that the time granted by the extension has also expired.

Mr. BELCOURT. It expires this July.

Mr. GALLIHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) referred to the mining regulations in the Yukon. Of course, were the Yukon a province, it would be entitled, like other provinces, to make its own mining laws. But while they remain a territory, with the lands owned by the Dominion government as representing the Crown, of course, the Dominion will make its own laws and regulations. But let me say—and it seems to be an opportune time to approach this subject—that mining does not receive the special attention it should receive. Mining matters come under the care of the Department of the Interior. We all know that that department covers a great variety of subjects—the Geological Survey, Immigration, Indian Affairs, Mining. I need not enumerate them all. But, it seems perfectly clear to me that this department involves a greater range and variety of duties than any single minister, no matter how capable he may be, can give proper attention to. And I contend that the mining industry of Canada has reached a stage when it must be regarded as one of our most important industries. an industry that is entitled to have a separate portfolio presided over by a responsible minister. Under this new department, if it were created, would probably come the Geological Survey, which, I believe, is more closely allied to mining than to any other branch of industry. In my opinion, and not only in my opinion, but in the opinion of all those who live in our mining sections, the time has arrived when the government should look to the establishment of a separate portfolio of mines. The existence of such a department would be a great benefit to the country. The minister at its head could give much more careful attention to mining affairs than can the Minister of the Interior who has so many other affairs in his charge. That new minister would be in a position to take the course suggested by my hon. friend from Yukon (Mr. Thompson) or some similar course—he could thoroughly acquaint himself with the laws governing mining affairs. He need not confine himself to the Yukon or to British Columbia, but could consider the mining laws of every province of Canada and those of other countries, including the laws of the mining states of the union, where mining laws were in existence before we had any such laws in Canada. And the framing of regulations by that minister, I believe, as does the hon. member for Yukon, would be greatly in the interest of the people of our mining regions and of the people of Canada generally. One of the first and greatest results of the existence of a separate department of mines under a responsible minister would be to give confidence in Canadian mining investments to capitalists abroad. In my opinion it would do far more to bring about that result than even the best laws and regulations of any separate province. If you have one federal bureau of mines with a minister presiding over it you can collect data from all the provinces, and it would be presented not in a sectional way as it might by the representative of one province who is bent upon upholding that province as the best field of investment. That information would be from reliable sources and centralized in one bureau at Ottawa it would be a source of information to people outside. This would give the greatest impetus that has yet been known to the investment of foreign capital in the mining industries of Canada.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN (West Hamilton). I desire to say just a word in relation to the subject so ably dealt with by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson). I wish to congratulate him on the splendid address he gave us this afternoon. It was certainly a very interesting speech. I was dissappointed in hearing his statement that although the Yukon has produced $128,000,000 in gold during the last eight years, we have received but $13,000,000 worth of trade from that country. Certainly these figures are out of all proportion, there must be something wrong. I think if the Canadian government purchased the gold produced in that country it would to some extent overcome that difficulty. The fact of all that gold going into the United States and being purchased there, means that the miners must get most of their supplies in that country. I think the time has come when we Canadians should receive the benefit of our own natural weath. The hon. gentleman also spoke with regard to free mining machinery. Now, Sir, I claim that the increase in the business of mining is so great that it should stimulate Canadian manufacturers to enter into the business of making mining machinery. That business has become great, and is rapidly growing. My hon. friend stated that it would probably be some years before mining machinery could be manufactured in this country that would be suitable, and therefore no duty should be placed on mining machinery, it should be admitted free. I claim, on the contrary, that the longer you leave the duty off the longer will you have to wait to see this machinery manufactured in Canada. Again I thank the hon. gentleman for his statement. It was a great delight to me, and I believe it will do much good in the country. It is to be desired that we hear more frequently in this House speeches of that kind

that have the true Canadian ring about them.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The House is undoubtedly very much indebted to my hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) for the very able address with which he has favoured us this afternoon. It was all the more able that it was so temperate and judicial in tone. He has spoken his mind in a manly fashion, concealing nothing, and endeavouring to please no one, but merely to state the facts. He was enthusiastic in describing the character of the country which he represents, though I do not think he was unduly enthusiastic. We knew a good deal of the Yukon and of its possibilities, we know more of them now. If there was one part of his speech that I enjoyed more than the rest, it was the statement he made that the Yukon is not only a gold producing country, but that also it has possibilities for agriculture which few of us had suspected. If it be true that this distant part of our northern continent can produce wheat, that wheat can ripen there, I think that fact should be even more satisfactory to us than its mineral riches. Because after all, the great source of wealth of any country is not its mineral resources, but its agricultural resources; and if we have in that northern part of Canada a soil and climate in which wheat will ripen, as well as other cereals, and some fruits and vegetables, the future of that country is assured, even when, hundreds of years from to-day, the gold has been exhausted.

But undoubtedly the most interesting portion of the address of my hon. friend was his remarks with regard to the reforms which are needed in that country. On the whole the government cannot complain of the manner in which he approached this subject. He has shown that the administration has not been free from faults, but I think on the whole we can reasonably claim that the faults have been very few, having regard to the condition of things we found there seven years ago. One of the important points to which my hon. friend addressed himself was the character of the mining regulations. I did not understand that he complained particularly of the character of the regulations which exist at the present time. One thing which he insisted upon strongly was that these regulations should have the stamp of stability put upon them. He stated that of late changes had been made. I think that is true, but I am not aware that of late there has been any marked change in the regulations. But it was unavoidable that in the early days of the discovery of gold, when miners rushed in there by thousands every year—it was unavoidable, I say, that there should have been mistakes made, and it was at first impossible to give that country the institutions which have been found to be most desirable for the development of the gold industry. I would remind my hon. friend of the conversation, which he himself repeated, that he had with Mr. Murray, the Prime Minister of the province of Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia, I think, has a very satisfactory mining code at the present moment, and he asked Mr. Murray if they had always had that code, and Mr. Murray told him they had not, but it was the result of successive experiments, and of frequent conferences with the miners, and that only after long experience had they been able to evolve a code which at this moment gives so much satisfaction to all the parties concerned. No doubt some improvements can be made in the Yukon, but I do not know that at present there is much to be reformed. I noticed that one of the reforms to which the hon. gentleman wanted immediate attention to be given, was the size of the claims. At present the size of the claim is 250 feet by 2,000 feet; he would have the size doubled, so that a claim should be 500 by 2,000 feet. If I remember right, nothing in the regulations has been changed so often as the size of the claims. They have varied frequently, time and again we have made changes; but these changes were only made after consultation with the parties interested, after inquiry, and upon representations that the regulations were defective in that respect. In the early days of the Eldorado, in 1897 and 1898, the claims were very rich, and they were not as large as they are to-day. But though they were smaller in size than they are to-day, still representations were often made to us that they ought to be changed, and it was only after a series of changes that they have attained to their present size. I must say to my hon. friend that I have not heard any complaints made as to the present size of the claims, still he desires that some alteration be made in the regulations in this respect and apparently he speaks by authority.

I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) that I do not know how far it would be possible and proper or that the time has come when we should have a mining law enacted by this parliament. Up to the present time we have not thought it advisable to have mining laws enacted by this parliament because we thought it would be preferable to vest the power of passing such laws in the Governor General in Council, so that changes might be made promptly where changes were found necessary, but now that the condition of the country is more certain and is better known, and now that we have come to what we should call a condition of practical settlement, perhaps it may be advisable indeed that we should have a mining law enacted by this parliament. But, although this is the case, for my part, I have always expected that we would be informed in this matter some time or other by the Yukon Council. I have been expecting—and in this I have been disappointed, I must say,—the government has

been expecting that at some time the Yukon Council would be able to send us at least the skeleton of a mining Act which could be taken up by the department here to prepare legislation. If this is not done, I do not know that the government may not profit by the suggestion of my hon. friend of sending a commissioner to interview the miners, to confer with them and report the result of his investigation and make this the basis of legislation say for the next session of parliament. It is a suggestion which is very well worthy of consideration and the government will give it due attention. The next thing to which my hon. friend addressed his remarks is one as to which I must say I hardly think I can agree with him ; it is with regard to what he calls the export duty on gold. The export duty at the present time is simply a royalty. We have given it the form of an export duty for reasons which I shall explain in a few moments but it is with a view of collecting the royalty more easily. First of all should we have or should we not have a royalty on gold ? My hon. friend represented to the government some time ago that the duty should be at least suspended upon all gold produced in the Yukon whether by placer or quartz mining. The government had no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that upon all gold produced by quartz mining there should be a suspension of the duty for ten years, and we have applied a similar exemption also to copper, but I submit to my hon. friend if he has the opinion and will persist in the opinion that there should be a suspension of the duty on gold produced from the placer mining that if there is a principle which is sound in political economy it is that a moderate tax should be put upon the production of the precious metals. This is done in many countries. My hon. friend stated that in the United States there is no such tax. I was not aware of the fact ; I take his word for it, but in most civilized nations of the world there is a small royalty put upon the gold produced. In the province of Nova Scotia which has as was stated by my hon. friend a moment ago a very good system of mining laws, there is a small royalty if I am correctly informed, not only upon placer mining which is not carried on in that province, but upon quartz mining, and for this reason I submit to my hon. friend and I would submit also to the people of the Yukon generally, that in order that they should bear their share of legitimate taxation which all parties have to bear it is not unreasonable that they should submit to a moderate royalty. If the royalty is too large at the present time that is a matter for consideration and debate. In the early days we imposed a royalty of 10 per cent and I agree that this was a very exorbitant tax. At that time, however, I do not think it was felt to be too hard, because the production was so abundant, the gravel was so rich, that I think the people submitted willingly to the tax. After a few years we reduced it by one-half and brought it down to 5 per cent, and we again reduced it to 2½ per cent. Now, as I understood my hon. friend he did not ask that it should be abolished altogether, but that it should be suspended for a certain number of years even if only for three years. Before I would give assent to this suggestion I think it would be worth while considering again as I said a moment ago, and I would like the consideration of my hon. friend and of the people whom he represents if it is not reasonable and fair that they should bear their share of the taxation which of course they have to bear like all others, and having a particular branch of wealth which is very productive indeed, I do not think it would be unfair for them to consider that after all they should bear that tax if it is too heavy at 2½ per cent, I think I would be open to consideration of this, but as at present advised I do not think it is too heavy or too large. My hon. friend suggested that if we are to maintain the export duty it should be applied only to the gold which really goes out of the country and not to the part of the gold which remains in Canada. As to that I do not think I can at all agree with my hon. friend. The export duty is made not for the purpose of discouraging the sale of gold outside the country ; it is simply to facilitate the collection of the tax because in reality it is a tax and nothing else. At the present time, by putting the tax in the form of an export duty the miner is entitled to go to the bank, sell his gold and get a draft from the bank which he can collect in the east after he leaves the Yukon. It seems to me that in the interests of the miner it is far preferable that he should dispose of his gold before he quits the Yukon and put his wealth in the shape of a draft which is safer, more easy to carry and not so susceptible of loss, and which can be cashed by him whenever he comes out into the outside world again where he can use his wealth. For this reason, I think my hon. friend will agree with me that perhaps if there is to be a tax upon gold this is the best way of collecting it. I sympathize to a large degree if not entirely with my hon. friend as to the suggestion which he has made with regard to the disposition of the gold. He suggests that the gold should be bought by the government and not by the banks. For my part, I sympathize altogether with that suggestion. I think the government should buy the gold if it was in a position to buy it, but I must say to my hon. friend that no government can buy gold unless it has a mint to coin it. Gold is a merchandise like everything else and if we buy it we must sell it. When we have a mint we will coin the gold. Every ounce of gold brought from the Yukon will then be brought to Ottawa

or to an assay office at Dawson, and I think we should have one here, we should have an assay office in the Yukon. Then the miner can take the gold to the assay office and dispose of it there to the government. Then it would be brought here and be coined, it would go into circulation for the purposes of the country and what is not required for the use of the country would have to be exported abroad, like every other merchandise. This is the way it is done elsewhere, this is the way it must be done here. I must say that I could not exactly realize my hon. friend's meaning when he said that we should buy the gold and give treasury bills for it and then treat it as we treat the savings of the country when they are brought to the savings banks. It seems to be a plain business principle that if we buy gold we must buy it simply as merchandise, and I agree that the government is the proper party to buy that merchandise, because the government, having a mint, is in a position to sell it. Otherwise I do not think it would be practicable.

My hon. friend spoke of the hydraulic concessions which have been given. I may say and say in all frankness that I am ready to believe that in this respect the policy which has been followed by the government has not been satisfactory. The motive was good and if the policy was excellent in itself, if that policy has been carried out as it was intended, it would have been of very great benefit to the Yukon. My hon. friend stated and stated truly that the want, if not the chief want of the Yukon, is water. Water is almost as precious as gold in the Yukon. One thing which the miner must have and without which he cannot prosecute his industry is water. These hydraulic concessions were in every instance for the purpose of promoting water development. Unfortunately these concessions have not produced the results anticipated, and I believe the policy of the government will be henceforth not to give any more concessions. In obedience to the suggestion which was made by my hon. friend when he came here a few months ago we have sent a mining engineer up to the Yukon to make a hydrographic survey, after which we will be able to resolve a new system of disposing of the water there which, we hope, will give more satisfaction to the people of the Yukon than the system which has been pursued in the past.

My hon. friend has made another suggestion for the development of quartz mining which, I am afraid, he will find some difficulty in passing through this House. My hon. friend has suggested that we should have mining machinery and dredging plant made free; that is to say that the miners should be at liberty to import from the United States the mining machinery and dredges which they require for the prosecution of their avocation. We have a law—my hon. friend has alluded to it—which permits at the moment the free introduction of mining machinery of a class not now made in Canada, but the suggestion is that we should confer this privilege not only in respect to machinery that is not made in Canada but also in respect to machinery that is made in Canada. I am afraid that my hon. friend will find very serious opposition to this, because, after all, we have a tariff which has been adopted for purposes which were deemed sufficient by the parliament and people of Canada, and if under this tariff men have been induced to put their money into the production of dredges and into the manufacture of mining machinery, and if they were to be subjected to competition which they did not expect and which deprived them of their market, undoubtedly very serious complications would result and there would probably be very serious representations made to parliament and to the government. I do not think it would be possible to encourage quartz mining in that direction. I am afraid that the miners in the Yukon who, I understand, are now going from placer mining into quartz mining, will have to make the best of their situation, but I believe that quartz producing will be sufficiently remunerative to induce them to put their money into that industry even apart from the advantage which my hon. friend would like them to have.

My hon. friend has also spoken of the extra duty which is imposed upon liquor going into the Yukon of $2 a gallon. If my hon. friend had been here some few years ago he would have been aware of the discussion which took place on that question. There was a movement at that time to prevent liquor from going into the Yukon. There was quite a feeling in the country that the Yukon should be a prohibition country. We did not think it advisable to yield to that request, but we thought that it would at all events be advisable to put a restriction upon the consumption of liquor and it was done in this way. On the whole I think that the Yukon, although it is not a prohibition country, is a temperate country. I do not think there is a greater excess of drinking in the Yukon than there is in any other part of the country. However, we will certainly feel it to be our duty to consider the suggestion that my hon. friend makes that the extra $2 per gallon shall be dropped.

But, the most important part of the observations of my hon. friend to the House this afternoon was what he said about the Yukon Council, and his remarks upon that subject certainly ought to command our best attention. Everybody will agree with my hon. friend that the Yukon, like every other part of Canada, should have representative institutions. But, I ask my hon. friend: Is the government, or is parliament at all derelict in its duty in regard to that matter? It is only eight years since

the Yukon was discovered and brought into civilization. Up to that time it was an unknown country. All of a sudden, in 1897, there was a rush of population from all over the world, not only from Canada but from Europe and America, into that distant country. Under great difficulties, in the face of great inconvenience and obstacles, they rushed into that country and things were rather unsettled. My hon. friend will agree with me that it would have been extremely unwise if we had given to this new population coming from all parts of the world representative institutions. Those who came from outside of the British empire would have been voters, but the few who came even from the British empire would have been lost, or would have been mixed with such a large number of the foreign element that it would have been extremely unwise to have given at once an elective council to this new community. We proceeded then to appoint a commissioner giving him an advisory or a legislative council composed of a certain number of officials and one or two elected members. That was sufficient for the time, and I think served the purpose very well. As the country became more settled and as it commenced to have a permanent population the system was changed and the council was constituted of five elected members and five nominated members. At that time it was impossible to do better. My hon. friend has found some fault with the character of the men who are nominated by the government. They are all, as he said, officials of the government. That is very true. At that time, four or five years ago, when this was done, I think it would have been unwise to have had any other members appointed to the council than those who were officials of the government. They had been sent from the east, they were known to the government and therefore, to some extent, the government could rely upon them. But, that time has passed, I am quite prepared to admit. My hon. friend says : I will not say whether or not the government at this moment should make the whole council elective, but if they do not make the whole council elective they should withdraw the present nominated members and appoint members who are absolutely independent of the government. I am quite prepared to consider that. I think it is perhaps a wise suggestion and I am quite prepared to consider the suggestion in favour of making the whole clause elective. That it must be made elective at an early date goes without saying, that it must be made elective almost immediately I am quite prepared to consider also, but I submit that if it should be done to-day it should not have been done before, and that the government has not been remiss in the character which it has given to the institutions of the Yukon. Let me remind my hon. friend of the fact, as I said a moment ago, that it is only since 1897 that there has been a population in the Yukon. It was not five years after the commencement of the movement of population into that Territory that the Yukon was given representation in this House, and nothing is better for the Yukon than to have a representative on the floor of this House who can speak for the people of that country and who can perform the duty which my hon. friend has performed so well to-day of informing us what is wanted by them. My hon. friend says : I speak for the Yukon; I speak for the people who are there and who have sent me here, and I say that you must change the character of the executive and legislative council as it exists to-day, you must give it new life and make it more accessible to the people. You must make it more representative than it is at the present time. I am quite prepared to agree to that. All I have to say in defence of it is that we did not know that it would be advisable to do this at this moment. The government will be bound to consider the observations made by my hon. friend on that subject.

I will not enter to-day upon another question raised by my hon. friend, as to whether or not the Yukon should be annexed to British Columbia. I would not say yes, and I would not say no. Speaking a few days ago on this subject, I stated that there were in our country some territories which in my opinion ought to be annexed to the older provinces. I spoke for instance of the territory of Mackenzie, the territory of Keewatin, the territory of Franklin and the territory of Ungava. So far as we know these districts, they are not of the same character as the Yukon. they cannot have, so far as I know, any agriculture, and where there is no agriculture there can be no permanent population. Therefore these Territories are not likely to have such a character as to induce any government to make them into provinces. But if the Yukon country is of a different character, if we are to have there a permanent population, it has certainly the space to make a province, and therefore we can leave this question for future consideration. My hon. friend does not expect or desire that the Yukon should be made a province at the present time ; but what he wants to be assured in advance is that it shall not be annexed to another province, even if it be the good, fair and rich province of British Columbia. I think I can asure my hon. friend so far, that we have no intention of marrying the Yukon to British Columbia, and if it puts an obstacle to the banns, I may say to him that I have never had that idea in my mind at all. I have only again to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for the manner in which he has introduced this subject, and for the very valuable information which he has given us, and to assure

him that the government will deem it their duty to give the subject their very best consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in the congratulations which have been extended to the hon. member for the Yukon for the very full and well informed address which he has given to us respecting the conditions in that territory; and I think we may also congratulate ourselves that certain methods which were employed to prevent the return of that gentleman to represent the Yukon proved unsuccessful at the last moment, owing to the determination of the people of the Yukon not to permit such methods to prevail as those which had prevailed there previously. I was a little pained to observe that the Prime Minister did not meet the request for free mining machinery with that generous enthusiasm for free trade which inspired him during his tour of the west in 1894, when he declaimed against protection of any kind as bondage in the same sense that American slavery was a bondage, and declared that he would not rest in his political career until the full measure of free trade as it is in England was obtained for this country. I would have thought, from his utterances of those days, that the Prime Minister would have said to my friend from the Yukon that this was a slight instalment of that free trade towards which we have been tending so rapidly during the last eight or nine years, and that the request of the people of the Yukon in that regard would be granted at the earliest possible moment. However, it was the ill fortune of my hon. friend from the Yukon to find the Prime Minister in a somewhat unsympathetic mood in that regard. Perhaps he may be less obdurate on some future occasion.

I was glad also to receive from the hon. member for the Yukon an assurance, which has already been given in certain official publications of this government, that that 80 per cent of the trade of the Yukon at the present time is in the hands of Canadians. I am glad of this, because we have had from the Prime Minister on many occasions since what is known at the Mackenzie & Mann deal was defeated in the Senate, various lamentations that a certain railway proposal of this government to which I have just referred was not carried through, and that by means of the action of the Senate at that time the trade of this country had been thrown into the hands of the people of the United States. Well, it appears that these apprehensions of the Prime Minister and his colleagues were wholly unfounded; and I was glad that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister was so well advised as to congratulate the hon. member for the Yukon upon a result which the Prime Minister himself said a few years ago would never obtain unless the proposed railway was built. The speech of the hon. member for which he has been congratulated by the Prime Minister is the best possible vindication that could be offered of the action of the Senate of Canada in doing what it did at that time.

In regard to the many matters of interest which have been alluded to in the speech of my hon. friend—and I regret that I was not able to hear all of it, having been called out of the House during a portion of the afternoon—I would like to say just a word or two with regard to only a few of them. In the first place, as to the concessions to which the hon. member made reference, I see no reason why the government should not at once accede to the proposal which he has made, and call upon the men who have obtained concessions of gold mining territory in the Yukon, to fulfil the conditions upon which they obtained those areas. Is there any possible reason why that should not be done? We had some discussion on these matters a few years ago, the result of which was that a certain commission was sent by this government to investigate the position of affairs with regard to the Treadgold concession and with regard to concessions generally. Representations of a very strong character had been made by the miners of the Yukon at that time, charging not only unwisdom in the making of those concessions, but in some cases at least actual fraud. Well, the government propose to issue a commission, taking good care to exclude from the terms of that commission any opportunity to the commissioners to investigate those charges. They were carefully eliminated, after and in spite of debate on this House before that commission was sent forward. The commission did go forward and their report was delayed for a very long time. We urged the government to bring down the report in order that it might be debated, and eventually a certain member of the administration who has a seat in another House stated that the report would not be brought down at all. His colleagues did not concur in that view. The report was brought down after an announcement had first been made in the public press that the commission was to be cancelled, and it was cancelled. Well, there are other concessions in the Yukon, and, so far as I am able to gather from the remarks of the hon. member, the present position of affairs permits these areas to be held for future development, and the government is not calling upon those who hold them to fulfil the conditions which are essential to the proper development of that country. That is a condition of affairs which should not be permitted for a single moment. The result of permitting that to continue is that

these lands are held for the benefit of men who may not intend to develop them at all, but may intend to hold them in order to obtain in the future that increment of profit which will arise from the efforts of the ordinary miners in the Yukon, and which will make those properties very much more valuable than they are at present.

My hon. friend from the Yukon referred, I think, to the representation fee?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, but not adversely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some two years ago we pointed out on this side that while the ordinary miner was bound to pay his representation fee, that condition did not prevail in respect to some of these concessions. It did not prevail with regard to the Treadgold concession, which was a matter we then discussed and criticised. If that condition still continues it is a subject of grave criticism, because gentlemen obtaining these large concessions should not be placed in any better position in that regard than the ordinary miner.

With regard to the necessity of stable laws and wise regulations, I do not think that the Prime Minister answered the argument of my hon. friend. In Nova Scotia the regulations, as he had been informed by the Prime Minister of that province, were made after careful consultation between those representing the mining interests and the officials of the government; and consequently these mining laws and regulations are not only advantageous to the province, but satisfactory to the miner and tend to the development and not to the stagnation, of the mining industry. The right hon. gentleman referred to this as if it were a mere question of time, and emphasized the necessity of a long time for the purpose of accomplishing these desired reforms. But the point emphasized by the member for the Yukon was that these regulations never could be made satisfactory until the government took into its confidence the mining men in that country and discussed with them the nature and character of the regulations which it would be wisest to adopt. The right hon. the First Minister did not meet that point, and that is a point which has been emphasized in this House over and over again. Over and over again we have pointed out that these Orders in Council and regulations were devised only after discussion with one or two government officials in that country—men not absolutely in touch with the mining interests and frequently in antagonism and opposition to those interests. In a country such as that, situated so far from Ottawa, you should call these mining men into a conference and proceed exactly along the same lines as those upon which the government of the province of Nova Scotia proceeded. Then, after proper conference, discussion and consideration, you could put the laws in such a condition that those who desire to invest capital will not only be satisfied with them, but also with the permanency of the laws and regulations thus made. Two years ago, when the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) brought down certain amendments to the law under which these regulations are made, we insisted upon one measure, that at least gave a certain publicity to the regulations, which, before that, had been altered, amended and renewed, from time to time, without the knowledge of parliament or any one except the officials of the department and the persons affected by them in the Yukon. We urged upon the Minister of the Interior of that day that every regulation and every amendment to a regulation should be brought down and laid on the table of parliament within thirty days after the beginning of the next session subsequent to its enactment. That has been done. We also obtained the consent of the government to another measure, namely, that unless parliament, by resolution of both branches of the legislature, should confirm those regulations and amendments to regulations, they would become absolutely inoperative after the close of the then session.

There are one or two other matters to which I wish to refer. There is the question of the elective council. So far as the rights of self-government in that country are concerned, the government have proceeded very much along the same grudging line as did the governments of sixty or seventy years ago. All our provinces have gone through the same experience as that through which the Yukon has been passing the last four years. First, they had government by a council not responsible to the people in any way. Then, after a time, a certain council was established, partly elective and partly appointed, with the government always taking care to retain in its own hands the absolute control. In the past my right hon. friend was a follower of the school of those who brought about the change in those conditions and entrusted to the people full representative institutions. Why is it that to-day my right hon. friend seeks to carry out exactly the same principles in the Yukon as those which were successfully fought against and overcome by the men of sixty or seventy years ago? Why pretend to give something to the Yukon, when in reality you give nothing? You had, in the first place, a council composed of men appointed by the Dominion administration who were bound to fulfil its will under pain of dismissal. When the people of the Yukon complained, they got a stone where they demanded bread. They were given the right to elect a certain number of members to the council, but this government retained in its hands the absolute control, so that if every elected member of that council was absolutely opposed to the policy of the Dominion government regarding some par-

ticular matter, this government could control the council by means of an equal number of men appointed by the government as members of that council and the casting vote of the chairman. That simply meant that the people of the Yukon were being mocked at. My hon. friend who spoke this afternoon demonstrated to the satisfaction of this House that these conditions do exist, and I see no possible ground for withholding any longer the right of self-government from the people of the Yukon, such as was demanded by their representative this afternoon. The Prime Minister, indeed, acknowledges that. But he says that the time has only come at this moment. I think the time came three or four years ago. And I venture to think that there would have been less dissatisfaction, less scandal, better administration in the Yukon, if that which was demanded by these people four or five years ago, if I am not mistaken, had been conceded to them at that time.

I was not aware that the subject was to be discussed this afternoon, or I might have extended my remarks to some of the other subjects adverted to by the hon. member for Yukon Territory. I can only say, in conclusion, that I am very glad we have on the floor of the House the gentleman who in so forcible, yet so temperate and moderate a speech, has presented the condition of that portion of Canada to the attention of the government. And, in congratulating him on the speech which he has made I desire also to express the earnest hope that the government will, at the earliest possible moment, take into favourable consideration the matters to which that hon. gentleman has called attention.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has made a statement of facts—unwittingly I have no doubt—which is entirely disproved by the evidence. He stated that in the commission issued to Judge Britton to investigate certain matters of the Yukon the government had carefully omitted any instructions to inquire into questions of fraud——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is my recollection.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is quite mistaken. I would refer him to the commission as printed in the return included in the report of Judge Britton himself as brought down in return to an order of this House dated March 17, 1904. Judge Britton says :

> The undersigned commissioner and Benjamin Taylor A. Bell were appointed by letters patent under the great seal, dated 30th day of July, 1903, to inquire into and report upon certain matters and things more particularly mentioned and set out in certain Orders in Council bearing date respectively the 29th day of May and the 30th day of June, 1903.
>
> These Orders in Council state——

The sections are set out in order, and section 10 is as follows :

> 10. That it has been alleged that the hydraulic claims granted in pursuance of the regulations for the granting of hydraulic claims in the Yukon Territory have been procured by fraud and misrepresentation, and that the material conditions of the leases, have not been observed, thereby rendering the same liable to cancellation.

I have only had time to look at one or two pages of the report with regard to this point, but I find that, at page 16, in dealing with the hydraulic concessions generally, Mr. Justice Britton says, among other things :

> If there has been shown any fraud or misrepresentation by reason of which a concession has been granted, my commission enables me to deal with such. It may be taken for granted that if a hydraulic concession is only of such a mining location as is contemplated by the regulation and if that location is worked as such, it must necessarily be beneficial to the mining industry of the Yukon Territory——

And so on. Dealing with the various concessions separately under different heading, Mr. Justice Britton reports, as will be seen at page 17 :

> Within the period set out in the public notice given by the commission, protests were filed against the following hydraulic mining leases, and representations were made that these leases had been obtained by fraud or misrepresentation on behalf of the applicants, and that the holders thereof had failed to comply with the requirements of the leases of such concessions.

Then, dealing with the Matson concession, he says page 19 :

> It is of considerable importance in dealing with the question of fraud and misrepresentation that :
>
> 1. The application was made before the regulation ; and
>
> 2. That everything which could possibly be ascertained by the applicants was supposed to be known by Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Ogilvie speaks in his letter of 16th of September, 1899, of some of those located as merely speculators. See also his letter of 11th November, 1899.
>
> In the face of what had been done by the holders and accepted by the department, and sentation on behalf of the applicants, and that the conditions of the lease have not been complied with.

And in dealing with the Doyle concession and the Bronson and Ray concession he refers to the question of fraud :

> In the absence of evidence contradicting Mr. Ogilive, commissioner of the territory, or evidence showing bad faith on his part, fraud or misrepresentation on the part of the applicants cannot be found.

I merely rose to call the attention of the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) to a very serious error on his part, imputing to the government something which, I am sure, he would not have imputed to them had he correctly remembered the facts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) has not convinced me. I remember distinctly the debate that took place in the House and the controversy between the Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) and myself in regard to the appointment. The Postmsater General made a speech in which he announced that the commission would be issued, and in that speech said that it would be given the widest terms. I do not know the terms in which it was issued—

Mr. BELCOURT. I have just read them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the proposal which the Postmaster General brought down to the House, and which, I have the right to assume, covered the terms in which it would be issued, was very much narrower than the speech which he made, and we had a prolonged debate as to the terms of the commission, in which we urged that it should be made wider. I have sent for 'Hansard,' and I think I can satisfy my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) that my remarks of a few moments ago were not at all out of place in view of what occurred on that occasion.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Mail subsidies and steamship subventions—a line or lines of steamers to run between St. John, Halifax and London, $40,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This service is now performed by two lines, the Canadian Pacific and the Furness lines. The contract was entered into in November last and expired on the 31st of May. We have asked for other tenders, the time allowed for tendering to end in July next.

Mr. DANIEL. Do I understand that tenders have been asked for, and the time not yet elapsed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The service is in operation now, and was last winter. We have asked for more tenders to be received in the month of July.

A line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax, or either, and the West Indies and South America, $80,700.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is an old subsidy. Under the present subsidy there are two lines of steamers which are subventioned. One subsidy for which we pay $65,000, now goes to Messrs. Pickford & Black, that is the subsidy for a service between St. John and Halifax and a number of islands in the West Indies, among which are Bermuda, St. Kitts, Antigua, Dominica, St. Vincent, Grenada, St. Lucia and Trinidad. The imperial government also pay them a similar sum of $65,000. Besides, we pay Pickford & Black $15,000 as a subsidy for a direct service between St. John and Halifax and St. Domingo. That subsidy has expired, we have asked for tenders, and have received a tender from Pickford & Black. But they have asked for certain modifications in the service, dispensing them from calling at certain islands, and as the imperial government is equally interested in the service, paying one-half, we are now in correspondence with them with regard to the matter.

Mr. AMES. Would the minister be willing to let this item stand over ? Considerable correspondence has been exchanged between various boards of trade on this matter. I did not anticipate it coming up to-night, and have not the correspondence with me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Steam communication between a port or ports in Prince Edward Island and a port or ports in Great Britain, $7,000.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. When that matter was up before, the minister promised to give some information with regard to the trips made by one of these steamers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the information which is furnished me by the minister.

The vote for 1903-4 for this service was $7,000, though a contract was in force with Messrs. Furness, Withy & Company, for $5,000. Of this, only $2,500 was expended. Two half trips were made in the fall of 1903, that is to say, in October, 1903, and November 28th. 1903. There was some disarrangement of the dates of sailing, owing to disaster to the 'Manchester Trader,' in the St. Lawrence. It was found that the 'Manchester Trader' would be unable to take up her sailing, and no other steamer being available, Messrs. Furness, Withy & Company, were permitted to have the 'Manchester Trader' call at Charlottetown on the Montreal service ; and it was agreed that the 'Manchester Trader' thus calling at Charlottetown should only be entitled to claim for half a trip. When the second call had to be made, the repairs to the 'Manchester Trader' were not then completed, and the department permitted the 'Manchester Engineer' to call on the voyage from Montreal, under the same conditions, that is to say, that the call at Charlottetown should be considered half a trip.

Mr. ALEXANDER MARTIN. I would like to say with regard to this item, that the service so far as it relates to Prince Edward Island is not very satisfactory. We have in our province two large articles of export, cheese and butter. At present, cheese sold for Great Britain has to go first to Montreal ; so with butter in many cases, eggs and ham and pork, they go to Montreal, where they have to be transhipped to Great Britain. Any one can see how the farmer in Prince Edward Island is handicapped in the price which he receives for these articles compared with prices received in other parts of Canada. The trips these boats make are very irregular, they call at no stated times. There is no definite time for them to sail. Sometimes they sail on the date agreed upon, and sometimes they do not. Farmers in the island are at a loss,

and shippers are at a loss, to know when to prepare their cargoes for these boats. At present people have first to ship their cheese up to Montreal and then tranship it to Great Britain, or else send it to Halifax, which involves a very large expense, three transhipments, and three short hauls over railways at a very heavy railway rate, and thence to Great Britain. The apple trade with Great Britain in the fall of the year is handicapped in the same way. I would like if the government would insist upon these boats sailing at stated days in the season, which would be advertised three or four months ahead, so that the farmers and shippers would know beforehand what accommodation they were to receive, and when to bring their cargoes to the place of shipment. Sometimes when the ship does call, the shippers not knowing ahead when she would call, are not ready with their freight. But if these trips were made regularly and at stated times, the people would be relieved of a great deal of difficulty which they now suffer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In view of the information which I have in my hands, I do not think the criticism of the hon. gentleman applies, because the contract stipulates absolutely at what times the trips are to be made. The terms are two complete round voyages, the first trip to be made in the month of October, and the second trip prior to the 15th of December. So the people of Prince Edward Island can know that in the month of October next this ship, 'The Manchester Trader' will call at Charlottetown, and then some month or six weeks afterwards it will call again. So there is no necessity of giving any notice in advance when the ship will call, because it is stipulated in the contract, and the subsidy cannot be earned unless the ship calls at Charlottetown at those stated periods. Let my hon. friend tell the people of Prince Edward Island that the subvention cannot be earned unless this ship calls at Charlottetown at the times mentioned in the contract.

Mr. A. MARTIN. All I know is what has happened there before and what may happen there again. Although the sailings of these vessels are advertised and are in the contract I know from my own experience in shipping in the province that very often when these days arrived the vessels were not there, and I remember some years ago when I was in this House, that in the spring of the year it was given out that the steamer was to call at the province and a great many farmers fattened their cattle for export to Great Britain, but when the time arrived, there was no boat, no boat called at the province to its great detriment. The same thing happened only a few years ago and I think that while two trips a year may be all right—I suppose that would supply the province with some little accommodation—I think a trip in the spring of the year if it could be arranged would be of great advantage to the farmers for a great many feed their stock during the winter and ship it in the spring, and at present they have to take the roundabout way of first shipping them to Halifax and re-shipping them from there afterwards. However, perhaps after this more regular trips may be made; I am only speaking of what has happened before and what I hope may not happen again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This subsidy for which we are now asking is for only two trips in October and December. No provision is made in these estimates for any more trips than that.

Mr. A. MARTIN. How much is the contract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $2,500.

Mr. A. MARTIN. That would be only $5,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $5,000, yes.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Then there is $2,000 more?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, I am informed by the deputy that it is hoped the service can be improved and that perhaps one or more additional trips can be provided for but at present the contract is only $5,000 for two trips. We have not been able to get anything better but we hope we can get some company to earn the $7,000 we offer.

Mr. A. MARTIN. That is the very complaint I am making, the very great uncertainty of the service. There may be three trips or there may be only two trips, that it creates the uncertainty which causes the uncertainty of freight also.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the present time we have settled for only two trips under the arrangement, but we hope to perfect this arrangement and to provide for two or more additional trips. At present all we can be certain of is the two trips.

Mr. LEFURGEY. My hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin) was right in his statement that on several occasions there has been a great deal of uncertainty in the sailing of these boats. I have myself known occasions when the people have been at a loss to know when if at all they were going to have a boat. I would suggest now that the two trips are certain and definite and as the government has in view the getting of another steamer for a spring trip, the arrangement should be made at least some months ahead or the people would not be in a position to know whether they are to have the spring trips or not. I would like to ask how the trips are published, in what manner the shippers become cognizant when the sail-

ings are to be made in October and possibly six months later.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that a part of the terms of the contract is that there is to be an advertisement published 20 days in advance of the exact date at which the boat will be at Charlottetown.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is there any authority at Charlottetown to publish this to the shippers on the island ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The notification is sent to the newspapers by the agent of the company.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I would urge on the Prime Minister that the rates of freight charged by these steamers should be the same as can be obtained at Montreal, St. John or Halifax.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is part of the contract.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. And that should be indicated in the contract ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. And there should be no doubt about it. During the last few years when these steamers went down there they charged whatever they felt like charging, and there is no rule to guide the steamer or shippers. I think it should be definitely stated and the public should know what the rates of freight are which these steamers are permitted to charge to shippers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear. That is quite reasonable, and I am very glad to be able to inform my hon. friend that it is part of the contract that the freight rates are not to be greater between the ports mentioned than the current rates between Montreal and Manchester. There are to be the same rates between Prince Edward Island and Manchester as between Montreal and Manchester.

Winter navigation between Quebec and St. Lawrence harbours, down to Murray bay and River Ouelle, $12,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say we have no contract. We have not been able to find any steamer to provide that service, but we are taking the appropriation in the hope that we may find a steamer this year.

Steam service between Victoria, Vancouver, way ports and Skagway, $12,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a somewhat important service. It is altogether performed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. It is really two services, the particulars being as follows :

Route A.—Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway four complete round trips in June, July, August, September and October, three complete round trips during March, April and May, two complete round trips during May, November, December, January and February.

Route B.—Victoria, Vancouver, Naas Harbour and Skidegate, calling at way ports 2 round trips each month.

Route C.—Victoria and Ahousset Quatsino and Cape Scott and way ports, 4 round trips from April to September, inclusive as follows : 2 from Victoria to Ahousset, 1 to Ahousset and Quatsino and Cape Scott.

During remaining months 3 round trips from Victoria to Ahousset one to be continued to Cape Scott calling at way ports.

Steam communication between Prince Edward Island, Cape Breton and Newfoundland, $8,000.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Might I ask for the ports of call for this service in Prince Edward Island ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have a contract with Robert J. Leslie, of Halifax, who has two steamers, the 'Amelia'—300 tons capacity with passenger accommodation for twenty-five first-class passengers and 100 second-class passengers, and the 'Helen May Butler' with a capacity of about 65 tons and with adequate passenger accommodation. The 'Amelia' will sail from Charlottetown to Placentia, Newfoundland, calling both ways at Pictou, Souris, Cheticamp, North Sydney and Sydney with the option of calling at St. Pierre and Miquelon, and to omit the call at Souris on the return voyage from Placentia to Charlottetown. The 'Helen May Butler' will run a subsidiary service from and to Bridgetown and Cardigan Bridge, Prince Edward Island, calling at the public wharfs on both sides of the Grand and Cardigan rivers and connecting at Pictou with the 'Amelia.' There will be a regular semi-monthly service between the aforementioned ports.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would like to ask the hon. First Minister if there was not a request from the board of trade or from some other authority on the island asking that these steamers call at Summerside also? Summerside is one of the principal shipping ports off Prince Edward Island. In the schedule of these boats it is left out altogether.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that there is no recollection of such a representation being made to the government from Summerside. I cannot say positively that there was none made, but the deputy informs me that he has no recollection of it.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is it not a fact that one of these boats was lost or got into trouble lately?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, one of these boats has got into trouble. We have not yet got full details.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Is the department taking any steps to have her replaced?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the contractors are doing their best to replace the boat; otherwise, they cannot earn their subsidy.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In these estimates I observe that there is provision for a subsidized service between New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and the West Indies. Between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies there formerly existed a large trade, but that trade has been gradually decreasing on account of the large subsidies to services from both Halifax and St. John and because there have been no subsidized boats running between the West Indies and the province of Prince Edward Island. It is well known that the fisheries of Prince Edward Island constitute a most valuable industry. In codfish and other articles that province has a large production. It is a hardship to the province that while the provinces around it have the benefit of cheap transportation by subsidized boats, Prince Edward Island has to depend on its own resources for the transportation of its products. I understand there has been a proposition to subsidize a line of boats from Montreal to the West Indies. I would suggest to the right hon. First Minister that if that should materialize, Charlottetown be made a port of call between Montreal and the West Indies in order to give the province of Prince Edward Island the means of carrying on trade with the West Indies, which I am sure, would increase very largely if there was a boat calling at that port.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Alex. Martin) that we have in contemplation at the present time a service between Montreal, Cuba and Mexico. I would not be too sanguine or give too much hope to my hon. friend, but if that service comes into operation, if we succeed in getting somebody to undertake it as we want to, we contemplate having the vessels call at Charlottetown.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. When this item was before the committee on a former occasion, I entered my protest against it. It was pointed out to me, in answer to some observations I made, that this service was to call at certain ports in my own constituency, and that one of the ports was Glace bay. Upon the assurance that the present service was to make Glace bay a port of call, I withdrew for the moment any opposition to it. I find, however, that, whereas on a former occasion the itinerary included Glace bay, the list as read to-night does not include Glace bay. I would like to ascertain how it is that Glace bay has been dropped out of the list of ports at which this service is to call.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the contractors say that they could not call at Glace bay.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. There is a very simple and a very short answer to the contractor. I am sure the contractor would not undertake to give me that answer for the simple reason that while he might undertake to fool the department he would scarcely undertake to fool anybody who is familiar with the situation. I think that in view of the fact that representations were made to the effect that this service was to make Glace bay a port of call there should be some better explanation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take a note of it and see what we can do.

For services of wrecking plant on the St. Lawrence for the year ending June 30, 1906, $10.000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move to drop that vote. This has been transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Item dropped.

Steamboat service between Canada and New Zealand, $50,000.

Mr. MONK. We will require some explanation as to that. That is a new service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have at the present time a growing trade with New Zealand. We have extended to them the preference which we give to British colonies and they have extended to us their preference. There is a growing trade and we have taken this appropriation in the endeavour to have a contract entered into, but we have not yet made any arangement.

Amount authorized by statute, $73,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In regard to this item there is an error which I want to correct. The appropriation last year was $224,666.66. This year the appropriation that we ask is only $73,000. This is an error. There was an appropriation of $73,000 last year for the service which we had with Japan. This year we have made an appropriation for a steamship service with France under statute which will cost $133,333, so that in reality the decrease is not, as it is stated there, $151,666.66, but only $18,333. In other words, what we propose to expend this year out of this amount of $224,000, which is authorized by statute, is as follows: $73,000 for the service between Canada and Japan and $133,000 for the service between Canada and France.

Mr. MONK. Is there a contract signed for the service with France?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; the contract was signed in the month of February

last, and it is to commence with the opening of navigation in 1905, and to expire at the opening of navigation in 1908. The contractors are the well-known firm of H. & A. Allan. The steamships to be placed on this line are the 'Laurentian' (4,522 tons), the 'Pomeranian' (4,258 tons), the 'Sardinian' (4,349 tons) and the 'Buenos Ayrean' (4,164 tons). The minimum speed is to be not less than 10 knots when loaded at sea. The terminal points are Montreal or Quebec during the season of navigation on the St. Lawrence, and Halifax or St. John during the season of closed navigation. The ports of call in France are Cherbourg or Havre at the contractors' option. Each east-bound trip may be extended at the contractors' option to a port or ports in Great Britain, but the first port of call after leaving Canada shall be a French port and the last port of departure for Canada shall be a port in France. The number of round voyages from France to Canada and return shall be not less than eighteen yearly; that is to say, during the months of May and November, inclusive, in each year there shall be run not less than two full round voyages each month; and during the remaining months, from December to April, inclusive, in each year, the remaining voyages shall be performed. The number of round voyages from France to Canada may be increased to twenty-four per annum. The subsidy stipulated is $100,000 for eighteen voyages or $133,333.33 for twenty-four voyages. The vessels are to be fitted with such amount of cold storage accommodation and under such regulations as the minister may require, and thereafter during the continuance of the contract this is to be at all times subject to the approval of the minister. The minister may at any time revise the freight rates to be charged on all articles or classes of goods. In no case shall any discrimination be made against Canadian merchants or shippers, who shall always have preference. The steamers are also to carry mails.

Mr. DANIEL. I presume the terminal points on this side of the Atlantic are left to the option of the steamship company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 10.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 8, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 172) for the relief of Philip Vibert—Mr. McCool.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Mr. H. GERVAIS presented the fifth report of the select committee appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of the House during the prersent session as follows:

Your committee recommend that Mr. Rodolphe Laferrière be appointed translator of the official report of the Debates vice Mr. H. R. Fiset, whose services have been dispensed with.

That the said appointment and remuneration, viz.: $1,500 per annum, date from the adoption by the House of the foregoing recommendation.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. GERVAIS, Chairman.

QUESTIONS.

POSTMASTER AT MARKSTAY.

Mr. BRODER asked:

1. At what date was A. P. Lefebvre, postmaster at Markstay, dismissed?
2. For what cause was he dismissed?
3. Was there any investigation before dismissal?
4. Has any person been appointed to fill the vacancy? If so, whom, and where from?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General):

1. Mr. A. P. Lefebvre was removed from the postmastership of Markstay on the 1st April last.
2. He was dismissed because of great carelessness in the management of his office and for serious irregularities in his accounts.
3. There was a full investigation before dismissal.
4. Mr. Norbert Roy has been appointed to fill the vacancy.

CACOUNA WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. What sums of money were voted last year for the wharf at Cacouna, in the county of Témiscouata?
2. What sums were paid and expended?
3. What works were done?
4. How many employees were there?
5. What was the employment of each of them, and were they employed as permanent or extra employees (à quel titre)?
6. What was the salary per day of each, and what were the sums received by them last year?
7. What report has been made?
8. How long did the works last?
9. Who was the engineer in charge of such works, who was the superintendent, or superintendents, foremen, assistant engineers, &c.?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance):

1. $1,250.
2. $1,249.27.
3. The top planking and stringers were raised and levelled on a length of nearly 400 feet; the railing was replaced or repaired on the entire length of the wharf; the extension was sheated on the outer end with hardwood and strapped with iron; a stairway was built on the east side of the ex-

tension, and the bottom of the wharf, which was disintegrated at places, was repacked with stone.

4. Eleven men.

5. Zephirin Levesque, foreman in charge, $2.50 per day, total amount paid, $172; James Johnson, carpenter, $1.50 per day (15 days as labourer at $1.25), total amount paid, $91.50; Francois Bérubé, carpenter, $1.50 per day, total paid, $102; Alphonse Morin, carpenter, $1.50 per day, total paid, $84; Auguste Gagnon, carpenter, $1.50 per day, total paid, $90.75; Maxime Bossé, labourer, $1.25 per day, total paid, $75.62; Paul Lepage, labourer, $1.25 per day, total paid, $38.12; Johnny Lausier, labourer, $1.25 per day, total paid, $38.12; Alfred Coté, labourer, $1.25 per day, total paid, $35.62; William Kirouack, tinsmith, $1.50 per day, total paid, $1.50; Arthur Pelletier, carter, $2 per day, total paid, $24. All men on this work were employed by the day.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Engineer in charge made usual reports as to progress and completion of work.

8. From the 12th of August to the 31st October, 1904.

9. The work was in charge of District Engineer J. A. Tremblay, of Montmagny.

EMPLOYMENT OF ELIE MARTIN.

Mr. BERGERON—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has Elie Martin, a retired farmer, living on his revenues (cultivateur et rentier), of the parish of Saint-Arsène, in the county of Témiscouata, any employment in the Customs Department?

2. If so, what is that employment?

3. How long has he been appointed?

4. What is his salary?

5. What are his duties?

6. What reports has he made to the government, and when?

7. What sums have been paid him since his appointment?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Elie Martin, of the parish of Saint Arsène, county of Témiscouata, has no employment in the Customs Department.

TIMBER SALES IN NORTHWEST.

Mr. A. A. MACLEAN asked:

1. Have any, and what, timber limits, situated in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories, been advertised for sale by the Department of the Interior since 1st October, 1904? If so, what are the dates of the advertisements, the conditions of sale, and in what newspapers were such advertisements inserted?

2. If any sale or sales of timber limits have been made by the Department of the Interior since 1st October, 1904, in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories, (a) where are such timber limits situated; (b) what extent of territory does each such timber limit comprise; (c) what is the name of each purchaser; (d) what is the amount of the consideration or purchase money for each such sale; (e) what were the sales made by public competition, and what were the sales made by the minister or by officials of the department?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I find that it will take some time to prepare the information asked for. It is now being got ready and will be laid on the table of the House as soon as completed.

COLONIAL CONFERENCE.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to a despatch which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' of last evening from London, to the following effect:

London, June 7.—It is announced to-day in the most positive fashion in the Radical papers that Laurier, replying to Lyttelton's communications re the next colonial conference has 'firmly refused to take part in any tariff discussion until the opinion of this country has been ascertained at a general election.' The Leeds 'Mercury,' which is bitterly anti-Chamberlainite, rejoices over the announcement, and says that Laurier and other colonial ministers 'see through the Chamberlainite scheme and fully appreciate the difference between the pinch-beck imperialism of the protectionists and the pure gold of disinterested sentiment, of which Rosebery is the leading exponent.'

Official circles here are very reticent and will not confirm Laurier's alleged refusal, but it can be confidently stated that if the Canadian Prime Minister has refused, the conference of 1906 will not be held.

If a Liberal ministry is returned here at the next general election, their present intention is to let the conference meet in the usual course with a clear prior announcement, however, that all schemes for a preference involving a British tariff against the foreigner are impossible.

It is noteworthy that in the second report of Mr. Chamberlain's tariff commission respecting the cotton industry issued yesterday, great stress is laid on the fact that an equitable Anglo-colonial scheme of preference is essential to the future stability of British trade and the proper expansion of imperial resources.

WINDERMERE.

I desire to ask the Prime Minister whether he has any information to give to the House upon the matter set forth in this telegram, and especially whether or not the alleged policy of the Liberal party in Great Britain referred to in this telegram, if they should be returned to power in the next general election, would be likely to call into active exercise the declaration made by the members of this government, who attended the colonial conference, and renewed by the Minister of Finance in his budget speech of two years ago, when it was declared in effect that unless some preference to Canadian products should be granted in the markets of Great Britain and Ireland this government would hold itself at liberty and, in fact, would propose to withdraw the preference which has already been given to certain British products in our markets.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention was drawn last evening to the despatch which has been published in the 'Star.' I have simply to say that there is no foundation at all for the action or words attributed to myself. I have received no communication from Mr. Lyttleton or from any one else on the subject of the proposed Colonial Conference or upon any matter which might be discussed at this conference. I have made no communication myself to Mr. Lyttleton or any one else on that subject, and with regard to any change in our policy which might be affected by any change in the government of Great Britain, I have only to say to my hon. friend, to the House and to the country generally, that our policy stands as it is and cannot be affected by any changes that take place in England or elsewhere.

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask for a little more information with reference to land scrip in addition to the small amount which has already been applied for. I would like to get all Orders in Council respecting scrip and grants thereof, either money or land, to half-breeds in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories since February 15, 1903. There is a report which brings the record up to that date, but I wish the Orders in Council which bring the record down from that date. Then I want the reports of Coté and McLeod, who were appointed commissioners for settling the half-breed claims under Order in Council of March 2, 1900, and what disposition, if any, has been made of the claims reported on by them. There were two commissions. This was for Saskatchewan. I find the reports of the other commission for Alberta and Assiniboia; but I can find no trace of any report from Coté and McLeod on the results of their work. Then I would like a return of the cases dealt with under Order in Council of the 20th of March, 1897, all claims for half-breed children's scrip, giving the applicants, assignees, locatees, patentees, and all correspondence in respect thereof. There is a reference in McKenna's report of 1901, in which he said that he had thirty reserved claims sent to him by Coté and McLeod, and of these he had allowed three, disallowed nine and reserved the other eighteen. I would like to trace what became of these disallowed and reserved. I would like also a complete set of the forms and instructions in use in the department in regard to applications for scrip, its transfer and location, including the forms of receipts for the different kinds of scrip. There are four or five or six different forms or scrip issued. I see by the papers, and I would like the printed form of each of these, together with the form of application. This is only a small Bill, and will not take a great deal of time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will endeavour to satisfy my hon. friend, but when he says that it would take only a short time, I am not so sure of that. His appetite is like that of the Frenchman, it grows by eating; the more he has the more he wants.

Mr. FOSTER. I have got that from association with my right hon. friend and imitation, they say, is the sincerest form of flattery.

THE BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. FOSTER. Before sitting down, I would like to ask the Finance Minister if by any chance he has made up his mind whether he will give a budget speech this year or not; and if so, when? Is he waiting until all the estimates, railway subsidies and everything else are through?

Mr. FIELDING. The country is getting along so happily, that if by chance we missed the budget speech, I think the country would still prosper. I cannot think we are dependent for the prosperity of the country on the budget speech, although budget speeches do sometimes help that prosperity. I think an understanding was reached some time ago that the budget would not be brought on until the Northwest Bills were disposed of. I hope that at an early day we shall dispose of whatever blocks the way, and then the budget will come on.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Mr. BERGERON. I desire to ask the Minister of Finance when we may expect a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee? Last week we had a meeting, which was postponed for lack of a quorum, and it was then understood that we would have a meeting to-day. I understand that my hon. friend the Finance Minister has been absent. Now that he is back, would he be kind enough to say when we shall have a meeting of the committee?

Mr. FIELDING. I came to-day expecting to find a meeting, and I came up this morning at some inconvenience to myself to find that there was none. So many members are absent that we cannot apparently have a full meeting at present; but I think we should have a meeting next week.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend understands that the chairman is away. He said last week that he would not be here to-day, and I thought my hon. friend might be in a position to authorize the calling of a meeting in the chairman's absence.

Mr. FIELDING. As a matter of courtesy I have sometimes been consulted, but the chairman would be quite free to modify the arrangements. I am reminded by one of my hon. friends that the chairman will be here on Monday, and I think a meeting should then be called immediately.

THE TREADGOLD CONCESSION INQUIRY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to refer to a difference of opinion which I had yesterday with my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) as to a matter connected with the Treadgold Commission of 1903. The instructions to which I referred in speaking yesterday are to be found on pages 4486 and 4487 of 'Hansard' of 1903. There was not only a debate upon the character of the instruction. But Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, then the member for Montmorency, moved a resolution in regard to them; and in the second last paragraph of the resolution attention is specially called to the fact that the provision which the opposition thought should be inserted in those instructions had not been inserted. It is possible that some further instructions were sent to the commissioners afterwards, because I observe, in the pamphlet which the hon. gentleman was good enough to hand to me, reference to an Order in Council of July 30.

Mr. BELCOURT. A return to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That Order in Council was never before the House. The instructions I referred to were those set forth in the speech of Mr. Casgrain.

Mr. BELCOURT. I understood the hon. leader of the opposition to say distinctly yesterday afternoon that the government had refused to instruct the commissioners to inquire into the question of fraud and misrepresentation in the obtaining of the concessions. I called my hon. friend's attention to the fact that the return brought down and printed and distributed among the members of this House for some time, showed clearly that the instructions contained in paragraph 10 were distinct and clear instructions to the commissioners to investigate questions of fraud and misrepresentation, and I pointed out to my hon. friend, that the judge, in various parts of his report, had referred to those instructions, and had stated distinctly when the commission opened, that he was empowered to investigate questions of fraud and misrepresentation. I pointed out also that he had heard evidence in several cases tending to prove or to disprove that there had been fraud and misrepresentation. I pointed out that in every one of the cases referred to him in which charges were made, the judge reported that no fraud or misrepresentation had been proved. So I think the hon. gentleman owes it to the House to say that he was mistaken when he said that it is not fair on his part to say that there were no such instructions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I repeat again that the instructions which were brought down and in respect to which the debate took place in this House, did not contain any such instructions to the commissioners.

Mr. BELCOURT. That was not my hon. friend's statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I say further than that, that the Postmaster General, upon the resolution moved by the hon. member for Montmorency, distinctly said that the government would not insert any such instructions to the commissioners. Not only that, but a division was taken on the resolution, and the members of the government, and my. hon. friend himself, voted that no such instructions should be inserted. The words of the resolution which was moved by the hon. member for Montmorency were these:

> This House regrets that by the instructions given to the commissioners to be appointed to investigate this subject and which were laid on the table of the House on the 8th of June instant, the proposed investigation is limited to the question as to whether the grant or concession to A. N. C. Treadgold and his associates of the 21st April, 1902, and other similar concessions are likely to be beneficial or injurious to the mining interests of the Yukon Territory.

That was the shape in which the instructions were presented to the House, and upon which the division was taken, and it was to that I referred in my remarks of yesterday.

Mr. BELCOURT. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I want to say that I was clearly within my right in calling the attention of the House last night to the fact that my hon. friend's explanation was not satisfactory to me if it was to other members of the House. My hon. friend stated distinctly that the government had refused to instruct the commissioners to investigate the question of fraud and misrepresentation in connection with these concessions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So they did on that occasion and changed their minds afterwards.

Mr. BELCOURT. I say that these were not the instructions of the government. The instructions were distinctly and clearly to investigate all questions of fraud and misrepresentation and I have proved that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend say that any such instructions as those he has just mentioned are contained in the instructions laid on the table?

Mr. BELCOURT. I say that the return—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not talking about the return but about the instruction.

Mr. BELCOURT. I say that the return laid on the table of this House, and which has been for months in the possession of hon. members, shows clearly that these instructions were given to the commission-

ers, and that the commissioners had acted upon them in every case, and reported in every instance that there was no fraud or misrepresentation in connection with these concessions. It is due therefore to the House that my hon. friend should say he was mistaken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not mistaken. I have seen no instructions other than those to which I have referred, and I am not aware that there were any others laid on the table. The instructions which were laid on the table, and in respect of which this motion was moved, are instructions which limited the investigation to the matters to which I have referred. Upon the resolution, a vote was taken and my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) voted against any extension of those instructions to the commissioners—a circumstance which I think he should have remembered.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition informed me some time ago that he wanted to make some observations with regard to clause 16.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I wish to make a few observations with regard to the supposed difference between section 16, No. 1—by which I shall designate the section as at first introduced—and section No. 2, by which I shall designate the section as now proposed by the government. In one or two speeches recently delivered by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) he remarked that I had been a long time coming to a conclusion that there is no difference between the two sections. My hon. friend was somewhat forgetful in making that statement, because he sat in the House and followed me in debate on the 22nd March, when I expressed the opinion that the two were the same in principle, were practically the same in detail, and certainly the same in substance. No doubt my hon. friend forgot that although he immediately followed me in debate and although the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who spoke a day or two afterwards, controverted very strongly the view I had expressed.

The supposed difference between these two sections has been discussed by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). The argument of the Prime Minister in favour of the amended section as contrasted with the original section was this: He said that the Act of 1875, section 11, was restricted in its operation by an ordinance, and that Sir John Thompson, who was then Minister of Justice, would have disallowed that ordinance in 1890 except that such disallowance would bring into effect another ordinance, the time for disallowing which had expired, and the conclusion of the First Minister, based upon this premise was that, under these circumstances, to bring into operation the Act of 1875 purely and simply would create confusion. I am not able to follow the argument of the Prime Minister in that regard for several reasons. The Act of 1875 has been variously called a sacred compact, a constitutional right, a solemn promise; and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in dealing with it on the 3rd May, said:

> Dealing now with section 16, I would like to say that the second paragraph of that section was added—although in my opinion unnecessarily—because it was not thought advisable to re-enact the provisions of section 11 of the Act of 1875. This is for the purpose of making it quite clear that this parliament was merely carrying out a solemn promise already made. That very paragraph was intended to give legislative sanction to the conditions now existing with respect to grants in aid of education.

And further on he said:

> What are we doing? I say that in the future history of our legislation and in the records of this parliament, it would be a serious reflection upon the people of the Dominion if the solemn promises made in 1875, repeated in 1880, and oft repeated since, were not carried out.

I can hardly understand the argument of my right hon. friend when he suggests that a solemn promise of that character is likely to create confusion. It seems to me that the carrying out of a solemn promise, if it is as distinct and explicit as has been suggested, could not possibly cause any confusion.

The Prime Minister is easily answered. In the first place the Act of 1875 could not be restricted by an ordinance. I take issue with him there, and I base my argument in that regard upon very good authority, namely, the authority in the first place of Sir John Thompson himself, and in the second place that of the Minister of Justice of to-day. Sir John Thompson, in dealing with this question in his report of the 10th January, 1890, said this:

> The ordinance respecting schools does not contain the provision that the statute requires it to contain, but merely contains the provision that the minority may establish a separate school in an organized public school district, thus placing the minority at the mercy of the majority, and only giving the minority the right to establish a separate school, if the majority think proper to organize a public school. It is necessary to point out that the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act, before cited, cannot be abridged by the ordinance and must be considered as still in force, notwithstanding the restrictive terms of the ordinance. In so far

as it is attempted by the ordinance to declare the meaning of the Northwest Territories Act, the ordinance fails of that purpose, and is objectionable as being an interpretation by an inferior legislative body of the Acts of its superior.

That was Sir John Thompson's view, and it is a view in which I think every lawyer in this House would at once concur. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice, speaking in this House during this session, on the 10th May, voiced the same opinion. He said :

In my judgment, section 93 would bring in all the rights and privileges which existed in favour of the denominational schools in the Territories at the present time or at the 1st July coming. These rights and privileges would include all those rights which are covered by section 11 of the Act of 1875 and any subsequent legislation up to the present time, and, in my opinion,—and I must say I have given this matter most careful consideration, and it is my settled opinion—it would cover all the privileges conferred by the Act of 1875, notwithstanding the provision of any ordinances that may have been passed by virtue of that Act.

So, in view of these expressions of opinion by Sir John Thompson himself and by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), I cannot think that there is anything in the distinction which has been claimed by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) between section 16, No. 2, and section 16, No. 1. And let this also be observed in this connection—that in the report to council of Sir John Thompson from which I have just quoted he was not dealing in any way with the character of the schools. The only circumstance to which he was calling attention was this : That whereas the Act of 1875 gave to the minority in the Northwest Territories the right to establish schools whether majority schools had been established or not, the ordinance to which he referred cut down that right, in his opinion, not in respect of the character of the schools, but in respect of the locality in which they could be established. That is to say, the Act of 1875 provided that the minority anywhere might establish a separate school ; whereas, the ordinances passed by virtue of that Act declared that the minority might erect a school in any district where a majority school had been established—in other words they might create a separate school in any established school district.

Now, the Minister of Justice read a very carefully prepared opinion with regard to the supposed difference of section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. I have heard my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) sometimes compliment hon. gentlemen on this side of the House upon their efforts to becloud the issue. I feel very much like returning the compliment to my hon. friend on this occasion. Let us see just what the hon. gentleman did say on this subject. I am not confining myself to his opinion read in the House on May 15th, but I am also taking—as I have a right to do—the expression of his opinion given to the House and to the committee on previous occasions. Relying on all these sources of information, what do we find that section 16, No. 1, accomplishes, according to the argument of my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), who, outside of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), were, I believe, the principal speakers on that side of the House with regard to this question ? The effect of section 16, No. 1, according to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) in the speech which he delivered on the second reading of this Bill was as follows :

The Bill re-enacts clause 14 of the Act of 1875, and thus it is revived, crystallized and made absolutely certain.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton), no doubt, referred to clause 11 of the Act of 1875, because that clause is numbered 14 in the Revised Statutes, and in that way he got the number as 14 instead of 11. So, section 16, No. 1, revised, crystallized and re-enacted section 11 of the Act of 1875. Now, what did section 11 of the Act of 1875 mean ? What did it accomplish ? My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in the opinion to which I have already referred, passed over the meaning of section 16, No. 1, very lightly. He declared :

The meaning of this section was expressed in the earlier school ordinances.

That is a very important statement indeed by the Minister of Justice. I rely upon it because he was not speaking without preparation ; he was not speaking in the heat of debate ; he was reading from a carefully prepared opinion. Therefore, I attach an importance to these words which I would not feel inclined to do if I were dealing with the words of the Minister of Justice in ordinary debate. Well, then, we are to get the meaning of the Act of 1875 by referring to the earlier school ordinances. Let us see what the earlier school ordinances were, because according to the deliberate opinion of the Minister of Justice they set forth the meaning of the Act of 1875. My hon. friend the member for Brandon has relieved me of the necessity of quoting the earlier school ordinances, because he has set forth in his speech on the second reading of the Bill the effect of these earlier school ordinances, and I will read his words as a fair statement of what the earlier school ordinances accomplished. He said, referring to the Act of 1875 :

What followed the passing of this law ? There was established in the Northwest Territories a complete dual system of schools, a system of schools under which the denomination regulated the text-books and the conduct of the teacher, and by which everything which pertains to the

Roman Catholic schools was directly under the control of a Roman Catholic board of education. We had in the Northwest Territories at that time under that Act, to all intents and purposes what are generally known as church schools or clerically controlled schools.

To the same effect is the opinion of certain members of the legal profession who sit on the other side of the House. For instance the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont) said :

The Act of 1875 would fasten on the Territories for all time to come an absolute dual system of sectarian schools.

And the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) said :

The minority, under the Act of 1875, might be entitled to a full system of separate schools.

And the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said referring to the Act of 1875 :

We would fasten on the new provinces the system of clerical schools which the people abolished in 1892.

This, then, according to the direct statement of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and other gentlemen on the other side of the House is the effect of section 16, No. 1, because it brings into force according to their argument, section 11 of the Act of 1875.

Now we come to consider the meaning of section 16, No. 2. we have to inquire in what respect section 16, No. 2, differs from section 16, No. 1. Section 11 of the Act of 1875, omitting the immaterial words—is as follows—and I adopt, for the sake of convenience, the summary of that section which is given by the Minister of Justice in the opinion which he read to this House :

Section 11, Act of 1875, empowering the majority of the ratepayers of any . . . portion of the Northwest Territories . . . to establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and the minority of the ratepayers in any . . . portion of the Territories to establish 'Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools.'

Now let us look at section 16, No. 2, and see what becomes of it. Subsection 1 of section 16, No. 2 is as follows :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

Now I have already explained in this House that in my opinion section 16, No. 2, does not in any way perpetuate a system of schools in the new provinces to be established in the Northwest. The people of the new provinces in the Northwest can, under the proposed law, make any change in their system that they see fit, subject to the provision contained in section 16, No. 2, that separate schools must be at all times established in the new provinces, provided the minority claim and demand such schools. It is not a system which is being perpetuated, it is a certain limitation upon the legislative freedom of the new provinces which is being perpetuated by the legislation we have before us. Let us see what are the rights and privileges which the minority thus receive under section 16, No. 2. Let us remember that nothing in any law which shall be passed by the new provinces is to prejudically affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act, under the terms of chapters 29 and 30. Chapter 29 of the Revised Ordinances of the Northwest Territories, section 41, is in these words :

The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such a case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereto.

If I understand the English language, you have in chapter 29, section 41, which is thus perpetuated as part of the constitution of the new provinces for ever, exactly the same provisions as those which are to be found in the Act of 1875. Every important or effective word, so far as I understand it, that is to be found in the Act of 1875, is to be found here. Section 16, No. 1, perpetuates the Act of 1875 in so far as that Act provides for separate schools in the Territories. That was the intention, that was the direct enactment, of section 16, No. 1. Section 16, No. 2, does the same thing indirectly. It does not directly re-enact the Act of 1875 as a part of the constitution, but it re-enacts this part of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories as part of the constitution, it re-enacts the chapter and section of the ordinances to which I have just referred, and which are thus made part of the constitution of the new provinces for all time to come. The provisions of that section are to all intents and purposes, so far as my understanding goes, the same as the Act of 1875. Let us test the question in another way. Up to the present time I have been comparing the Act of 1875 with section 16, No. 2, and I have done that because the Act of 1875 was re-enacted in section 16, No. 1. Let us now take section 16, No. 1 directly, and compare it with section 16, No. 2, and with the ordinance which is brought into force by section 16, No. 2. In subsection 2 of section 16, No. 1, omitting the immaterial words, you have the words which constitute a protection to the minority in the Northwest. I will read them, omitting all immaterial words, as my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has done in regard to the Act of 1875. Section 2 of sec-

tion 16, No. 1, omitting these immaterial words, is as follows :

> The minority of the ratepayers therein (that is to say, in any established school district), whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools, shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

That is the essential and material part of section 16, No. 1, so far as it perpetuates the right of separate schools in the new provinces in the Northwest Territories. Now let us read chapter 29, section 41, of the Northwest ordinances once more, and see how the words of that section, which is perpetuated by section 16, No. 2, compare with those I have just read :

> The minority of the ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.

There are the same identical words with one or two absolutely minor and immaterial changes, the words of chapter 29, section 41, on the one hand, perpetuated by section 16, No. 2, and on the other hand, the words of the Act of 1875 which I have just read, perpetuated as a part of the constitution of the Territories by section 16, No. 1. The expressions in both cases are in meaning absolutely the same, and in form of expression almost identical. To sum up : Section 16, No. 1, according to the view of the government as expressed by the Minister of Justice, brought into force the Act of 1875, both by means of section 93 of the British North America Act and by direct re-enactment in subsection 2 of that section ; section 16, No. 2, brings into force the same Act of 1875 by preserving all rights under chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances, in which chapters everything in this respect contained in the Act of 1875, is directly set forth and re-enacted. In other words, section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, proceed by different routes, but arrive at precisely the same goal in that regard.

Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, at page 5985 of 'Hansard,' uses language which was apparently intended to suggest that under section 16, No. 2, less rights and privileges are accorded to the minority than under section 16, No. 1. I have already demonstrated, to my own satisfaction at least, that section 16, No. 2, gives all that the Territorial Act of 1875 give, because it practically re-enacts it; in truth, however, it seems to me to give more : in the first place it gives the right of separation which is the only thing given by the Act of 1875. The expression 'separate schools' is not a technical expression ; it has not so far as I understand any technical meaning ; it means exactly what it says : the right of separation. Section 16, No. 2, also gives the half hour of religious instruction and this was not guaranteed by the Act of 1875. The position then of the hon. member for Brandon is this : that he resigned as a cabinet minister because of the provision of section 16, No. 1, and he came back under the provisions of section 16, No. 2, which, so far as the character of the schools is concerned concedes all and more than all that was guaranteed by the Act of 1875. And yet, he reflects upon his colleagues by referring to his own independent action, laughs at the draughtsman who framed these clauses, and professes thoroughly to understand the effect of section 16, No. 2. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Sifton) if he were here, that the next time he undertakes to set his wits against those of the draughtsman, in the preparation of Bills, it would be well for him to get some member of the profession to come to his assistance, because I think I have already demonstrated (and I intend to still more fully demonstrate) that in this respect the hon. gentleman does not know exactly where he stands, and that instead of section 16, No. 2, being any concession to the opinions which he voiced in this House, section 16, No. 2, goes further away from these opinions and from the policy which he has expressed in the past than did section 16, No. 1.

Section 16, No. 1, contains certain provisions with regard to state aid ; section 16, No. 2, also contains certain provisions with regard to state aid. The hon. member for Brandon was very much exercised about the possibilities under section 16, No. 1. He said, speaking in this House, 'Hansard,' page 3106 :

> I am fairly confident that it is an opinion that will be justified by any court to which it may be referred, that the effect of that clause will be that if twenty years from now the province of Alberta undertook to appropriate $250,000 to build and equip a provincial university, a proportionate amount of money, proportionate to the number of separate schools as compared with the public schools, would have to be set aside for the establishment of a separate school institution.

Let us look at the provisions of section 16, No. 1. They are as follows :

> In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature in aid of education and in the distribution of any moneys paid to the government of the said province arising from the school fund established by the Dominion Lands Act, there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools ; and such moneys shall be applied to the support of public and separate schools in equitable shares or proportions.

The provision in section 16, No. 2, is as follows :

In the appropriation by the legislature or distribution by the government of the province of any moneys for the support of schools organized and carried on in accordance with said chapter 29, or any Act passed in amendment thereof, or in substitution therefor, there shall be no discrimination against schools of any class described in said chapter 29.

To understand what schools are described in chapter 29 we must go to the provisions of that chapter, and we find that in section 4, to which reference is made, the following schools are described :

The department shall have the control and management of all kindergarten schools, public and separate schools, normal schools, teachers' institutes and the education of deaf, mute and blind persons.

As will be readily seen by any hon. gentleman who has followed my remarks the effect therefore, is simply this : under the terms of section 16, No. 1, there shall be no discrimination in state aid between public schools and separate schools; according to section 16, No. 2, there shall be no discrimination in state aid against kindergarten schools, public and separate schools, normal schools or teachers' institutes. In this there is no reference to universities and no words wider than 'public and separate schools.' If we read into section 16, No. 2, the material provisions of the ordinance chapter 29, section 4, which I have just read, then section 16, No. 2, will read as follows :

In the appropriation by the legislature of public moneys there shall be no discrimination against public or separate schools.

That is what my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Sifton) is willing to accept and the provision which he was not willing to accept (ommitting the immaterial words) was:

In the appropriation of public moneys by the legislature there shall be no discrimination between the public schools and the separate schools ; such moneys shall be applied in support of public and separate schools in equitable rates or proportions.

Now, to sum up, the effect is just this. The same schools are named in section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2 ; in the one case they are named by express mention and in the other case by express reference. In the next place, if the word 'school' includes universities the danger which appals the hon. gentleman for Brandon still remains. If the word 'school' does not include universities, then the danger that appals the hon. member for Brandon never existed. That is the sum and substance of the difference, the alleged difference, the supposed difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, so far as state aid is concerned.

But the hon. member for Brandon was not quite equal to the draughtsman in another respect. Section 16, No. 1, did not define the meaning of the words 'by law' in section 93, subsection 3 of the British North America Act. Therefore there was grave doubt whether remedial legislation could be enacted by parliament by reason of laws existing in the new province while under territorial restriction. This of course would not apply to laws enacted by the provinces after they had been constituted as provinces. Section 16, No. 1, left the constitution untouched in that respect ; section 16, No. 2, defines the words 'by law,' as meaning the law set out in chapters 29 and 30. The effect of this is to give further opportunities for remedial legislation and to leave all Canada liable to be disturbed by future agitation which in my opinion should be entirely confined to the provincial arena. In this respect also the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) was not, I think, quite equal to the occasion when he undertook to revise or consider the work of the draughtsmen in that regard. The Minister of Justice said a very significent thing on one occasion in this House. He said that some censure had been passed on the draughtsman of the Manitoba Act ; he was determined that no such censure should be passed upon the draughtsman of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts, and I think I may fairly congratulate the Minister of Justice on this that he has at least proved himself more than equal to the member for Brandon in any little skirmishing that has taken place between them in connection with the wording of these sections.

But the draughtsman did not finish with the member for Brandon here. There is another little point that seems to have escaped the observation of that hon. gentleman. Section 16, No. 1, brought into force section 93 of the British North America Act with certain amendations. I shall read that subsection :

The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

Now section 93 of the British North America Act subsection 1 is as follows :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

This therefore preserved rights in respect of denominational schools and in respect of denominational schools only. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and a great many other speakers in this House have declared and reiterated that there are no denominational schools in the Northwest and therefore a provision preserving rights in respect of denominational schools west and in that case a provision preserving would have no force in the new provinces. In order that I may not do

the hon. member for Brandon any injustice, as he is not present here to-day, I shall read his remarks upon that subject. His words are these :

> I have read these extracts for the purpose of showing that when the ordinance of 1892 was passed the distinctive character of these schools as separate schools, as denominational schools, as schools controlled by a sectarian body for sectarian purposes absolutely disappeared.

You will observe he says their character as denominational schools absolutely disappeared. He goes on further referring to subsection 1 of section 16, No. 2 :

> This section preserves the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority to have their school, a separate school in name, but a public school in fact, in a separate building if they wish. That is the right it preserves. It preserves secondly the right of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority in such school to have religious teaching from 3.30 to 4 o'clock in the afternoon. . . . In the first place there is no such thing as a denominational school. Whether it is a separate school or a public school, a Catholic separate school or a Protestant separate school, it is a secular school from 9 a.m. to 3.30 p.m.

Therefore according to the statement of the hon. member for Brandon, according to the argument advanced by the gentlemen from the Northweest, there are no denominational schools, and therefore no rights to be preserved, but in the amended section 16, No. 2. the word 'denominational' which occurs in the British North America Act is changed to the word 'separate.' Under the New Brunswick Act as has already been pointed out, a question arose with regard to the character of certain schools as to whether or not they were denominational and it was held that they were not denominational and therefore no rights were preserved. The word 'denominational' would not preserve certain rights but the word 'denominational' is changed by section 16, No. 2 to which I have referred and in that respect a material departure from the British North America Act is made by that section 2, although not by section 16, No. 1.

Now one or two general observations with regard to the opinion of the Minister of Justice. I pass over for the moment the circumstance that he entirely ignores the possible effect of section 2. I think on one occasion in this House he stated that section 2 of this Bill as well as of the Haultain Bill might possibly make section 93 applicable—he may have done so here.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not in my statement, but in my speech ; I argued in my speech that section 2 made section 93 applicable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I shall pass that over for the moment but I shall speak of it before I close. The Minister of Justice also declared that not a single province can exclusively make laws at the present time with regard to education. That is true in one sense and not quite accurate in another sense. As was pointed out by the hon. member for the city and county of St. John (Mr. Stockton), the legislature of New Brunswick is the only authority within the province of New Brunswick which can deal with the question of education. The same thing is true of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia. But it is quite true—and I have no doubt the Minister of Justice meant this—that, if any one of these provinces should confer by law certain privileges on any class of persons resident within the province, then the remedial powers of the Dominion executive and of the Dominion parliament could be invoked.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a reserve power in the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point I desire to emphasize—and I know the Minister of Justice and I are absolutely at one about it—is that until the legislatures of these provinces voluntarily put themselves in a certain position defined by the British North America Act, they have the exclusive right to deal with the question of education. As soon as they confer any rights and privileges on the minority then they subject themselves to the remedial powers which are familiar to every hon. gentleman in this House, and if they do that they do it voluntarily, and within their own powers ; they are not acting under any compulsion, but their will is absolutely free and untrammelled.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The result is to bring them under the restriction of section 93.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so, and I pointed out I think in speaking on the second reading of this Bill that possibly that very circumstance, that very provision of the British North America Act, has deterred the legislatures of those provinces from enacting legislation conferring rights by law upon minorities which they otherwise would have enacted. The moment they give the minority certain rights by law, then they subject themselves to the remedial powers of the Dominion executive and parliament, and this seems to me a very apt illustration of the truth that sometimes an attempt to force by law that which would be freely given without compulsion is in the end of no effect.

Then the Minister of Justice refers to the Bill suggested by Mr. Haultain. It is sufficient for the present purpose to say we are not discussing the Bill submitted by Mr. Haultain ; we are discussing the Bill introduced by this administration. If the administration desire to rely upon any provisions in Mr. Haultain's Bill—and my

hon. friend the Minister of Justice was referring to clause 2 of that Bill—we can put the matter to a very simple test. Eliminate section 16, No. 2, as you have already eliminated section 16, No. 1 and let this question be tested upon the provisions of section 2 of this Bill which are substantially the same as those of section 2 of Mr. Haultain's Bill. If Mr. Haultain's Bill was sufficient to accomplish the purpose claimed by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, there need be no further discussion about the question at all. Eliminate section 16, No. 2, as you have already eliminated section 16, No. 1, and let all parties stand upon their rights in respect of section 2 of Mr. Haultain's Bill. I might also observe in passing that in discussing the effect of section 16 of this Bill and section 2 of Mr. Haultain's Bill, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice seems to me to have overlooked the definition of the words 'by law' which he has introduced into section 16, No. 2.

The Minister of Justice also says that he has merely defined the word 'province' and the words 'at the union' in order to remove doubt; but my hon. friend is too good a lawyer to require to be told that express legislation may be affected by definition. Here it is just the same as if he had substituted a new section containing the interpretation which he has given to those words. There cannot be any doubt about that, and I know that my hon. friend has not any doubt on that point. My hon. friend also observed at page 6201, unrevised 'Hansard,' that under the present ordinances the schools are schools of all the ratepayers. Is this intended as a distinction? By chapter 29, section 41, and chapter 30, section 8, of the ordinances, the minority ratepayers are taxed for only their own schools.

Now, I have just one further observation to make with regard to the reliance which has been placed upon what has been called the sacred compact, the constitutional right, the solemn promise, made by the Act of 1875, and to which it is alleged that the people of the Northwest Territories are entitled under the provisions of the British North America Act. I would like to observe to my hon. friend the Prime Minister that if section 11 of the Act of 1875 was a solemn compact, how does he distinguish the provisions of the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1886, chapter 50, section 110, which were first enacted in the year 1881? That section was as follows:

> Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the legislative assembly of the Territories and in the proceedings before the courts; and both those languages shall be used in the records and journals of such assembly; and all ordinances made under this Act shall be printed in both those languages.

It does not seem to me that because a particular provision was made in 1875, and another particular provision was made in 1881 by the same authority, the latter is less a pledge or a promise or a constitutional right than the former. In the one case, in 1875, a certain temporary provision, as I understand it, was made with regard to separate schools in the Territories so long as they should be Territories. In the other case, in 1881, a particular provision was made with regard to the use of the English and French languages in the debates of the council and the legislative assembly of the Territories; and if you are to call one a solemn promise and compact and constitutional right, why should you not call the other a solemn promise and compact and constitutional right? I do not at the moment have my attention called to any possible distinction which could be made in principle between the one and the other. My right hon. friend very well remembers that in 1890 there was a debate in regard to this matter, and a Bill was introduced, I think, by the late Mr. Dalton McCarthy; and eventually, at some stage of the debate, the following resolution was moved by Sir John Thompson:

> That this House having regard to the long-continued use of the French language in old Canada, and to the covenants on that subject embodied in the British North America Act, cannot agree to the declaration contained in the said Bill as the basis thereof, namely, that it is expedient in the interest of the national unity of the Dominion that there should be community of language amongst the people of Canada. That, on the contrary, this House declares its adherence to the said covenants and its determination to resist any attempt to impair the same. That at the same time this House deems it expedient and proper, and not inconsistent with those covenants, that the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories should receive from the parliament of Canada power to regulate, after the next general elections of the assembly, the proceedings of the assembly and the manner of recording and publishing such proceedings.

That gave occasion for debate, and my right hon. friend the Prime Minister supported this resolution of Sir John Thompson, saying in part as follows:

> The amendment of my right hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, tends to uphold provincial rights and local autonomy, and I am happy to extend my congratulations to the Prime Minister and to his government that more and more and day by day the force of circumstances brings them over to the principle.

I am afraid that I can hardly convey the same congratulations to the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues in respect of their attitude upon the Bills which are now before the House for discussion. The right hon. gentleman continued:

> I always have stated publicly, as well as privately, and I have never disguised my thoughts on this matter, that, in my judgment,

sooner or later, this question had to be settled upon the broad basis of local autonomy.

Referring to Mr. Beausoleil, a former member of this House, he said :

I know he is acting for the best interests of his country, according to his lights, and I am sure he will give me credit that in voting as I shall have to do with the government on this question, I do so not out of any love to the government, but with the conviction that in so doing I am acting in the best interest of my party and my country.

The resolution to which I have referred was followed by legislation in 1891, which practically re-enacted the Act of 1881 which I have just quoted, but added to it the following proviso :

Provided, however, that after the next general election of the legislative assembly, such assembly may, by ordinance or otherwise, regulate its proceedings and the manner of recording and publishing the same and the regulations so made shall be embodied in a proclamation which shall be forthwith made and published by the lieutenant governor in conformity with the law, and thereafter shall have full force and effect.

The result of that was that on the 19th of January, 1892, it was moved in the Northwest assembly by Mr. Haultain, seconded by Mr. Tweed, and resolved :

That it is desirable that the proceedings of the legislative assembly shall be recorded and published hereafter in the English language only.

As I said before, if the Act of 1875 was a solemn compact, why have we not in this Bill some provision for preventing the provinces from abolishing the French language? Why have we not some provision for enforcing the compact made in 1881, which, if we are to regard the Act of 1875 as a compact, is equally binding upon us ? Our position is to apply the constitution and abide loyally by the result. This position is regarded in some quarters as intolerant, but it is infinitely more tolerant than those who rail against it.

It is said by some in this House—not by the Minister of Justice, he would be the last to say it—that the enactment of section 16 in the form in which we have it to-day will prevent any litigation or contest in the courts as to its meaning. Nothing more ridiculous could emanate from the mouth of any hon. gentleman in this House. The constitution has been interpreted by the courts, I suppose, a thousand times since 1867. I am sure it has been interpreted in the courts of my own little province at least a hundred times. It will continue to be interpreted by our courts. The complexity of human, of national affairs, is so great that it is absolutely impossible to make in any written constitution everything so absolutely plain that we shall not have recourse to the courts. The history of the United States for 130 years, the history of our own country for thirty-five years, gives ample proof of what I am saying. Those who speak of preventing recourse to the courts do not understand what they are talking about or they have very little knowledge of the extent to which our courts have been appealed to for the purpose of interpreting the constitution.

As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to stand by every compact. I am reminded by the presence of my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that he rather misquoted me in making some observations on my speech on the second reading. He said I referred to a written contract. I did not use the word 'written.' I said I was prepared to stand by any compact. When my hon. friend, the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) endeavoured to point out a certain compact by which we were bound I asked him this question :

What I would like to know is whether the hon. gentleman contends that in this compact to which he has just referred, and which was made in London, there is anything which is not also in the British North America Act.

He replied no, there was not. Well, Sir, the position of myself and of those who think as I do in this regard is that the whole compact is in the British North America Act, and that we do full justice to all rights—to the rights of the majority as well as those of the minority—when we apply that Act to the new provinces.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, was good enough, for the purpose of convenience, to place in my hands an opinion prepared, as I understand, by his deputy minister—a very able lawyer, for whose opinion both the Minister of Justice and myself have the highest possible regard—with regard, not to clause No. 16 which we are now discussing, but clause 15, and with regard to certain criticisms which I made upon the language of that section. I observe that my hon. friend, the Deputy Minister of Justice, considered that the criticisms which were made by myself and others on that clause were based on what he regards as a misunderstanding. That may be quite true, but I think there is also a misunderstanding upon the part of the deputy minister. That gentleman failed to realize that when we are dealing with clause 16 or clause 15 or any other clause of this Bill, we must in the end, on this side of the House, direct our criticism towards such amendment as will, according to the views of the law officers of the Crown, bring about the results we desire. We may have our own views as to what the clause is, but in the end the government will insist that the opinion of the law officers of the Crown shall guide them,—and properly so. No government could be administered on any other principle. Therefore the ultimate criticism which we may make upon clause 15 or clause 16 or any other clause, must naturally and necessarily

have regard to the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice, in so far, of course, as it does not affect any question of principle upon which we stand. I am speaking now altogether of the framing of the sections, the forms of expression, after once the principle has been determined. But my friend, the Deputy Minister of Justice, used language in this memo. which, I understand, I am at liberty to use ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I look upon it as the statement of a public officer which is free to every member of the House, and bearing in mind that he was the draughtsman of section 15.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am aware of that. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice will stand by section 16 and will not deny himself the right of claiming that he is the draughtsman of that section. I shall read certain observations of the Deputy Minister of Justice, in this opinion, which seems to me to illuminate very greatly the question to which I have just now been adverting—the question as to whether or not the Act of 1875 constitutes a compact to which regard must be had when we are framing a constitution for the new province; and I do not think anything has been said or quoted by any hon. gentleman on this side which is more absolutely destructive of the position of the government in this regard than are the words of the deputy minister to which I now call attention. In referring to clause 15, he says :

> The criticism of the clause is, I think, largely, if not altogether, founded on misapprehension. It is, as I understand it, suggested that these words may enlarge or limit the constitutional powers of parliament or the legislature of Alberta. They can, I submit, have no such effect.

He is dealing with clause 15, which contains a reference to certain laws now in force in the Territories, and the question was whether or not, by the language of section 15, those would be continued as a part of the constitution of the Northwest Territories, so that they could not be changed afterwards, either by the parliament of Canada or the legislature of a province. It is necessary that I should state that, in order that hon. gentlemen on both sides may realize the full significance of the words of the deputy minister. I shall begin again the quotation, in order not to interrupt the continuity of Mr. Newcombe's opinion :

> The criticism of the clause is, I think, largely, if not altogether, founded on a misapprehension. It is, as I understand it, suggested that these words may enlarge or limit the constitutional powers of parliament or of the legislature of Alberta. They can, I submit, have no such effect. The Northwest Territories Act, so far as it affects constitutional powers, is merely a delegation by parliament to the assembly of the Territories of certain legislative authority for the government of the Territories provisionally. The territorial assembly is, with all its constituent authority, by the provincial Acts abolished, and two new legislative bodies are established with provincial powers. They differ in their nature from the Territorial assembly, and are in no proper sense successors to it. It cannot, I think, be argued that because the Territorial assembly had certain legislative powers, the provincial legislature, in the absence of provisions to the contrary, must thereafter have the same powers. A provision in the Northwest Territories Act, for instance, that the Territorial assembly may legislate in respect of education, could not, by reason of the clause in question, be held to confer any power with respect to education upon the provincial assembly. First, because it is no application whatever to the provincial assembly, and secondly, because the constitution and powers of the provincial assembly are comprehensively provided by the express provisions of the provincial Act.

Nothing more forcible or severe could be said with regard to the Act of 1875. The Deputy Minister of Justice, in giving this opinion, was dealing with the question of legislative power. He said that we cannot because a certain power was possessed by the Territorial assembly argue, under section 15, that any similar power shall be possessed by the provincial legislature. Tenfold stronger, it seems to me, is the argument that we cannot in any sense argue that, because there is a restriction upon the legislative assembly of the Territories, that same restriction shall continue as a restriction upon the legislatures of the new provinces. The argument is more forcible in the case of a restriction than in the case of a power. He continued—I omit some portion referring to my contention as to section 15—

> The other section to which Mr. Borden refers is section 14 of the Northwest Territories Act with regard to education. This seems to be a case where it is clearly otherwise provided by this Act, inasmuch as the provincial Acts contain express provisions determining the provincial powers with regard to education, but if they did not contain any such provisions I do not see how it could be argued that a power, which the Territorial assembly had, can without apt words be made to apply to the two provincial assemblies; they are not continuations of the Territorial assembly ; they derive no powers by reference to its constitution; they are new bodies created in the execution of special powers by parliament, and there is no room for the application to them of the laws previously defining the constitution of the Territorial assembly.

Now, I venture to submit that the observations of so eminent a lawyer as the Deputy Minister of Justice, concurred in, as they seem to be with respect to section 15, by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, apply with even more force to the argument which has been made by the government as to the necessity for embodying the Act of 1875 in the constitution of the new provinces. As has been forcibly pointed out by Mr. Newcombe, the legislative assembly of the province is not the successor of the legislative assembly of the

Territories. Parliament, in 1875, was making a temporary provision for the Territories as territories. In 1905 parliament is creating a permanent constitution for the new provinces in the Northwest, a constitution which this parliament cannot alter or amend after it has once been framed. My observations on the matter which I have just referred to are connected, to a certain extent, with the discussion of section 16 and with the discussion of section 2, which is to take place, as I understand, by arrangement, at the same time. They are not, of course, directly connected with the subject upon which I first addressed the House, whether or not there is any real, substantial difference between the effect of section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. And, while I have every possible regard for the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick)—a regard so high that when I find myself differing from him I always have a great deal of doubt as to the correctness of my own opinion—yet I must add that, after all, I do not find in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, read in this House on May 15th, anything that controverts what I have said to-day. For he took particular pains, it seems to me, not to state that there was any real difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. He only said, so far as section 16, No. 1, is concerned, that the meaning of it was expressed in the earlier school ordinances. That is all he says about it; but then he goes on to tell us what is his view as to section 16, No. 2. I do not find in his opinion, after all, anything that is diametrically—or, indeed, at all—opposed to the view which I have expressed to-day. And it gives me a great deal of satisfaction to find that, in expressing the view I have just ventured to place before this House, I do not find myself, as it seems to me, in conflict with the opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I do not know that it would be possible for me to add very much to what I have already said on this subject. I do not think there is anything very new that I have to offer; and, perhaps my hon. friends opposite may say, there is nothing very useful in what I shall add. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has been good enough to say that we differ in our opinions as to the meaning of these two sections 16—No. 1 and No. 2. I regret that we should differ; because I had hoped that on a matter of this sort the lawyers in the House who have given this question their serious consideration might have been at one. However, lawyers, like doctors, I presume, must agree to differ. Having listened with the greatest possible attention to what my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) said, when speaking on the second reading of the Bill, and to what he said to-day, I am inclined to believe that Mr. Haultain was quite right when in the interview published in the 'Mail and Empire,' and afterwards in the Winnipeg 'Tribune,' he stated that he had a great deal of difficulty in convincing the leader of the opposition to take the position he now takes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware that Mr. Haultain had so stated.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) was aware of it. But I will read what Mr. Haultain said. This was published in the Winnipeg 'Tribune' of May 12th, 1905, and purports to be a reproduction of the correspondence of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire':

> Mr. Haultain is confident that his contention as to the unconstitutionality of the autonomy measures, so far as the educational clauses are concerned, is sound, and cannot be successfully assailed. He goes even further than Mr. Christopher Robinson in this respect. There were those at Ottawa who were disposed to view with complacent concurrence this element of the Bills as but confirming by statute what already existed. Mr. Haultain had difficulty in convincing those that the proposed legislation was not only constitutionally defective in its conception, but would prove extremely dangerous in its application. It was some time before even Mr. Borden would recognize this, and it required deep reasoning with him to convince him that it was so, but finally he saw the weakness of the thing and the result was the magnificent speech which he delivered on the constitutional aspects of the legislation.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask if that is Mr. Haultain's statement?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I made it quite clear that I quoted from the Winnipeg 'Tribune' what purported to be a reproduction of the correspondence of the Toronto 'Mail and Empire.'

Mr. FOSTER. So it is a correspondent's statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never heard of it before.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not think that I was quite justified in drawing attention to it, because really if Mr. Haultain did make such a statement he is in the invidious position of saying that Mr. Christopher Robinson is all wrong, Mr. Borden is all wrong and Sir John Thompson was all wrong in 1891, but Mr. Haultain is all right. But those who differ from him are in excellent company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should have a great deal of doubt that Mr. Haultain ever expressed himself in that way, it is not likely.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is what he is reported to have said in these newspapers. I have here a report of an interview with him, published in the Toronto 'News' of

April 14, where he discusses the ordinances of 1892, and expresses himself in almost the same language with respect to Sir John Thompson. He does not mention Sir John Thompson, but those who are familar with all the occurrences know that he refers to Sir John Thompson. In this interview, Mr. Haultain :

Denies that the ordinance of 1892 was a stroke which swept away the dual system, as Mr. Sifton contends. Still more strongly does he deny that the law of 1892 was unconstitutional. He absolutely denies that he ever admitted that it was ultra vires. On the contrary, his written official statements are accessible, and they emphatically defend that legislation, while the ordinance of 1892 was a consolidation, and the principal portion of the educational legislation had been passed in 1891 and earlier.

As my hon. friend will see, Mr. Haultain here states himself as opposed to so eminent an authority as Sir John Thompson. However, that is by the way. I did not intend to take up the time of the House with matters of that sort ; I will now come down to these two sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think perhaps my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is doing Mr. Haultain an injustice, because I happen to have a copy of this interview. The report containing the opinion of Sir John Thompson was made in 1890 ; Mr. Haultain is referring to the ordinance of 1892 in this interview.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will deal with that further on. We are now endeavouring to deal with the two sections, No. 1 and No. 2, following the description given of them by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition for greater accuracy and perhaps for greater clearness. My hon. friend has said, though I am sure he did not really mean it, that I attempted to befog the issue, and endeavoured to gather clouds about these two sections instead of pointing out what is meant by them. I will endeavour now to make my meaning clear so far as it is possible for me to do so. The first paragraph of section 16, No. 1, provides :

The provisions of section 93 of the British North America Act, 1867, shall apply to the said province as if, at the date upon which this Act comes into force, the territory comprised therein were already a province, the expression 'the union' in the said section being taken to mean the said date.

Now what is the effect of that provision if this Bill becomes law ? The effect would be to apply section 93 of the British North America Act to the new provinces, and section 93 would apply in this way :

In and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education, subject and according to the following provisions :

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which any class of persons have by law in the province at the union.

At the time a territory came in as a province, that is what the words would mean. Now what is it necessary for us to do ? All that it is necessary for us to do is to understand the meaning of the words 'by law' and 'right or privilege.' What are the rights or privileges which any class of persons have by law in the territory at the present time ?—assuming of course that there will be no change before the 1st of July. They have at the present time by law all the rights and privileges which are guaranteed by the Act of 1875, section 11. Now what are the rights and privileges which are guaranteed to them by section 11 of the Act of 1875 ? I said that these rights and privileges have been incorporated in the earlier ordinance I referred to, the ordinance of 1884. What does the ordinance of 1884, No. 5, section 25, say :

In accordance with the provisions of section 10 of the Northwest Territories Act, 1880——

That is the Act continuing the Act of 1875, and practically it is the same Act, providing for the establishment of separate schools.

—it shall be lawful for any number of property holders resident within the limits of any public school district, or within two or more adjoining public school districts, or some of whom are within the limits of an organized school district, and others on adjacent lands not included within such limits, to be erected into a separate school district by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor, with the same rights, powers, privileges, liabilities and method of government throughout as hereinbefore provided in the case of public school districts.

There is the reproduction in terms of the Act of 1875. Now how was that acted upon, what was the result ? The result was that you had in the Northwest Territories four classes of schools : the Protestant public school, the Catholic public school, the Protestant separate school and the Catholic separate school ; or in other words, Protestant schools, either public or separate, and Catholic schools, either public or separate ; therefore you have a dual system of education. Now what happened after that ? You have then the ordinance of 1887. I fear I may weary the House by reading these ordinances, but perhaps they may be useful for reference. Section 37 of the ordinance of 1887 provides :

In accordance with the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act providing for the establishment of separate schools, it shall be lawful for any number of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, the same being a minority of the ratepayers resident within the limits of an organized public school district, to establish a separate school therein, by proclamation of the lieutenant governor, with the same rights, powers, privileges, liabilities and methods of government as herein provided in the case of public school districts.

That is the ordinance of 1887 which is reproduced in the ordinance of 1888, almost in words. There is a slight difference with respect to another section which I have not read, and which is not important for my present purpose. Now there is a departure from the principle settled by the Act of 1875 which created a dual system. This Act provides that it is only the minority of the ratepayers in a school district that have the right to establish a separate school.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That was not a question of the character of the schools; was it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course it was a question of the character of the schools.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the Minister of Justice, so as to make me clear about it, say what is the difference between a Catholic public school and a Catholic separate school?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The difference consists in this: That a Catholic public school is a school of the majority in a district where the Catholics are in the majority, and a Catholic separate school is a school of the minority in a district where the Catholics are in the minority. There is no difference between them; they are both separate schools except that in one case it is the school of the majority and in the other case it is the school of the minority. In reality there is no distinction under the Northwest system, as I understand it, between Protestant and Catholic schools; the distinction is between the schools of the majority and the schools of the minority.

Mr. STOCKTON. Would it not be a public school in both cases; there would be no Catholic or Protestant about it?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the ordinances of 1888 were submitted to the Minister of Justice for revision as it is usual, he examined this particular section to ascertain how far it was intra vires of the Northwest assembly. Here is what Sir John Thompson said:

> The undersigned has, however, to call attention to another particular, in respect of which he finds that the ordinance does not strictly conform to the requirements of the Act under which it was framed.
>
> Section 14 of the Northwest Territories Act (chap. 50, R.S.C.) provides, that ordinances in respect of education may be made in the Territories, but stipulates that in such ordinances it shall 'always be provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Territories, by whatever name the same is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor, and also that a minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein.'
>
> The ordinance respecting schools does not contain the provisions that the statute requires it to contain, but merely contains the provision that the minority may establish a separate school in an organized public school district, thus placing the minority at the mercy of the majority, and only giving the minority the right to establish a separate school, if the majority think proper to organize a public school. It is necessary to point out that the provisions of the Northwest Territories Act, before cited, cannot be abridged by the ordinance, and must be considered as still in force, notwithstanding the restrictive terms of the ordinance. In so far as it is attempted by the ordinance to declare the meaning of the Northwest Territories Act, the ordinance fails of that purpose, and is objectionable as being an interpretation by an inferior legislative body of the Acts of its superior.
>
> The undersigned only refrains from recommending the disallowance of this ordinance in consequence of its being merely a re-enactment of an earlier ordinance which disallowance would not affect, and which was allowed to go into operation, probably because attention was not called to this provision. The undersigned has the honour to recommend that the ordinance bringing these revised ordinances into effect, be allowed to go into operation.

So that you have it on the authority of Sir John Thompson, that the ordinance of 1888, of which he was speaking at the time, was an abridgement of the rights conferred upon the Roman Catholic minority of the Northwest Territories by the Act of 1875.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Purporting to abridge it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, he said it effectively abridged it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It goes further than that; it not only purports to abridge it but it actually omits from the ordinance the words which govern with respect to the majority in any school district when that majority happens to be Roman Catholic. The words are used in the ordinance of 1884, but they are omitted in the ordinances of 1887 and 1888 and they have been omitted in every ordinance which has been passed since that time.

Mr. BERGERON. But still the law of 1875 was always in force.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course that follows, the Act of 1875 remains in force and is in force to-day in the Territories. But as a matter of fact, the Roman Catholic minority, notwithstanding that by the ordinances their powers are abridged, have been in enjoyment of all their rights which they had under the Act of 1875, and where they are in a majority in a school district they control the school, they control the trustees, and trustees control the teachers, and to-day in the Northwest the organization of the schools, whether they be public

or separate, is absolutely under the control of the Northwest legislature. On that point, perhaps I may be permitted to read a brief memo. that I prepared in this connection, and which states my view absolutely, as I understand it, in such a way as it leaves no doubt about it. But perhaps I had better leave that aside until I deal with other points.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not want to interrupt my hon. friend ; I know how difficult it is——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not trying to make a speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is conversational ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Conversational entirely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand the Minister of Justice, that the words he said were omitted from that ordinance which were made necessary by the Act of 1875 ; were words applying to the character of the schools or only to the locality in which they should be established.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 11 of the Act of 1875 reads :

When and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the lieutenant governor by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but——

Now these are the words :

--but it shall therein be always provided that the majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit.

That is to say the majority have the right to establish such schools as they think fit. If the majority happen to be Roman Catholic they may have what I described a moment ago as a Roman Catholic public school. These words are omitted from the sections of the ordinances of 1887 and 1888, and the only words that are repeated are :

And the minority of the ratepayers therein whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and that in such latter case, &c.

In effect there is provision contained in the Act with respect to the case of a school district in which the majority of the ratepayers happens to be Roman Catholic. That is what the original clause 16 was intended to continue. The original clause was intended to continue to the minority in the Northwest Territories all the rights that they had by law, and one of the rights they had by law was this right to organize their schools under the Act of 1875.

Mr. BERGERON. That is clause 16, No. 1.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, I am dealing with that. Now let us come to clause 16, No. 2, or clause 16 in its amended form. It gives to the minority whether Portestant or Catholic in any district the right to establish a separate school therein. That is to say, a school to which sections 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 of chapter 29 are specially applicable. In effect these sections give the minority the right to organize a separate school district in which district the minority can establish a separate school. First the district, and then the school in the district. But, after the district is erected the board of trustees, which board controls the schools, shall possess and exercise all rights, powers and privileges and be subject to the same liabilities and method of government as are provided in the ordinance in respect to public school districts.

With respect to public schools which are the only schools available to Roman Catholics in these school districts where they have a majority, the ratepayers have no rights or privileges secured to them under this clause as a result of that amendment made in 1887 and 1888. Now that is the position, and when my hon. friend said, if he is correctly reported at London, that section 41 of the ordinance which is referred to in section 16, No. 2, repeated in terms the provisions of section 11 of the Act of 1875, he must have been in error, because the first part of the Act of 1875 is omitted in section 41 of the Northwest Territories Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as separate schools are concerned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So far as separate schools are concerned, and that is what we are dealing with.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I say it is the same section so far as separate schools are concerned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 11 of the Act of 1875 is cut in two and all that part which is applicable to a majority in a school district is omitted and that part applicable to the minority is inserted so that one-half the section is omitted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is right. I observe my hon. friend places emphasis on the expression 'such schools therein as they think fit.' That is not in the separate school but in the general school district. Does he regard the words 'such schools therein as they think fit' as qualitative, indicating the character of the schools ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think so, and my reason for so thinking is that the ordinance of 1884 enacts that the majority in a case of that kind may establish a separate

school. That is the provision of section 25 of the ordinance of 1884. That is the construction put upon the Act of 1875 by the legislative assembly of the Northwest Territories. Now I shall not detain the committee at any greater length upon this subject. There is the whole matter so far as I am concerned, and to those who want to listen and who want to understand it seems to me I have made myself absolutely clear. The first section 16 re-enacted or made provision rather for the perpetuation of the dual system which was provided for by the Act of 1875. That is what it did, it perpetuated section 11 of the Act of 1875. The second gives effect purely and simply to those provisions of the ordinance of 1901, which are applicable to separate schools and as I have pointed out in the opinion of Sir John Thompson, the provisions of the Ordinance of 1901 which merely reproduces the ordinances of 1887 and 1888 abridge the right of the Roman Catholics in such a way as to give to the minority in a school district the right to a separate school and makes no provision for a majority.

Mr. BERGERON. Of Catholics ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of Catholics.

Mr. STOCKTON. I think that the Minister of Justice has somewhat mystified the law with respect to the different qualities or characteristics of the schools existing in the Northwest when he seeks to impress upon this committee that there were under the Act of 1875 four conditions of schools in the Northwest Territories, that is a Catholic public school and a Catholic separate school, a Protestant public school and a Protestant separate school. I do not find that in the law. It is true that the majority can organize a section or can organize a school. If the majority of the ratepayers doing that were Roman Catholics that would not make it a public Roman Catholic school, or if the majority were Protestants that would not make it a Protestant public school, any more than a public school in the Northwest now would be a Presbyterian public school or a Methodist public school because the majority of the ratepayers happen to belong to that denomination. There is just one difficulty that I myself find in respect to the statement of the Minister of Justice and I have listened with some degree of interest that is that the rights have been cut down by subsequent legislation or by the ordinances accorded by the Act of 1875. I am not quite sure about that. I would certainly defer very largely to the legal opinion of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but does he not think that the Act of 1875 would be a part of the constitution of the Northwest Territories. That would be a question for the Minister of Justice to consider, could the ordinances of the Northwest Territories cut down or impair the authority of the Act of 1875 ? If the legislature has granted power, that is if this parliament has granted power under the Act of 1875 with respect to education then it does seem to me that any attempt by ordinance to cut down that power, if that has been attempted, would be ultra vires of the power of the Northwest council, and if that is so, why then the Act of 1875 continues in all its power from the time it was passed until the present time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is right, that is what I argued for about ten minutes.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understood that my hon. friend said that the ordinances of 1881 or 1884 cut down certain rights that were given under the Act of 1875. That is what I understood the Minister of Justice to say and that section 11 of the Act of 1875 had been cut in two and the part relating to public schools had been omitted and that therefore to that extent there had been a certain limitation or restriction put upon that. If you read section 11 of the Act of 1875, with all due deference I do not think that it will bear the construction that has been put upon it by the Minister of Justice. As I said it means that the majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be called, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor. That is a power given under the law to establish the schools and that power continues to-day. There has been no cutting down of that power on the part of this legislature or any attempt on the part of the Northwest legislature in the enactment of any ordinances ; it was only granting a power to the authority of the Northwest Territories under certain conditions to legislate and make provision for the establishment of the schools ; but with this limitation, that if there was a minority in that district who wanted a separate school they could have that separate school provided they complied with the law, and that when they did that their assessments should go towards the maintenance of that separate school and that therefore it would not be necessary to put that portion of section 11 of the Act of 1875 in the ordinances that were subsequently adopted. Therefore upon that point it would seem to me that there is no cutting down, no limitation, but only an authority given by this parliament to certain authorities in the Northwest Territories to establish public schools with the limitation that under certain conditions they can also establish separate schools.

That has been continued by section 41 of chapter 29 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories so far as separate schools for the minorities are concerned, and not

with respect to public schools. Now with reference to the difference of meaning between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition as to the legal effect of the language used in these two sections. No. 2 goes as far as No. 1, as originally introduced by the right hon. First Minister; and if we attempt to whittle down the meaning of No. 2 by saying that it does not go as far as No. 1, then the duty is cast upon those who argue in that direction to show where there is a limitation. I can find none in the section itself, and I have not understood the Minister of Justice to make the statement on the floor of the House that there is a less power in section 16, No. 2, than there is in section 16, No. 1. I did not understand the Minister of Justice to say so to-day; I did not understand him to say so when he made his explanation the other day. I think section 16, No. 2, is as full and ample to give separate schools to the constitutions of the new provinces as section 16, No. 1. I may be mistaken about that. I would like to hear from the Minister of Justice as to whether he is of opinion that section 16, No. 2, does not go as far as section 16, No. 1. If the Minister of Justice will make that statement, I would like him to say in what respect he is of opinion that it does not go as far.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. He said it twice.

Mr. STOCKTON. Had we not better let the Minister of Justice speak for himself? If he will stand in his place and make that statement, it will simplify the matter very much.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend said that he did not know that there were four kinds of schools in the Northwest Territories. I have in my hand the report of the superintendent of education, for 1901, on the first page of which four classes are specified: public school districts, Roman Catholic public schools districts, Roman Catholic separate school districts, and Protestant separate school districts.

Mr. STOCKTON. The report may put it that way, but the schools are not so constituted under the Act of 1875.

Mr. BRODEUR. That classification is still maintained.

Mr. STOCKTON. The fact that it is so stated in the report of the officer of the government does not make it the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. This report is accepted and published by Mr. Haultain.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a legal document?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it must be. It has been accepted by the Attorney General.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it a clause of an Act?

Mr. STOCKTON.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is a report.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend from St. John is perhaps somewhat justified in saying that he did not catch my statement in respect to the difference between clause No. 2 and clause No. 1, in so far as clause No. 2 abridged the right of the minority, because I was unfortunate enough to read the statement as to the effect of that clause; and, in reading, one cannot make his meaning quite as apparent as he can when speaking. But I will read again what I said on that point:

> In effect, section 16 (that is No. 2) gives the minority the right to erect a separate school district in which district the minority may establish a separate school; but after the district is established, the board of trustees shall possess and exercise all rights, powers and privileges, and be subject to the same liabilities and methods of government as herein provided in respect of public school districts.

That is, the same right, so far as that particular minority is concerned, as they have under the Act of 1875. But where the minority in the Territories happens to be the majority in the school district, then they have to avail themselves of the public school; and, so far as that public school is concerned, they have no right or privilege whatever secured to them under that clause. The minority in the district, where it happens to be Roman Catholic, will have certain rights and privileges secured to it under clause 2; but where the Roman Catholic minority of the Territories happens to be a majority in the school district, then it has no right whatever. Then, there is the other abridgment referred to by Sir John Thompson, resulting from the legislation of 1891, that the organization of a separate school district is dependent upon the action of the majority in the district. If the majority or the governmet does not organize a school district then the minority is without any privilege whatever.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice has certainly said something to-day which he did not say in the opinion which he read in the House before.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have endeavoured to avoid repeating what I said. I quoted Sir John Thompson's opinion when I spoke first.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any opinion of Sir John Thompson's along the line which the hon. gentleman read to-day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is the same as my hon. friend read.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as the question of separate schools is concerned, the expression on which the Minister of Justice relies does not occur in that particular portion of the clause of the Act of 1875 at all. I will just read it in order to make my meaning perfectly clear:

The Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, shall pass all necessary ordinances with respect to education; but it shall therein be always provided that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor.

That is so far as the majority are concerned. And further:

That the minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Catholics, may establish separate schools therein.

So far as the latter words are concerned, those relating to the establishment of separate schools, I do not understand my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to controvert the statement which I made, namely, that the effect of section 16, No. 2, is the same as that of section 16, No. 1, but he goes back and relies upon the language contained in the previous clause:

The majority may establish such separate schools therein as they may think fit.

These words he interprets as meaning that they may establish separate schools of such character as they may see fit. I venture to submit that they cannot have any such meaning. They do not refer to the quality of schools or the regulations under which they are carried on, because that would destroy altogether the legislative power already conferred upon the council of the Territories by the words I have just quoted: 'The Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, may make all necessary ordinances with respect to education.' But if you take the view of the Minister of Justice, you absolutely take out of the hands of the council the legislative power with regard to the character of the schools, and you would have absolute self-government, in respect of the character, the regulation, the superintendence and the control of the schools, conferred upon the majority in each district. That, I submit, is not the meaning of the words 'may establish such schools therein as they see fit.' Those words are always subject to the controlling power of the Northwest Territories Legislature with regard to education. To give them any other meaning would absolutely take out of the power of the Lieutenant Governor, acting with the advice of the council or assembly, all further control of the schools. Surely my hon. friend does not contend that that is absolutely the meaning of the Act of 1875?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that is the meaning put upon it by the ordinance of 1884.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The ordinance of 1884 cannot controvert, alter or amend section 11 of the Act of 1875. It cannot affect that Act in any way. I understand now what I did not understand before. I understand what my hon. friend the Minister of Justice meant by saying that the Act of 1875 was interpreted by an earlier ordinance. Let us understand the situation. Under the Act of 1875, you might establish a dual system of schools, if you saw fit, but you were not obliged to do so. That is the distinction. There was the power but no obligation. The Act of 1875 did not mean that the majority of ratepayers of the Northwest in any particular district could make those ordinances with regard to education, the power to make which had already been conferred on the Lieutenant Governor, acting by and with the advice of the council or assembly. Yet the very reverse is the construction to which we would be driven by the argument of my hon. friend this afternoon. 'May establish such schools therein as they may think fit.' But those schools must be established subject to the controlling power of the council or assembly. Therefore it does not seem to me that this new and very ingenious point, suggested for the first time to-day by the Minister of Justice, is consistent with a reasonable interpretation of the statute. The Lieutenant Governor in Council makes ordinances regarding education, and he must give power to the majority to establish such schools as they think fit, but not schools of such character as they think fit or subject to such regulations as they think fit, or subject to such superintendence or control or inspection as they think fit, because with regard to all these matters the power has been conferred, not upon the majority in each district, but upon the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the advice of the council and assembly.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In what respect then did the omission of the first words of the Act of 1875, section 11, abridge the rights of the minority, as stated by Sir John Thompson?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In this respect that, as I understand the report of Sir John Thompson, the Act of 1875 declared that the majority of ratepayers in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories might establish separate schools; but by the ordinance, which he thought to be beyond the powers of the Territories, that power was restricted to those districts which had been organized as public school districts, and he thought that in that respect there had been an attempted abridgment of the right conferred by the Act of 1875. At least that is the way I construe his language.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not want to tire my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, but I desire to ask him one or two questions. We seem to have come down to this, that

all the work of parliament is confined to finding out what clause 16, No. 1, and what clause 16, No. 2, really mean. Would not these words in the Act of 1875 'May establish such schools as they think fit' mean that the Roman Catholics, who are the ones intended to be benefited by the law of 1875——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend will allow me my own opinion, and that is that the law of 1875 was intended for their benefit. It must have been as hard then, as it is now, to speak of those questions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

An hon. MEMBER. There were bigger men then.

Mr. BERGERON. There were then fresh in the minds of everybody the promises which had been made by the Canadian government to the people in that country, and it was on account of these promises that clause 11 of the Act of 1875 was passed. What I wish to know is whether these words 'as they may think fit' did not mean that the minority could have the kind of schools they wanted. There was no law then to tell them what kind of schools they should have. I want to be posted on that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You will have to post yourself. The statute is there.

Mr. BERGERON. But I should like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice. Had they the right to teach French in the schools by the law of 1875 ? Would not that right flow from their right to establish such schools as they saw fit. And as a matter of fact, was not the French language taught in the schools then ? By the clause 16, No. 2, which puts in force only the ordinance of 1901, have they the right, whether in a separate or a public school, to teach the French language ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, but they do it as a matter of fact.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understood my hon. friend some years ago to declare by his vote that the French language was not an official language in the Northwest.

Mr. BERGERON. Where and when did I do that?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the House of Commons in 1889 or 1890.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to be shown that.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend does not remember that ?

Mr. BERGERON. No, it would have to be shown me very strongly to make me believe it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Does not my hon. friend remember that that question came up before the House in 1890? A long discussion took place in this House on the question whether the French language should be an official language in the Northwest or not.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not remember the occasion. And still, less, if possible, do I remember voting that way. Now there is another point which I want to ask the Minister of Justice about. It would seem that 'separate schools' under the Act of 1875 meant a very different thing from what we understand to-day by separate schools. At that time what was understood was a separate system of schools for the minority, whether Protestant or Catholic. What we understand by 'separate schools' to-day is simply that the minority in a school district, whether Catholic or Protestant may establish a separate school, but, as a matter of fact, the teaching is all the same, whether in the public or in the separate school. Is not that the case ? It seems to me that it is only by putting questions in this way that we can properly discuss this question. When a question is put and answered, we hit the nail squarely on the head. It is far better than long discussions in which the members try each for himself, to bring out all the points involved in this measure. My hon. friend from St. John city and county (Mr. Stockton) does not see any difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. For my part I believe there is a difference, but it seems to me that the Minister of Justice has not stated the differenc plainly. I would like to get it from him, because, in this discussion it is to him we naturally look for light.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My recollection is that the Act of 1875 was passed as a result of the agitation that grew up in Canada as a result of the New Brunswick school question, and not on account of any promise it made to the people of the Northwest Territories. Of course, I do not say that definitely, but that is my impression. I have endeavoured once or twice to make my meaning clear about the difference in these two cases. The first section would give to the minority in the Northwest Territories all the rights they have, de jure and de facto, at the present time. That would include all the provisions of the Act of 1875, section 11.

Mr. FOSTER. That is clause 16, No. 1, would do that ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. Clause 16, No. 2, would give to the minority in the Northwest Territories those rights and privileges which they have, not by the law at large as in force in the Northwest Territories, but by the particular law enacted under chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances.

Mr. FOSTER. Which would be——?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The right of the minority in a school district to establish a separate school under section 41 and following sections.

Mr. FOSTER. Now let a layman have about a minute or two to get in his question. Do I understand the matter right if I state it this way? Under the Act of 1875, the Roman Catholics if they were a majority in a district had the right to establish a school such as they thought proper. If they were a minority they had a right to have a school as laid down in the law. Now, under section 16, No. 1, these two rights are perpetuated. But clause 16, No. 2, makes a distinction. It conserves to the minority the right they had under the Act of 1875—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, not all.

Mr. FOSTER. All the right they have as a minority to erect a minority school in the school district?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. With an exception. That is to say, the right of the minority to have a separate school in a district is contingent upon the exercise of the right of the majority to establish a public school. That is the only distinction.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right. Well, suppose there is that little distinction—they are not allowed, under clause 16, No. 2, to erect their minority school unless the majority have organized a school district.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or the government have organized it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the majority refuse to erect a school district, it would be necessary that the government should intervene in the interest of the children of the majority in that district, and also in order not to deprive the minority of their right to organize. The other right they had under the Act of 1875, which was conserved under section 16, No. 1—the right of the majority in the district to have such school as they thought fit—is taken from them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is anything in that such as taking away the privilege in the latter case or granting a privilege in the former case, it will all depend on what you say is meant by such school 'as they think fit.' The Minister of Justice holds that this has relation to the quality or kind of school; otherwise, it would have been no privilege to them in 16, No. 1; and if that is not so, it is no deprivation to them in 16, No. 2. Now, let us look at that—of course, I do not discuss the legal aspect of the question. Is it reasonable to suppose that you could have a school system if the majority of the ratepayers in any district might establish such schools as they thought fit, including in that the power to determine the quality of its teaching, the hours and everything that goes to make up the conduct and discipline of the school? Suppose that were accepted, where would it land us? Why, the Roman Catholic majority in one case, the Protestant majority in another case, the Mormon majority in another case, the Doukhobor majority, or the Galician, or Hungarian or Polish majority, could establish such schools as they thought fit as to the quality and management of the schools. If this were so, I venture to say you could have no school system which would be worthy of the name. The majority might put in incompetent teachers. If it was a Polish majority, they might insist on teaching nothing but Polish and refusing the right to attend to an English-speaking or French-speaking boy. This is a wide power. The Mormon majority in a district could establish a school and in it teach their peculiar doctrines. If that is the meaning of it, we reason to an absurdity. It surely cannot mean that.

They may want a primary school, they may want a higher school, they may want one of different grades; such a school as 'they think fit' in that respect they can have, such a school as they think fit in respect to number and the like of that, but under this clause, always subservient to and determined by the general laws, rules and regulations which establish and perpetuate the school system. That is the point that puzzles me as a layman. If that is the interpretation, namely, that such schools 'as they think fit' refer to the matters of quality, discipline, order and everything which is taught in them, you would reduce the whole matter to an absurdity. So it seems to me the common sense principle of interpretation is not in respect of quality, but in respect of what I have spoken about in regard to the question of schools. Now does the Minister of Justice think that if the Poles were in a majority, that under the Act of 1875, and that law still has power, they could by a majority erect and establish such a school 'as they think fit,' saying that it shall be taught by a Polish teacher, who need not have a diploma, who need not have attended a normal school, who need not teach more than two hours a day, who need not do any of these things, and yet that they could avail themselves of the privileges of pay which go along with the erection and conduct of a school, and be a part of the system which is in vogue? Does he think they can do that? He does not, I do not think he can, then I think he will have to modify his interpretation of the phrase 'such a school as they think fit.' That is the practical difficulty that suggsets itself to my mind. But legal interpretations are sometimes wonderful things, and I do not know whether I am right or wrong. But I think mine is the common sense opinion.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend picks two or three words out of the section and attempts to construe these words without regard to the context. He has to look at the whole context in order to understand the true intent and meaning of each word; he has to look to the words 'Protestant and Catholic' which are mentioned further on in the section, and which are practically the governing words; that is to say, the schools which are to be established are those which will provide for the necessities of these two classes of persons. Now my hon. friend, if he is anxious to understand what the intention of the legislature was at the time this section was introduced, has only to refer to the debates of that time, and he will find that, dealing with that particular section which was introduced at the suggestion of Mr. Blake, Mr. Blake said:

> There should be some provision in the constitution by which they should have conferred upon them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the province of Ontario. The principles of local self-government and the settling of the question of public instruction it seemed to him ought to be the cardinal principles of the measure.

His meaning was that they should have conferred upon them the same rights and privileges in regard to religious instruction as those possessed by the people of the province of Ontario; and Mr. Blake who was the father of the clause, used these words in explaining it, and pointed out that the intention was to provide for a separate school system as between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Then the hon. gentleman will find further on, if he wishes to inquire, that by the ordinance of the Northwest Territories of 1884, effect was given to that section in the sense indicated by Mr. Blake, who was responsible for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was effect given to it in such a sense as to empower a majority of each district to establish schools of any character they saw fit?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a separate school system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But we are dealing with a majority school system.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The minority in a district are entitled to establish a separate school in that district; that is section 25 of the ordinance of 1884.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Upon a well recognized principle, as a particular part of this section deals with separate schools we are not to suppose, without express words, that another part of the same section is also dealing with separate schools. A particular part of this section deals with the minority schools, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic; the minority of the ratepayers, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein.

My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had to construe the words to which he drew attention, because the Minister of Justice was founding his argument upon them—'may establish such schools therein as they think fit.' It seems to me that the results which have been pointed out by the member for North Toronto would ensue by the adoption of the interpretation of the Minister of Justice. Sir John Thompson certainly never adopted that interpretation, or we would have heard something about it in his report to council. His only objection to this ordinance, which he considered carefully, and he was a great lawyer, and would not be apt to overlook a point of this kind—his only objection was not that which is raised by the Minister of Justice to-day; his objection was that the ordinance provided for the establishment of schools only in districts where majorities had decided to create the area into a school district. Now it does seem to me, with all deference to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that it is not possible to place such an interpretation upon this clause as that which he has suggested. That certainly was not the interpretation which occurred to the Minister of Justice in the first instance when he drew section 16, No. 1, because he himself told us in this House that he intended section 16, No. 1 to preserve the rights as they are at present, and therefore he could not have had this point in his mind then. It is obviously something that has occurred to him since.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They had all these rights in 1875.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon. friend the Minister of Justice had had this argument in his mind, if he had held this opinion which he has put forward to-day, at the time he drafted section 16, No. 1, he could not have stated in this House, as he did state, that section 16, No. 1 was designed to preserve the rights of the minority as they exist in the Northwest Territories to-day. Those two things would be absolutely inconsistent; therefore I am within my right in insisting that the interpretation now relied upon is not the one that occurred to the Minister of Justice when he was drafting that clause. It did not occur to him for the very good reason that an interpretation of this kind is one to which the Minister of Justice would only resort when he found no other one would meet the case. To say that you must interpret this clause in that way is going very far indeed, much beyond any canon of legal interpretation with which I am familiar. As I pointed out, you have power vested in the legislature of the Territories to enact laws with regard to education; you have a limitation upon that, a proviso attached to it that the majority may establish 'such schools as they think fit.' But that does not permit them to establish schools of any such character as they see

fit, because to do that would involve, in the first place, that they might apply religious tests: they might say, no child shall go to that school unless he or his parents make profession of a certain religion; no child shall go to that school unless his parents agree that he shall learn a certain language and no other; no child shall go to that school unless it is carried on subject to such regulations and such supervision, such control and inspection, as are provided, not by the legislature of the Territories, but by the majority of that particular school district; and I fancy that upon reflection the Minister of Justice would hardly like to persevere in a contention of that kind.

Mr. BOURASSA. There is one point that seems to be overlooked. The object of the legislation of 1875 was not to deal with the minority of any particular district, but was to deal with the rights of the minority in the whole territory, and therefore they had to provide for the same rights for every portion of the country, no matter whether a particular district contained a majority or a minority of one class or of the other. The conclusion to which the reasoning of the leader of the opposition would lead us is this, that the legislature of 1875 intended to give some protection to either the Protestants or the Roman Catholics when they constitute a minority in any particular district, but cannot give them any protection if they happen to constitute a local majority, although forming part of the minority of the whole territory. If section 11 is read, not in the light of too much legal knowledge but in a simpler light——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask my hon. friend one question?

Mr. BOURASSA. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does he consider to be guaranteed to the minority where it is a minority in any particular district, by the Act of 1875?

Mr. BOURASSA. I am coming to that, I was about to say that if instead of interpreting the Act of 1875 with too much legal lore, we interpret it simply by bringing to bear on it the common sense of the ordinary man, we might better be able to understand it. If you refer to the speeches that were made in this House in 1875, and especially to the speech of the Hon. Edward Blake at whose suggestion, and I believe under whose guidance this clause was drafted, you find that the object of it was to protect the rights of the total minority of the Territories whether it be Protestant or Roman Catholic, and whatever might be the division of territory that should be adopted by the Northwest government. That is made entirely clear by the part of the clause relating to the school districts. What they wanted to provide for was the establishment of separate schools for the minority of the Northwest Territories, and to provide for separate schools in every district whether that minority might be represented either by a local minority or by a local majority. It would be absurd to think that Mr. Blake meant to give separate schools either to the Protestants or to the Roman Catholics of the Northwest, only when they happened to be a minority in a particular district. For instance, let us take the facts as they have developed. To-day the Roman Catholics in the two new provinces are represented for nine-tenths of their population by local majorities. Was it the intention of the Act of 1875, and would it be the intention of this legislation, that one-tenth of the Catholics of the Northwest Territories would be entitled to separate schools and that nine-tenths of the Catholics in the same Territories would be entitled to nothing at all? Does the leader of the opposition intend to say that in case the majority of the people of the Northwest were Catholic, the Protestants would be entitled to separate schools only when they were a minority, but would be subject to the Catholic regime everywhere they formed the majority? The conclusion would be absurd. I believe, the whole clause means that either the majority or the minority must be considered not in the light of whether they belong to this place or to that place, but whether they belong to the Protestant or Catholic religion. What is guaranteed is the right to the majority to chose what kind of schools they would have with respect to the division that has been adopted throughout the Dominion of Canada, so far as the separation of schools is concerned. If the Catholics are in the majority they can organize Catholic schools under the guidance of the state under the same limitation that is provided in the former portion of the section; and if the majority is Protestant the majority may organize either a Protestant school or a non-sectarian school, because it is well known that on this question Protestants are not a unit and that sometimes they prefer sectarian and sometimes non-sectarian schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend observes of course that the word 'majority' is used in connection with the district or portion of the Territories. Does he not think the word 'minority' is used in the same connection?

Mr. BOURASSA. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought he said the word minority meant the entire minority in the whole Territories.

Mr. BOURASSA. On the contrary——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so. I want to ask my hon. friend another question. Suppose there was no majority of either

Protestants or Roman Catholics in the district; suppose there was one-third Protestant, one-third Roman Catholic and one-third Jews and Mormons; does he not think that the word 'majority' in section 11 would enable the majority of inhabitants to establish a school?

Mr. BOURASSA. No, I do not think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, well——

Mr. BOURASSA. I am taking the intention of the legislator as stated in Mr. Blake's speech. As the Minister of Justice has just said, Mr. Blake referred to the case of Prince Edward Island where the discussion was as between sectarian schools and non-sectarian schools. The right to have sectarian schools is claimed by Catholics, and as the Prime Minister well stated in his first speech on this subject, the right to have sectarian schools has never been claimed by the Protestants of this country as a whole. It has been claimed as a preferable system by some Protestants, but it has never been claimed as a conscientious right by any unit of Protestants in this country nor by the Protestant majority of any part of the country; it has only been claimed by the Protestant minority of Quebec. The object of the clause, as I have stated was to provide for the rights of the total minority of the Territories, and therefore when it speaks of the majority and the minority of any particular district it must mean that the majority or the minority of that district belong either to the majority or the minority of the total population of the Territories. I therefore hold that the reference to the establishment of schools as the majority may think fit, must be interpreted in the same way as the separate schools mentioned in the second paragraph, just as the word majority must be interpreted in the same way as the word minority in the second part of the section; that is: that the majority may choose to have a sectarian school whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, or a non-sectarian school; and that the minority whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may secede from them and have a Protestant school if the minority is Protestant, and a Catholic school if the minority is Catholic. The Minister of Justice has referred to the ordinance of 1884, but if the leader of the opposition refers to the ordinance of 1885—which is in fact the first ordinance adopted in the Northwest Territories because the ordinance of 1884 has never been put in force—he will find that the idea was there indicated in the clearest way possible. There was to be established public schools, non-sectarian or sectarian, for the majority and separate schools for the minority of any particular district. If the majority of a district choose to establish a non-sectarian school, then the minority could separate and establish a separate school either Protestant or Roman Catholic. If the majority chose to establish a sectarian public school then the minority could secede. That was clearly the intention of the legislature of the Northwest when it provided a council of public instruction in two sections, leaving to the total council the superintendence of the non-sectarian public schools, and to the Catholic and Protestant sections respectively the conduct of the Catholic and Protestant public and separate schools. I am not disputing the legal opinion of the Minister of Justice or of the leader of the opposition, but it will be clearly seen from the discussion in 1875 that it was the intention to give to the majority of any particular district the right to establish such school as they thought fit and that that meant that they could establish a public school, either Protestant or Catholic. I fail to see that it meant that the power of the government to regulate both public and sectarian schools was abridged by that, and I do not see how by re-enacting that legislation we would create any other state of things than the state of things that existed up to the time the Northwest legislature endeavoured to infringe on the powers that were given to the minority by this parliament, as Sir John Thompson stated.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. STOCKTON. When the committee rose at six o'clock there was a somewhat informal discussion as to the meaning of section 11 of the Act of 1875. Might I ask the Minister of Justice to give his attention to it. It says:

> When, and so soon as any system of taxation shall be adopted in any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, the Lieutenant Governor, by and with the consent of the council or assembly, as the case may be, shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education.

I pause for a moment upon these words, and it appears to me that they govern and to a certain extent interpret what follows:

> All necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein——

That is in the ordinances.

> —be always provided, that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories, or any lesser portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name the same may be known, may establish such schools therein as they may think fit.

Now what can that mean? That under the law the council passes the ordinances relating to education, and that all schools are established so far as the administration is concerned in accordance with the provi-

sions of these ordinances and in accordance with the free will as the case may be of the trustees or the authorities in the particular districts. It says :

Shall pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education, but it shall therein be always provided, &c.

Therefore the management, the administration of the schools under that, if you go back one section, is in accordance with the ordinances under the good judgment and common sense of the trustees or the authorities for the time being, and not as the trustees or authorities for the time being may deem fit. It is under the control of the ordinances as passed under the authority of the law.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It seems to me that a good deal of unnecessary confusion has been imported into this discussion simply because we have ignored the historic conditions under which this legislation has been arrived at. If you take this law, the Act of 1875, or indeed any law that you have in the statutes whether of Quebec, of Ontario or Manitoba, if you take them by themselves, without having any reference whatever to the historic conditions which have necessitated that legislation, you are at once confronted by a mystery which seems to be insoluble, but if you take the history, the conditions which have made this legislation necessary, or if not necessary advisable, then it seems to me that the conclusion is very simple, and that you have at once the explanation of the difficulty that was presented this afternoon. First of all as to the main point of discussion of to-day, that is the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. In order to examine them fully, let us come at the principle, let us look first at the law of 1875 incorporated in clause 16, No. 1.

Subject to the provisions of the said section 93, and in continuance of the principles heretofore sanctioned under the Northwest Territories Act, it is enacted that the legislature of the said province shall pass all necessary laws in respect of education, and that it shall therein always be provided (a) that a majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the said province or of any less portion or subdivision thereof, by whatever name it is known, may establish such schools therein as they think fit, and make the necessary assessments and collection of rates therefor.

The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) very properly asked : What is the meaning of these words, that the ratepayers in the school district shall have the power to establish such schools therein as they think fit. These words are very broad, they must be qualified in some way, they must have some meaning. It cannot be meant that they can have such schools as in their own will or fancy are fit for them. There must be some qualification necessary to interpret the clause. Everybody will agree with this. And now you have the explanation under what immediately follows :

(b) That the minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish separate schools therein, and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor.

You give to the minority the privilege of having separate schools when the majority in that district has had the privilege of establishing such schools as they think fit, and that privilege is given not to everybody, not to the Jews, as was suggested by the hon. member for Toronto this afternoon, not to the Mormons, but to either Protestants or Catholics.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the minority ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The minority has that privilege, not the Jews, this is not given to the Jews.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not refer to the minority schools, I was arguing on the majority of ratepayers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. But the qualification comes in and applies in the same way to the majority as well as to the minority in this matter. The privilege is given to the minority, to a certain minority, that is to say to the Protestant or Catholic minority. There must be some reason for the difference. In the discussion which is going on to-day in certain parts of the country you often hear : But if you give that privilege to the minority, why not give it to the Jews, the Mormons and the Greek Church ? I am not concerned with these ; that is a matter for the local legislature ? but so far as this parliament is concerned, we have only to deal with the law as we find it, that is to say the privileges given to the Protestant or to the Catholic minority, not to any other. When this law was first established in the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, and subsequently in the province of Manitoba, the great body of the Canadian population was divided between Catholics and Protestants. There were very few people of other denominations. There are more now, but at that time there were no denominations to be reckoned with except the great body of Protestants and the great body of Roman Catholics and the law was made for them. Now if you give the privilege to the minority whether it be Protestant or whether it be Catholic to secede from a school which has been established by the majority since the privilege is given to the Protestants or to the Catholics, it is because there must be in the school something offensive to the conscience of the Protestant or of the Catholic. You cannot conceive any reason for distinction and separation except for that. If

the separation had been given to any other body than these religious bodies, you might say there was something else in the mind of the legislature, but as the legislature has provided to give that privilege only to the Protestant or Catholic it follows as a necessary consequence that this privilege is given where something is taught in the school is offensive to the conscience of the Roman Catholic or to the conscience of the Protestant. Let us take a concrete example. Here is a school established say by a Roman Catholic district in the province of Quebec; then their catechism will be taught, the Roman Catholic catechism, that is to say the Roman Catholic form of Christianity will be taught in that school. If there is a minority there composed say of Presbyterians, of that very fine body of men, who as they claim themselves with some pride, are fed on oatmeal and the shorter catechism, that naturally is very offensive to them, and they would have the right to secede. Take the converse proposition. Suppose there is in Quebec as there is in the eastern townships, a school where the Protestants are in the majority and then the shorter catechism is taught. That would be offensive to the Roman Catholic minority and there they would have the right to secede also. Take another case. Suppose there is a Protestant school where no religion is taught and there is a Roman Catholic minority there and they want to have religion taught, it is offensive to their conscience that no religious instruction should be given to their children: there again provision is made that they have the right to secede. There are only two kinds of education which can be given in a school, secular or religious. It is conceivable and easily conceivable that religious education which is given in a school may be offensive to the conscience either of the Catholic minority or the Protestant minority if there is such a minority in that school. But when you come to secular matters it is different. And yet, Sir, in the manner in which secular education may be given, there may be something offensive to the conscience of the minority. There can be only one way of teaching arithmetic or grammar, and that cannot offend the conscience of any one, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic. But every one knows that it is not so in regard to the teaching of history, for instance. History may be taught in a manner which will be offensive to the Protestant minority or to the Catholic minority. There are some text books of history the truth of which would not be admitted by Protestants, and there are some the truth of which would not be admitted by Roman Catholics. Under such circumstances the minority may have cause for offence in the manner in which even secular education is given, and in that case provision is made that the minority may secede. Now, I need not tell the House, for it is known to everybody, that the Roman Catholic church has always sought to have for herself the privilege of secular education as well as religious education; and when the Act of 1875 was passed, the majority and the minority were given the privilege of having the education of their respective churches in the schools if they saw fit. That law, legally or illegally—I shall not discuss this point at this moment, but I shall do it later on—was interpreted by the legislature as conveying to the minority the right of having a separate organization for the tuition of their own children. There were two systems of education established—a system for the Protestants and a system for the Roman Catholics. This condition existed for some years, but it was a cause of great friction, and it was finally changed by the legislature, which passed an Act taking to the civil power the teaching of secular education and leaving religious education altogether apart. Now, this was a grievance to the minority. If you look at the correspondence which took place on this subject, you will find that the removal of the peculiar arrangement which existed, and which permitted Roman Catholics to have the organization of their own schools, was the grievance which was felt by them with the greatest acuteness. But the legislature thought otherwise. They were persevering in their views, and they would not yield upon that point. Let me now explain the law which has been substituted for the law of 1875. As I said a moment ago, the characteristic feature of the present law, which was enacted to take the place of the law of 1875, is this, that the legislature has separated absolutely religious education from secular education. Secular education has been made by the legislature the sole privilege of the trustees in every district. Under the ordinance, chapter 29, which contains a new clause in substitution of the old law, the state does not pretend to have the slightest control of religious education. At half past three in the afternoon the secular education is at an end, and then the trustees can come in and have whatever sort of religious education they desire. It may be the shorter catechism, it may be the Roman Catholic doctrine, it may be any of the doctrines of Protestants. But up to the hour of half-past three in the afternoon the state insists upon having the control of the schools absolutely—insists upon having all the teachers certificated by the state, insists on having all the inspection done by the state, insists on having all the text books selected by the state. Whether the schools are separate or public, the state has absolute control of them to-day. Now, this is a grievance on the part of the Roman Catholic minority. They have always thought that they should have the control of their schools for secular education as well as for

religious education. But a question now arises, which I will not discuss at this moment, but I will do so later on, whether or not the old law of 1875 is still in force, or whether the new ordinance, which has done away with the control by the minority of the secular part of education, is in force. Now, we are asked, what is the difference between clause 16, No. 1, and clause 16, No. 2 ? The difference is simply this, that in clause 16, No. 1, the law of 1875 was enacted, giving to the minority—I suppose the Roman Catholic minority—the control over secular education as well as the control over religious education, whereas the new clause brings into force the existing law of the territories, the ordinance of 1901, by which the state has absolute control over the secular part of education, and the people have control simply of the religious part of education from half-past three in the afternoon. This is the absolute difference which exists between the old clause and the new clause. I have for my part agreed to the new clause 16, and in so doing I know that I have restricted my fellow-religionists in regard to some of the rights which they think they have at this moment. I shall explain in due time why I agreed to do so. But my duty at present is to state what the difference is, and there it is in a few words. If this law passes, as we think it ought, the legislature will have full control over the secular part of education, and the people will have full control over the religious part. The legislature does not attempt to control the religious part of education ; but if the old law had remained in force, the legislature would have surrendered its control over the secular part as well as over the religious part of education. Now, I think I have made very clear what is the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. The motives which have influenced us in agreeing to that change I shall explain at the proper time. I do not propose to do so to-day, for this reason. I look at the House before me, and I see it absolutely disorganized. There are few members from the Northwest Territories, if there are any, present ; and as they are most interested in this question, I want to discuss it in their presence. At the present moment I merely explain the difference between the two sections.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will my right hon. friend be good enough to cite the words in the Act of 1875 which, in his opinion, give the control of secular education to the minority ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The words are there in substance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want them in the statute.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman cannot have them in the statute if they are not there ; but I have given the interpretation as we understand it—'May establish such schools therein as they think fit.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is majority schools.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The minority schools are also provided for : That the minority of the ratepayers therein, may establish separate schools therein.' So I can only emphasize what I said a moment ago. The right to establish a separate school in a district which has been established by a majority is not given to a minority of lawyers, farmers, mechanics or any profession, but is given to a religious body—to the Protestants or the Catholics, nobody else. If that privilege is given to the minority of Catholics or Protestants, what can the reason be ? It must be that they are not satisfied with the teaching which is given in those schools of the majority, because they believe in them their consciences are oppressed. I cannot see any other interpretation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand the right hon. gentleman, his view is that these words give the right of complete control over school education : 'The minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein.' That, in his opinion, gave complete control over school education.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. What I say is this, that if the minority are not satisfied with the manner in which education is given in those schools, they have the right to secede. In other words, the right of secession, when it is given to a religious body, can have only one raison d'être, and that is that the conscience of the minority is oppressed. There can be no other reason.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not controverting anything the right hon. gentleman has said, but am merely endeavouring to understand his argument. He says there are some words in the Act of 1875 which give the minority an absolute right to the control of the education in their separate schools, and I have read him the only words in the Act of 1875 from which that right could be deduced : 'The minority of the ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein.' It is upon those words the right hon. gentleman must depend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Exactly the same words are contained in section 16, No. 2.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well ; but my hon. friend has forgotten that if in section 16, No. 2, these words are found; there are also other words found in chapter 29, and these words are :

No school shall be organized, whether separate or public, unless it be under the supervision of the province or the authority created by the province.

There is a board of instruction which shall decide what books that separate school shall use, which shall give certificates to teachers, and so on; and, therefore, in section 16, No. 2, it is stated:

Nothing in any such law shall prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to separate schools which any class of persons have at the date of the passing of this Act under the terms of chapters 29 and 30 of the ordinances of the Northwest Territories passed in the year 1901.

To-day, under the ordinances, though there are separate schools, the people who have formed those separate schools have not the right to select their own books or teachers or supervise their own schools as they did before. Many of the rights which existed before the ordinances of 1892 are denied them, and therefore there is all the difference in the world between clause 16, No. 1, and clause 16, No. 2.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If those words have the construction which the right hon. gentleman claims for them in the Act of 1875, it inevitably follows that they have the same meaning in the legislation introduced by section 16, No. 2. Those words in the Act of 1875 are: 'The minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein.' In section 16, No. 2, the words are: 'The minority of ratepayers in any district, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein and make the necessary assessment and collection of rates therefor, and that in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate schools shall be liable only to assessment of such rates as they impose upon themselves with respect thereto.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is from chapter 29.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These words are exactly identical.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If they have the meaning attributed to them in the Act of 1875, surely they must have the same meaning in clause 16, No. 2.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We will see about that. I do not know for what reason you can differentiate, but I would like to have some authority from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice other than that which has come to hand up to the present, to convince me that the words 'separate schools' have any such technical meaning as has been given them by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. The term 'separate schools' in the statute of Canada has no technical meaning. It means exactly what the statute says. It means that the minority may establish separate schools. The right hon. gentleman says that the right to establish separate schools implies the complete control of the education given in those schools. It is sufficient to show that the Act of 1875 does not declare anyhing of the kind. It simply establishes one principle, namely, the principle of separation. But my right hon. friend, when pressed upon that point, says that he relies upon the interpretation made by the territorial government when it enacted the ordinances under this legislation. He spoke of confusing the issue. There has been no confusion of the issue such as he himself created when he made that remark. There was nothing in the Act of 1875 to prevent the Territories from establishing separate schools of that character if they saw fit, nor was there anything in that Act to impose upon the territorial legislature the necessity of establishing such schools. In other words, such wide powers were given by the Act of 1875 to the Territories that they could establish denominational schools if they saw fit. There was nothing to restrict them, but neither was there anything in the Act of 1875 to impose the obligation of establishing denominational schools. The term used is not 'denominational schools,' but the right hon. gentleman has thus interpreted it. The term used is 'separate schools' and separate schools only. I see that my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Lavergne) is impatient. There is evidently something on his mind which troubling him.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. In our legislation, is not 'separate schools' synonymous with denominational schools? In section 93 of the British North America Act we see the term 'separate schools' employed once and the term 'denominational schools' also employed once, thereby showing that they mean the same thing.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Supreme Court of New Brunswick must have been very much astray, if that is the case.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I think that was the opinion of the Privy Council.

Mr. STOCKTON. That case was confirmed by the Privy Council.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. member will tell us why the term 'separate schools' is used instead of 'denominational schools' in section 16, No. 2, if they are equivalent to each other.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. It is used because they are taken as synonymous.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then would my hon. friend support a motion to restore the words 'denominational schools,' if both terms mean the same?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. That will depend on the motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That shows how very sincere the hon. gentleman is in the opinion he has put forward. However, I was dealing with the right hon. gentleman and not with the hon. member who has just interrupted me. 'The minority of ratepayers therein, whether Protestants or Roman Catholics, may establish separate schools therein.' That is the language of the Act of 1875. The word 'separate' has no technical meaning, as I have pointed out. It is not denominational schools but separate schools. A distinction has been drawn in the courts between those. The word 'separate' simply implies separation, but the right hon. gentleman sees a great deal more in it. And why? Because the territorial legislature established a dual system of schools—clerical schools and public schools; but surely the most cursory glance at this Act of 1875 should inform him that it was perfectly competent for the territorial legislature to do that, but not necessary that it should do it. It was perfectly competent for that legislature to establish a dual system of schools. He speaks of interpretation, but we cannot get any aid from the Territorial legislation, because the Territorial legislature had no power to interpret this enactment. The ordinances of 1884 and 1887 were measures which the Territorial government passed, and which were within its powers as defined in the Act of 1875. They cannot be regarded as interpretation of that Act because they might or might not go to the full extent of the power which it conferred. The situation seems to me so absolutely plain that it is almost impossible to argue it. They had the power to establish clerical schools and public school, if they saw fit. It appears they did so by the ordinance of 1884. And, because they did so under the full powers given them, it is said they interpreted the Act of 1875 in the sense that that Act made it necessary for them to do this. According to that argument, you would say that because parliament could pass clause 16, No. 1, having the power to do so; therefore, there is a constitutional obligation on this parliament to pass that clause. It is merely necessary to state the proposition to confute it. Then, come down, in the end, to the expression 'separate school' which the right hon. gentleman defines as having a certain meaning, for which definition he has no other warrant than the interpretation—as he calls it—of the Territorial government in 1884. And merely to speak of that is to indicate in the clearest manner that no such so-called interpretation could have any effect. Suppose some one were to go to court to-morrow and contend that the Act of 1875 made it necessary to establish a dual system of schools in the Territories; and the judges should examine the Act and declare that they found no expression of that kind in it; and counsel should answer: 'Ah, but the Territorial legislature, under this Act, did establish a dual system.' Any man who would make that argument before a court, it seems to me, would not favourably impress the court; the argument would be laughed to scorn. You must distinguish between the power given by the Act of 1875, and the restriction imposed by the Act of 1875 with respect to the establishment of separate schools. There was power, I repeat, to establish a dual system of schools, but there was no obligation to do so. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) goes back to the expression 'separate schools' for his sole warrant that under the Act of 1875 the schools were to be controlled, so far as their teaching is concerned, by the particular body that established them. I cannot see any room for such an argument. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman desires to make some observation before I deal with another point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; go on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This Act of 1875 must have been of a most extraordinary character, if we are to take the two interpretations placed upon it to-day by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have spoken. According to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) it meant, in the first place, that the Territorial legislature, although it received the power to make ordinances with respect to education, was to have no control over education, but that the majority in each district was to make the ordinances, the laws, the regulations with regard to that district. Therefore, you might have not merely five or ten, but forty or fifty different systems of laws in the Territories under the provisions of the Act of 1875. It seems to me it is not necessary to mass arguments to refute an interpretation of that kind. And then my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) declared further that the majority of the ratepayers who were to establish what might be called the majority school was a religious majority and not a majority of the ratepayers. That is, the hon. gentleman's argument would mean that in a district in which there were 2,000 Protestants, 2,400 Roman Catholics, and 500 of other religious denominations, it would be impossible to establish schools, for the simple reason that there would be no religious majority. Or take another illustration: Suppose there were 2,000 Protestants, 2,400 Roman Catholics, and 500 of other denominations. According to the argument of the hon. member for Labelle it would be impossible for 2,000 Protestants and 1,000 Roman Catholics to unite as a majority for the purpose of establishing schools. You could not, by any combination have a school established in such a district. Will any hon. gentle-

man in this House, whether a lawyer or not, believe for a moment that such an interpretation could be placed upon the statute? Why, absurdity could not go further. Under the law the majority of ratepayers in a district can establish such schools as they think fit, and it would not make the slightest difference whether they were all Protestants or partly Protestants and partly Roman Catholics; or whether they had among them Jews and Mormons—they would be a majority for the establishment of a school. And, when these schools had been established the minority could establish separate schools. But the word 'separate schools' to my mind does not impart anything more than separation; it does not involve the idea that the separate schools so established should be absolutely under the control of the persons who established them, any more than is the majority school. I do not think that any such result could follow without a fuller and more definite expression of that intention than we find in the Act of 1875.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has travelled very far afield, but, for my part, I do not wish to depart from the point he raised this afternoon as to the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. My hon. friend has gone back to that old heresy and fallacy of his that there is no constitutional obligation upon this parliament to pass this legislation. I shall not touch further upon that now, though I may exchange some words with him upon it later on. But let me show him again, since he has declined to see it, so far, the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. Under section 16, No. 1, which practically re-enacted the law of 1875, there was no restriction whatever upon the power of the minority to establish such schools as they thought fit. So far as I know there was no restriction whatever. My hon. friend says that in that case, you could have many different laws for different districts. Sir, that would have been the legitimate and logical conclusion of the law. And, in order to obviate that in the Territories, they did what has been done in other places—they provided for a board of education which was separated into two sections, one to legislate for the Catholics and the other to legislate for the Protestants.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman permit me a question?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the statute conferred the absolute right to do that, how could the Board of Education interfere with them?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the laws which are meant to be interpreted by school trustees were always interpreted by able lawyers, perhaps many things would not be done which are done; but unfortunately these are often interpreted by the man on the street who does the best he can according to his knowledge. The legislature of that time thought it advisable to have two boards of education; they thought differently afterwards and abolished them, whether they acted within their right or not. Suppose the Act of 1875 did not authorize that to be done. After it had been in force for a number of years it was withdrawn, and it was held to be a grievance, and that grievance has been felt ever since. My hon. friend is familiar with the correspondence which took place between Archbishop Taché and others when this law was withdrawn in 1892, they made it the subject of complaint. My hon. friend might think that if the archbishop had been as good a lawyer as he is, he might have concluded that they had no right under the law of 1875 to this extra board. But they thought they had. Now we have enacted the law of 1875 again, so that they may not begin again. Although I have great respect for the opinion of my hon. friend, there are other lawyers besides himself in this House and out of it, who differ with him, and who believe that the establishment of the second board and its organization was a legitimate consequence of the law of 1875. And as we are not here to legislate simply for fancy purposes, but for useful purposes, we desire, in order to give satisfaction to the people, to pass such laws here as may not be exposed to the quibbles of lawyers in future years. Let us come now to the practical part of the case. What was the legitimate consequence of the law of 1875? If we take chapter 29, we find that the power to establish in a school district such a school as they think fit, is taken away from them. My hon. friend did not quote that, but it is a qualification of what he did quote, he only quoted section 41. I now quote from section 29:

> The minority of ratepayers in any district, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, may establish a separate school therein, and in such case the ratepayers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic separate school, shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof.

Then with a tone of triumph the hon. gentleman exclaimed: Is not that the same thing as we had before? Is there any difference? Is it not the same as the Act of 1875? I say no, it is not the same thing, and the reason is because there is something in this clause 29 which the hon. gentleman did not quote. It is this:

> There shall be a department of the public service of the Territories called the Depatment of Education, over which the member of the executive council appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under the seal of the Ter-

ritories to discharge the functions of the commissioner of education for the time being, shall preside.

The department shall have the control and management of all kindergarten schools, public and separate schools, normal schools, teachers' institutes and the education of deaf, deaf mute and blind persons.

Therefore, the board of education has control over separate schools. And what has the board power to do ?

The commissioner, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall have power to make regulations for the department.

For the classification, organization, government, examination and inspection of all schools hereinbefore mentioned.

That is to say, of public schools and separate schools.

For the construction, furnishing and care of school buildings and the arrangement of school premises.

For the examination, licensing and grading of teachers, and for the examination of persons who may desire to enter professions, or who may wish certificates of having completed courses of study in any school.

For a teachers' reading course and teachers' institutes and conventions.

To authorize text and reference books for the use of the pupils and teachers in all schools hereinbefore mentioned.

Then my hon. friend quoted section 41 as giving the same privileges to separate schools as given under the law of 1875. My hon. friend sees there is a great difference. Under these ordinances the minority have no longer the power to establish such schools as they see fit, they may only establish such schools as the Board of Public Education sees fit. Therefore there is a great difference. When it comes to the matter of religious instruction, however, here is what the law says :

No religious instruction except as hereinafter provided shall be permitted in the school of any district from the opening of such school until one-half hour previous to its closing in the afternoon, after which time any such instruction permitted or desired by the board may be given.

Then when it comes to half-past three, in every school, whether public or separate, the board may provide for such religious instruction as they want. The state does not follow education beyond that point. The state concerns itself only with secular education. Therfore I say again, section 29 has made a difference in the law of 1875. And here again I say that my fellow co-religionists have made a great sacrifice. It may not perhaps be a great sacrifice of power. In his opinion they may not have made such a sacrifice, but in their own interpretation of the law, they made a sacrifice, and therefore it is that we are asking for this safeguard to our co-religionists.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like the contention of the right hon. gentleman made perfectly clear. He has referred to the right of the majority to establish such schools therein as they may think fit, going back to the argument made by the Minister of Justice this afternoon. He has also referred to the Act of 1875 as possibly providing that there should be a separate board of education, or a separate board of control. Now what does he mean ? Let us not confine ourselves to vague expressions—what does he mean? Does he mean that a majority of the ratepayers in any district could, under the Act of 1875, make laws absolutely with respect to schools to be established in that district, making regulations with regard to pupils, and who should be admitted? Could they establish religious tests ? Could they make provision as to text-books ? Could they declare that certain children should not be admitted to the schools ? Could they do everything that is embraced in the expression 'pass all necessary ordinances in respect to education'? Or does my hon. friend mean that under the Act of 1875 majorities could not do this, but that there was to be a separate board of education, a separate board of control in respect of separate schools? The two propositions are absolutely distinct. We have already had one this afternoon. My right hon. friend, while apparently adhering to that puts forward another view as to a separate board of education. What is the position of the government with regard to that when they come to define the difference between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, because it is a very important point.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The position of the government is this: that the minority claim that under the Act of 1875 they had the right to select their own text-books. They claim also, as the correspondence of record will show, that they have a right to separate school boards. They have that or they have not, and in order to make it absolutely sure, we have abandoned that clause and taken the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked my right hon. friend one question and he slipped away very conveniently to another. The words 'as they may think fit' do not occur in respect to minority separate schools. Does not the right hon. gentleman remember the section ? I asked him a very distinct question as to the meaning of the words 'such schools therein as they may think fit.' These words do not occur in connection with the provision for minority schools, but they do occur in connection with the provision for majority schools, about which the right hon. gentleman was speaking. When I ask him about that, he leaves that part of the section and goes to the next part of the section, which does not contain these words at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may tell my hon. friend, without being offensive to him, that I knew these words were not to be found in the second part of the section. I read:

> That a majority may establish such schools therein as they think fit . . . the minority may establish separate schools therein.

The words are not reproduced in the second part of the section, but in my estimation it is a distinction which is unworthy of my hon. friend to say that the minority under such circumstances would not have the same right as the majority. If the majority has the right to establish such schools as they think fit, the minority has that same right also, though it is not expressed in so many words.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the right hon. gentleman then conclude as to the meaning of the words 'such schools as they may think fit'?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say that in the opinion of the minority the words 'as they may think fit' gave them the power to select their own text-books. That has been taken away from them. Their contention was right or it was wrong, it was legal or it was illegal, but whether it was legal or illegal they thought they had it, and in order not to create the impression on their mind we have taken that away and put in the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman does not contend there is any real distinction; he only says that the minority thought there was a distinction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let us put it that way if you want to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, after all, there is no effective argument that there is any real distinction between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, but that a certain class of our citizens (the minority in the Northwest) had a certain opinion, and therefore there is a distinction between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2. If it comes down to that; if that is the argument, it seems to me that there is not very much need of discussing it further. If the government take that position, they simply abandon the contention that there is any real distinction between section 16, No. 1, and section 16, No. 2, and confine themselves absolutely to the position that certain of our citizens who are interested in this question had that opinion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If that is not a good argument for my hon. friend, it is a good argument for me, and, I hope, for many other members of this House. We should not legislate here in order to convey to men the impression that they are given bread when they are given a stone. If the minority for the last fourteen years have thought that they had been deprived of their right, but in order to have peace and harmony they abandoned that right and agreed to live under a system which has given satisfaction to everybody, it is, I think, a good reason why we should have no equivocation about it; why we should know where we are, and legislate accordingly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That would be an excellent comparison, except that the change was made, not at the instance of the minority, but at the instance of the majority.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, because if the majority and the minority had not agreed to that, there would be the same thing as occurred elsewhere, and which we do not want a repetition of here; we do not want to have another Manitoba school question, we had enough of one.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not hope, after the discussion we have had, to shed any new light on the interpretation of section 11 of the Act of 1875, but perhaps I may be permitted to give the committee my interpretation of that section. The House is face to face with two interpretations; one given by the leader of the opposition and concurred in by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and the other interpretation given by the Minister of Justice this afternoon. I shall endeavour to state briefly my reasons for adopting the opinion of the Minister of Justice. The interpreation given by the leader of the opposition and by his hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is what I would term a strictly narrow, judicial interpretation of the statute. It is the interpretation which a court of justice might give, and I think I am stating the case fairly when I say that the leader of the opposition informed the House that his interpretation is that which would be given by a judge if that section were brought to a court to be interpreted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What other interpretation should one put upon it?

Mr. BELCOURT. Permit me to say that in my opinion the canons which should be adopted by parliament in interpreting a statute differ in many respects from the canons which govern a court of justice. The interpretation by a judge is according to the language of the statute and that only; a judge does not look to the extraneous or surrounding circumstances which existed at the time the law was passed; a judge would simply interpret the language to the best of his ability according to the dictionary and according to jurisprudence. Parliament, in interpreting a statute, must and should adopt a much wider view; parliament, I submit, must, in interpreting a statute, look at the conditions as they were at the time the law was passed; parliament must look at the intention of the legislature which passed that law; it must look at past history; it must look at every circumstance

which can in any way throw any light upon that law. We all know that the Act of 1875 was passed somewhat hurriedly; we know that section 11 was introduced after the other provisions of the statute had been discussed by the House. A subject of great importance, such as the question of education, was treated in a very short section and in very few words. It was passed with apparently no contentious discussion in the House; it was passed, as I remember, unanimously, and there was no discussion whatever as to the meaning and effect of the terms used. We know that in 1875, when this law was passed, it was but a few years after the passage of the British North America Act. It is a matter of history that in Canada so far as legislation is concerned the meaning of the words 'separate schools' is synonymous to 'denominational schools'; in the British North America Act the same sense was attached to it as to the words 'denominational schools.' We had only two kinds of schools in Canada at that time, viz., the public school and the separate school. Separate schools were introduced in Ontario in 1860, and they were then intended to be, and have ever since been, denominational schools. So it is in the province of Quebec; the separate schools of the province of Quebec are to-day denominational schools and so they are in Ontario. I appeal to any member in this House to point to me a single instance in any province of the Dominion where there is a separate school which is not, to all intents and purposes, a denominational school.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood that a great many members on the other side of the House have alleged that the separate schools in the Northwest are not denominational schools.

Mr. BELCOURT. As I understood it, the argument of gentlemen on this side is that the school which it is now intended to have under clause 16, No. 2, will be non-denominational schools. I never understood any one on this side of the House to say that the separate schools which existed under the dual system put into force by the Northwest Territories was not a denominational school.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I mean the separate schools that are there to-day.

Mr. BELCOURT. So far as I understand it, the schools existing in the Territories under the Act of 1875 and the ordinance of 1884 were, to all intents and purposes, denominational schools.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman take the ground that the separate schools in the Northwest to-day under the present schools in the Northwest Territories, at all times denominational schools.

Mr. BELCOURT. No, I do not, I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the hon. gentleman said that you could not have separate schools which were not denominational.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said that the separate schools of Canada, whether in the east or the west, the north or the south, have been, perhaps with the exception of the present schools in the Northwest Territories, at all times denominational schools.

Mr. FOSTER. In Quebec are the Protestant schools which are separate schools denominational schools?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not know what they are de facto, but they are de jure. They can be made denominational schools to all intents and purposes under the law.

Mr. FOSTER. According to the argument of my hon. friend it is the de facto and not the de jure that ought to rule. My difficulty is that you have a Protestant school, a minority school; I suppose it does not often happen that that minority school is not made up of different denominations of Protestants. If you have Baptists and Presbyterians and Methodists, making up the minority forming a school that is a separate Protestant school, how are you going to make that a denominational school? Because the tenets of these three denominations are different. You could not teach the Presbyterian catechism because the Methodists do not like it.

Mr. BELCOURT. As far as I understand the legislation of this country, whether it has been Dominion or provincial legislation, denominational schools have been confined to two classes of His Majesty's subjects, that is the Protestants on the one hand and the Catholics on the other. That is the only distinction, that is the only division or separation which any of our laws has ever contemplated and I say when the Confederation Act of 1867 was framed it was—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be very true, but still would not what has just been suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto prevent the Protestant schools from being denominational in the sense which the hon. gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. BELCOURT. No, I do not think so, because the words 'denominational schools' is used in a general sense as far as Protestants are concerned. My hon. friend must admit that the expression 'denominational schools' was a distinction between Protestant and Catholic schools, exclusively, and I say all through our legislation they have been treated as such. Nobody has ever thought in speaking of denominational schools of attempting to give the Mormons, the Doukhobors, the Galicians or any other sect, separate schools, it has always been a separation as between Protestants and Catholics only.

Let us look at what were the facts, what are the historical facts in connection with school legislation in Canada. At the time the British North America Act came into operation there were practically only two religious sects in Canada; there were practically only Catholics and Protestants at the time the Act of 1875 was put in force with reference to the Northwest Territories. There were practically only two religious denominations in the Northwest Territories, Catholics and Protestants. It was never attempted to make any provision, never sought to make any provision which would confer any right on others than these two denominations. In 1875, as I have said a moment ago, there were two religious denominations only, This afternoon in order to make their argument, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) conjured up the case of the Galicians and Doukhobors, Mormons and Jews and other religious denominations, and other denominations. Well, I think that is introducing into the interpretation of section 11 of the Act of 1875 an element which should not be introduced at all. We must look at legislation in order to interpret it properly in the light of the facts which are contemporaneous with that legislation, not the historical facts which came into existence 35 or 40 years afterwards. If this clause were taken in court to-morrow to be interpreted, I would ask the member for North Toronto, I would ask the leader of the opposition, if any lawyer would be allowed to argue that the majority mentioned in section 11 must be interpreted in the light of the extraneous facts which have been introduced this afternoon, in the light of the fact that there are to-day Mormons, Jews, and Galicians. Surely not.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the law of 1875 exist simply for the year 1875?

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all.

Mr. FOSTER. Or for all years and all conditions? And not for each year which the law is in force.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not think that is a difficult question to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not a difficult question to answer but any judge or court in interpreting the law of 1875 would interpret it for 1905 under different conditions. How is the interpretation going to go? Is it going to go according to the conditions of the year 1875 or to the conditions of 1905?

Mr. BELCOURT. That is exactly the point I am trying to make. I submit as a matter of sound parliamentary interpretation of law, that in the interpretation of a law by parliament and not by a court of justice——

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking of a court of justice.

Mr. BELCOURT. A court of justice would not look at the circumstances of to-day or of 30 years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Then my hon. friend has no argument at all.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have no argument? That is a mere affirmation. I am going to make an argument and if I cannot impress my hon. friend perhaps I can impress somebody else.

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to be impressed.

Mr. BELCOURT. So far as the judge is concerned, I quite admit that the hon. member for North Toronto who took such pains this afternoon to say he was not going to argue as a lawyer, but as a parliamentarian or common sense man, argued it from the most narrow, contracted view that any lawyer could take.

Mr. FOSTER. That shows that the law and common sense go side by side.

Mr. BELCOURT. My hon. friend is well known for his ability to whittle, whittle, whittle things down to the very finest point, and when he says that he has not the legal ability or acumen to argue as a lawyer he is doing himself great injustice. I repeat that this Act must be interpreted not in the way a judge might possibly interpret it, in a narrow, judical way, but in a large, broad, what I would call an equitable way. Parliament to-day should look at the intention of parliament in 1875; it should look at the conditions of things at that time and I have no hesitation in saying, so far as I am concerned, that section 11 of the Act of 1875 contemplated and intended to give the Northwest Territories a dual system of education. That it contemplated the erection there on the one hand of Protestant denominational schools and on the other hand of Roman Catholic denominational schools. I submit that the words:

> That a majority may establish such schools therein as they may think fit.

—give the people of the Northwest Territories where they are a minority either Catholic or Protestant the right to establish according to their own religious belief, schools of their own faith according to their own views.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would my hon. friend——

Mr. BELCOURT. I was coming to that. My hon. friend was going to tell me that would be inconsistent with the first portion of the section.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I was not, I was going simply to ask whether or not the hon. gentleman concurred in the view of the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) that the majority mentioned in that part of the clause is a religious majority?

Mr. BELCOURT. Quite so, that is my view.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well then he said: You are not to consider Mormons or the possibility that Mormons and Jews and inhabitants of different religious belief from either Protestant or Catholics, may affect the situation. But if it is a religious majority we know we have in portions of the Northwest Territories, a considerable number of Mormons. For example, what will you do where you have say 2,000 Mormons, 1,000 Protestants, and 1,000 Roman Catholics? What will you do about establishing a school? What I desire to know is, does that condition under the Act of 1875 prevent the establishment of a school section at all?

Mr. BELCOURT. My answer to that is this, that the Mormons and the Galicians and every other religious sect outside of the Roman Catholics and Protestants have nothing whatever to do with the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I see.

Mr. BELCOURT. That they are outside of it altogether.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no law for them?

Mr. BELCOURT. There is no denominational school law for them. I am speaking of the law of 1875, interpreting that law, and I say the law of 1875 as well as the Confederation Act, 1867, did not assume to bother itself with any other religious sect but these two. That is my argument, I may be wrong, but surely that is very plain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose for example you had in a school section 1,000 Roman Catholics, 500 Protestants, and 2,000 Mormons. In my hon. friend's view of the law the 1,000 Roman Catholics would be the majority mentioned in section 11. He would disregard the Mormons or the Jews altogether.

Mr. BELCOURT. Certainly. That is my view, and that seems to have been at all times in our history the only view which received the consideration of parliament. In 1867, at the time of the Confederation Act, we were not worried over any class but Roman Catholics and Protestants. There was no attempt made at that time, and so far as I know there has been no attempt made at any time or anywhere in Canada, to pass legislation conferring any special right on any other religious denomination than those two.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. May I ask my hon. friend a question? Does he know the position of the Jews in regard to schools in the province of Quebec?

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Well, they are under the control of the Protestant Council of Public Instruction.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have taken their choice.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Yes, they have taken their choice, but that proves that the law provided for only the two classes, Protestants and Catholics.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is a fact which must be apparent to everybody. Legislatures have never at any time in Canada provided for separate education except with reference to these two denominations; and if we bear that in mind, we must come to the conclusion that the only object of section 11 of the Act of 1875 was to make legislation to cover those two cases. Now, what does the law say? It says that the majority in a district may establish such schools therein as they think fit. Take the case submitted to me by the hon. leader of the opposition. If there are 1,000 Roman Catholics and 500 Protestants in a district —I take no note of the others, because it seems to me they do not enter into the account—the 1,000 Catholics who are in the majority will establish such schools as they think fit. The next paragraph of the same section provides for the establishment of a Protestant separate school. It may be said that this interpretation would be in conflict with the power conferred upon the legislature of the territory to make regulations and ordinances in respect to education. That is an objection which evidently must be met, and the way in which I meet that objection is this. I say that the Act of 1875 intended that there should be a dual system of schools in the Northwest Territories, either Catholic or Protestant, and that the legislature should be given the power to make necessary ordinances in respect to education, subject to and within the other provisions of section 11. That is, where a majority of Catholics wish to establish a school of their own, the ordinances and regulations which the legislature of the territory is given the power to make, would have to be consonant with the religious belief of that majority. That that was what was intended is evidenced by the fact that the first legislation which was passed by the Northwest Territories to put the law of 1875 into operation established a dual board, having control, one of Roman Catholic schools and the other of Protestant schools. It seems to me that we are beside the question when we import into the interpretation of section 11, elements which at that time did not enter into the contemplation of parliament, and which should not to-day. Now, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition argued this afternoon that we on this side of the House were wrong in assuming that section 11 created an obligation which ought to be respected to-day. My hon. friend argued that because in 1886 we who speak French and who want

to continue to speak French had allowed (but not without protest) the abolition of the French language in the Northwest Territories, we should be willing to-day to consent to the abolition of religious instruction in the schools. I think that my hon. friend will on reflection admit that that is a rather curious argument. Is it because the Roman Catholic French Canadians of the Northwest have been deprived of the right to teach French in their schools that they must also be deprived of the right to have religious instruction in their schools? Is it because the lamb has been shorn of half his wool, that he must be compelled to give up the rest? That is a curious sort of argument. So far as I am concerned, I have no hesitation whatever in adopting the interpretation put on section 11 by the Minister of Justice to-day. I say that under the Act of 1875 the majority in the Northwest Territories, whether Catholic or Protestant, had the right to establish their own schools as they might think fit; and that there was to all intents and purposes established by that Act in the Territories a dual system of schools, to the same extent and in the same manner that that system was established in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec before confederation and as they now then exist and are maintained. If I am right in my interpretation of section 11, it follows as a necessary corollary, that the distinction between clause 16, No. 1 and clause 16, No. 2 is very evident. It is quite plain to me, speaking as a Roman Catholic and a French Canadian, that by clause 16, No. 2 we have given up something which we certainly were entitled to under the original clause 16, No. 1 and under the Act of 1875. If the Act of 1875 is still law to-day, and I believe it is, we are entitled in the Northwest Territories to a system of separate schools as a matter of right, not merely for the purpose of giving half an hour or an hour of religious instruction, but we are entitled to the absolute control of our schools. I submit that not only parliament, but even any court of justice should give that interpretation to the Act of 1875. So far as parliament is concerned, I think we have something more to do than to give a narrow and contracted interpretation to that Act. I think it is the duty of every member of this House to inquire and find out for himself what was the intention of parliament at that time—to look at the extraneous and surrounding circumstances in order to determine what that intention was and what the interpretation should be. I do not think it should be circumscribed or narrowed down to the circumstances which exist to-day; but we should go back to the circumstances as they existed at the time the Act of 1875 was passed and interpret the law accordingly.

Mr. BELCOURT.

Mr. STOCKTON. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat has given expression to some views with respect to interpretation which have somewhat astonished me. Section 11 of the Act of 1875 says that the majority of the ratepayers of any district or portion of the Northwest Territories may establish schools. As I understand the interpretation put upon that by my hon. friend, you have to eliminate from these words 'the majority of the ratepayers,' all who cannot properly come under the denomination of Protestants or Roman Catholics; therefore Doukhobors, Jews, Galicians and Mormons would not be included in that category. I think that is the argument of my hon. friend.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is quite right.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then, if we have a district in which the people are all Jews, for instance, the parliament of this country must entirely ignore that class of people, and you cannot have any education there. Under the argument of my hon. friend you cannot institute a school system.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not argue that. I did not say that these people were to go without education.

Mr. STOCKTON. How will they get it if they cannot establish a school system of their own?

Mr. BELCOURT. They are not entitled to schools of their own. They can get their education either in Protestant or Catholic schools.

Mr. STOCKTON. That is not the argument of my hon. friend. He said that the majority means either Protestant or Roman Catholic, and that you could not establish a public school except by a majority which should be Roman Catholic or Protestant.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am glad he is taking it back because he evidently did not understand exactly the force of his argument.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not take it back. What I said was that the majority whether Catholic or Protestant, have an absolute right in the Territories to establish schools of their own, in the words of the statute, as they may think fit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman this question? He said if you had a thousand Catholics and five hundred Protestants and two thousand Mormons, Jews and others, the thousand Catholics would be the majority, and my hon. friend said distinctly yes. He would ignore the Mormons altogether.

Mr. STOCKTON. He said they could not have any schools.

Mr. BELCOURT. What I said was that if there were a thousand Catholics as against five hundred Protestants and two thousand Mormons the Catholics, as a matter of right, under section 11 of the Act of 1875, would have the right to establish schools as they might think fit, and the five hundred Protestants in the minority would be entitled to separate schools of their own. As regards the Jews and Mormons and others, they would have to go either to the Protestant or Catholic schools.

Mr. STOCKTON. That is exactly what I said was the argument of my hon. friend, and it follows that if there were neither Catholics nor Protestants in any locality, there would be no schools for the Jews or Doukhobors or Galicians or whatever else the population might be composed of.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not say that.

Mr. STOCKTON. Where are they going to get their education if they are not free to establish schools of their own? Surely that is not the interpretation of section 11 of the Act of 1875. Let us read the English language according to the plain meaning of it. It says the majority of taxpayers. Is a Jew not a taxpayer and a citizen of this country just as much as a Protestant or a Roman Catholic? Are you going to invite those people to this country and then deny them the rights of citizenship, although they have to bear the burden of citizenship along with ourselves.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is beside the question altogether.

Mr. STOCKTON. It is not. You are going to put the burden of citizenship on these people, and yet you say that they have not the right to establish public schools in the district in which they live, if they happen to be the majority. That is what he said.

Mr. BELCOURT. No. They might establish a Protestant school or a Catholic school if they wanted to but not a school of their own.

Mr. FOSTER. Where would the rights of conscience be then?

Mr. STOCKTON. For the sake of argument I will say yes they might, but it is not very likely they would under those circumstances. There is another point that I thank my hon. friend for.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put him a question? Are not the Jews in Montreal under the Protestant Council of public instruction?

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not know.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Well, they are.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then they are treated as citizens and better treated in the city of Montreal than my hon. friend would treat them in the Northwest, when these new provinces are organized, according to his argument.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am glad my hon. friend sees the weakness of his argument in that respect and is willing to withdraw it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all; I do not withdraw it.

Mr. STOCKTON. He sees now where his argument will lead him and he wants to withdraw it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I do not want to withdraw anything.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then I would ask him to stick to just what he has said.

Mr. BELCOURT. I would not rely upon the hon. gentleman to quote correctly what I have said, because it is evident the hon. gentleman will not state fairly what I did say.

Mr. STOCKTON. I do not wish to state anything unfair with respect to my hon. friend and I presume that 'Hansard' tomorrow will show exactly what he has said; and when he comes to read it in cold type, he will see that the interpretation I put on his argument is exactly correct and in accord with what I have stated.

Mr. BELCOURT. Not at all.

Mr. STOCKTON. I have to thank my hon. friend for another argument he has made to-night. He says that the judges and the courts would put the same interpretation upon this Act that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) would put upon it.

Mr. BELCOURT. I said they might. I did not say they would.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does he say they would not? I understood him to say they would.

Mr. FOSTER. He withdraws that.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does he withdraw that or will he stick to what he said?

Mr. BELCOURT. Perhaps my hon. friend thinks he is lending to the dignity of parliament by this manner of carrying on discussion. If my hon. friend wishes a passage of arms of that kind, he may proceed but I shall not lend myself to that line of argument.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am lending myself to the arguments which I understood he made.

Mr. BELCOURT. I would not offer a challenge of that kind to my hon. friend because I would not be in it with him.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am lending myself to the argument I understood him to make. I understood him to say that, under a strictly legal interpretation, the courts would decide according to the interpretation put upon the Act by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto. If I misunderstood him in that respect, I shall be very glad to be corrected. If that be the case, where do we go for the interpretation of statutes except to the courts? And if the courts decide as to what the correct interpretation of a statute is, can we come to this legislature to ascertain its meaning? We pass laws here every day, but this parliament does not interpret the meaning of the statutes which it passes. The courts interpret the meaning of those statutes; and therefore I was surprised at the statement I understood my hon. friend to make, namely, that a strict judicial interpretation would be according to the meaning put upon the Act by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto, but that a broad, liberal interpretation would be according to the opinions expressed in debate here in parliament. If my hon. friend admits that, he admits then the position taken by the leader of the opposition and the hon. member for North Toronto, and I thank him for that argument.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. If I may be allowed to interject a few remarks into this hair splitting controversy which we are now having, I might remind my hon. friend that the courts interpret statutes liberally according to the intention of the legislature, and I might refer my hon. friend to the decisions of the courts on the law of patents. I am not surprised that my hon. friend did not understand the argument of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) because it took him two hours this afternoon to understand the argument of the Minister of Justice, who repeated the same thing that he had said a couple of weeks ago, and it was only on a third repetition of the argument for his own benefit that my hon. friend understood it. My hon. friend has taken under his wing the Jews and all those who do not fall under the denomination of Catholic or Protestant. Well, it is quite clear, both by the law of 1875 and the British North America Act, that denominational or separate schools, which are synonymous in the law, apply only to the dual system of Catholics or Protestants, and that the Jews or the Mormons—the latter of whom seem to be the favourite protegés of our hon. friends on the other side—if they want schools of their own, must choose between the Catholic and the Protestant system, as they do in the province of Quebec, where we have the most perfect system of separate schools in confederation. That therefore is not an argument which my hon. friend can bring against section 11 of the law of 1875. This is the first time in the history of Canada that the interpretation given to that section by the leader of the opposition has been given to it. On every occasion before, when we have had a debate on the question of separate schools, the interpretation we, on this side, have given of this law has never been questioned.

It is quite clear, and if my hon. friend takes the trouble to read it over once more, he will see that the adjective 'Protestant' and 'Roman Catholic' is applied, and that when it speaks of the majority, that is only as co-relative of the rights given to the minority. Of course, the rights given to the majority must be the same as those given to the minority—you cannot deprive the great number of rights that are given to the few. So, I think that it is only hair-splitting that we have been given to-night. As to section 16, No. 2, it deprives the Catholics of the Northwest not only of the right to have their schools where they are a majority, but of a great many things they would have had under section 16, No. 1. I do not wish to go into the merits of the difference between these two proposed sections—that will come later on. But, if there are any people interested in the rights of the Catholic minority in the Northwest they are the bishops of the Northwest. And we have heard their opinion. And if there is a man who desires to see that minority deprived of its rights, it is the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton). And that hon. gentleman has come back to the support of the government because section 16, No. 2, deprived them of rights which section 16, No. 1, would have given them. These things, I think, he no doubt knew as to the relative meaning of the two sections.

Mr. PRINGLE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armand Lavergne) a question. Does he concede that under the amended clause 16, the Catholics are deprived of any rights to denominational schools other than the right to religious instruction? Under section 41, chapter 29, the minority of the ratepayers in a district whether Protestant or Catholic have the right to establish separate schools. Under section 45, that school must be established subject to the privileges and according to the method the government has provided in chapter 29. Now, under that, are the schools separate and public, placed upon the same footing except in regard to religious instruction?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. That is my opinion. And that has been corroborated by a Conservative paper in Quebec called 'L'Evenement.' That paper says that to-day denominational schools in the Northwest Territories have ceased to exist since the ordinances were passed. I may say in

a few words, that the separate schools in the Northwest to-day are not denominational schools as we Roman Catholics understand that term.

Mr. BARKER. I rise only to correct an expression used by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) with regard to the meaning of the expression 'separate schools. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that throughout Canada that expression had a recognized meaning, that it meant a religious school of the Roman Catholics or the Protestants. Now, there are only two provinces, Ontario and Quebec, that have separate schools. And, certainly, in one of these two provinces the province of Ontario, the expression 'separate school' has not the meaning the hon. gentleman stated. I have here the school law of Ontario, and I find that separate schools may mean Protestant schools, or Roman Catholic schools, or coloured schools.

Mr. BELCOURT. For Catholic or Protestant.

Mr. BARKER. No. The coloured children do not go to a Protestant separate school, or the Protestants to a coloured separate school.

Mr. BELCOURT. If my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will permit me—I was addressing myself simply to the religious distinction and not to points of race or colour. My argument was that whenever parliament or the legislatures had attempted to deal with schools in the light of religion, they made a distinction only as between the Catholic and the Protestant.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) was speaking of separate schools. Now, after dealing with Protestant schools the statute of Ontario says:

> And, upon the application in writing of five or more heads of families resident in any township, city, town or incorporated village, being coloured people the council of such township or the board of school trustees of any such city, town or incorporated village, shall authorize the establishment therein of one or more separate schools for coloured people.

After that I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) will desire to withdraw his expression with regard to separate schools of Catholics or Protestants. The expression means precisely what it means in English words—a school separate from the schools of other people. And when the hon. gentleman said that separate schools had a recognized meaning throughout Canada, he made a mistake in saying that it meant only Catholic or Protestant separate schools.

Mr. BELCOURT. What I said was that whenever parliament has legislated with reference to separate schools, it had recognized only Catholic and Protestants. I was not dealing with racial distinctions. Evidently there are none so blind as those who will not see. I have made the statement half a dozen times, and have made it as plainly as my command of English will allow. I say I was dealing with denominational schools and that I spoke of those alone.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt was defining the expression 'separate schools,' and I hold him to that, if he will allow me. He asserted that that expression had a recognized particular meaning, which meaning he gave. I quote this statute to show that it has no such meaning. And I would ask him where he finds the legislation, when he speaks of school legislation by this parliament. School law is provincial law, and he has to go to the provinces to find that law, except for the provision of the British North America Act. And so I bring to his attention the separate school law of Ontario showing that the words have no such recognized meaning as he says they have, and this is one of the only two provinces in which they have separate schools by law.

Mr. BELCOURT. Well, if my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) is satisfied, I am.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I certainly thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) was defining separate schools as denominational schools—I thought that was part of his argument. If I understood him wrongly, I am sorry. But I followed him carefully and understood him to say—and he was supported by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. A. Lavergne)—that separate schools meant necessarily denominational schools, and therefore, as he said, the word 'separate' in section 11 of the Act of 1875 meant not merely a school separated, but meant a denominational school. If I did not hear the hon. gentleman make that argument my ears deceived me. As to the misunderstanding which occurred between the hon. gentleman and my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton), I certainly did understand the member for Ottawa to say this, in answer to a question of mine: I asked him whether the majority mentioned in the first part of section 11 of the Act of 1875, was a religious majority, and the hon. gentleman said, yes. Then I asked him whether, in a community where there were 1,000 Roman Catholics, and 500 Protestants and 2,000 Mormons, the 1,000 Catholics would be the majority within the meaning of the statute, and he said, yes. I do not think my hon. friend will deny having given that answer. It seems to me a very extraordinary result. For example, in a community of 1,000 Mormons, not having a school established, if one Roman Catholic or one Protestant should enter, then the one Roman Catholic or the one Protestant would be the major-

ity within the meaning of the Act of 1875—or I think the statute requires 5: if 5 Roman Catholics or 5 Protestants entered a community of 1,000 Mormons, then the 5 Roman Catholics or 5 Protestants would be a majority within the meaning of the Act of 1875. Well, that may be the case, my hon. friend may be right, but if so, it only adds one more to the extraordinary interpretations which we have been forced to place upon this Act of 1875. So far as the word 'separate' is concerned, I adhere, with all due deference, to the view that it means exactly what it says, a separate school, it implies nothing more. And when you draw illustrations from provincial legislation you are at once met with the illustration mentioned by my hon. friend from Hamilton, that in the province of Quebec you have a separate school which does not depend in any respect upon the religion of those who constitute the pupils.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think we have not made very much progress, and I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 9, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a certificate of the election of Mr. Louis Auguste Carrier for the electoral district of Lévis, in the province of Quebec.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of dividends remaining unpaid, unclaimed balances, unpaid drafts and bills of exchange in chartered banks of the Dominion of Canada for five years and upwards, prior to December 31, 1904.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 173) respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to give a word of personal explanation. I notice by reading the report of yesterday's debates that in replying to a question that was put to me by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), I gave a reply which certainly entitled the hon. gentleman to say later on in the debate, while I was absent, that I had stated something that led to an absurd conclusion. I see by reading the report that in fact I had not properly understood the question of the hon. gentleman. He asked me:

> Suppose there was no majority of either Protestants or Roman Catholics in the district; suppose there was one-third Protestant, one-third Roman Catholic and one-third Jews and Mormons; does he not think that the word 'majority' in section 11 would enable the majority of these people to establish a school?
>
> Mr. BOURASSA. No, I do not think so.

I had evidently misunderstood the question of the hon. gentleman. I was dealing at that time with the distinction that was established with regard to denominational schools, and meant to say that there was no other denominational school referred to in section 11 of the Act of 1875 but Protestant schools and Catholic schools, and I understood the hon. gentleman's question to mean that in case a majority would be composed partly of Protestants and partly of Mormons, they could establish any other denominational schools. Naturally the context to my remarks later on proved that I acknowledged the right of any majority to have a public school, but, as far as denominational schools are concerned, it would be either a Protestant or a Catholic school. Of course, I could have corrected this in the report of the debate so as to make my thought clear, but I considered it would be an injustice to the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) on account of the further remarks he made later on, so I prefer making this explanation and leaving the text as it is. I hope this will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Steamship subventions—for a line or lines of steamers to run between St. John and Halifax or either, and the West Indies and South America, $80,700.

Mr. DANIEL. As I understand it, tenders have been called for in regard to this service, which will be due, I think, about the middle of this month.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; the tenders have been invited, and are now in.

Mr. DANIEL. They have been received?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I am aware that the contractor for this service has expressed a desire to leave out the port of St. John and confine the maritime port to the port of

Halifax. Our business people in St. John have been considerably disturbed over that matter, and I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether this line will in future continue to make its trips to St. John as well as to Halifax, as it has been doing in the past.

Mr. FIELDING. The contractor who has been doing the service for some years has made a proposal that some change be made in the ports of call, both as respects the West Indies and the Canadian end of the service. The matter is still under consideration, and at this moment has not been finally determined.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister cannot say at present, then, how the line will be conducted in the future, with regard to the inclusion of the port of St. John ?

Mr. FIELDING. A proposal has been made which would involve the dropping of the port of St. John and making some arrangement for carrying the St. John freight by rail to Halifax, as one alternative. That suggestion is under consideration, and up to this moment nothing has been done with regard to it. If that arrangement should be made before this item is finally passed, it would necessitate a change in the wording of the item. For the present we are following the same wording as before.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend will see that he cannot ask for a change in the wording of the item unless he has first made up his mind what the policy is to be. If this item is voted, it will be impossible to cut out St. John. It would seem to me to be much better, if the minister has not made up his mind as to the policy, to let the item stand until he has, because I imagine that it would raise a pretty brisk discussion were he to propose to cut off the service to the port of St. John and leave the St. John shippers to run their freight around to Halifax in whatever way they could. It would be a radical change, and I think it had better be decided by the government before they ask for the vote.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the wording of the item would admit of the change if the change should be determined on, although when I spoke a moment ago I did not contemplate that. What I thought was that if a change in the wording were required, it could be made in the Supply Bill before the items were finally passed. What the tenderers propose is either to carry out the service as in the past, or as an alternative, in order to have a more rapid and more frequent service to the West Indies, to have the steamers call at Halifax only, and to have the St. John freight sent to Halifax by rail. Upon that no judgment has yet been come to by the government. If there is a desire to hold the item over, I do not suppose the Prime Minister would have any objection; but we are at present taking the vote with the same wording as in the past.

Mr. AMES. Have any offers for this service been made by other steamship companies than Pickford & Black ? Have the Royal Mail Line or the Elder-Dempster Company during the past six months entertained the possibility or made an offer for this service ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, the Royal Mail Line, to which my hon. friend refers, did not make any proposal.

Mr. AMES. I would like to say a few words as to this service, because the manner in which it is at present carried on is unsatisfactory, to the merchants of the city of Montreal at least. Either that service should be made purely a mail service and paid for accordingly, or else it should be made a truly representative freight service, which would collect all the freight that could be taken from Canada, the inland as well as the external ports, with a view to the expansion of the business with the West Indies. The merchants of Montreal are of the opinion, and I think their opinion can be very readily endorsed by facts, that if the terminus of this service could be made at Montreal, in summer at least, a very large amount of freight could be sent to the West Indies. That would not necessitate cutting out the maritime province ports, it would only necessitate adding Canadian ports in order to create a larger amount of business. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to a communication on this subject from the Corn Exchange of Montreal, which I think has been forwarded to the Minister of Trade and Commerce. On the 10th of December last the Montreal Corn Exchange passed the following resolution :

Resolved, That understanding that the term of the present subsidy for a steamship service between Canada and the West Indies expires in June next, the committee of management of the Montreal Corn Exchange Association urges upon the government the great desirability of adopting measures for the establishment of a new service to the West Indies, especially to Barbadoes, Trinidad and British Guiana, the steamers to run from Montreal in summer and the maritime ports in winter ;

That the West Indies import from the United States a large amount of products and goods which Canada could supply, and that, moreover, much of the present limited export of Canadian goods to the West Indies is now handled by United States firms, owing to the frequent steamship communication between those islands and New York and other United States ports ;

That the circumstance that so many steamship lines find freight between American ports and the West Indies would seem to show that a line from Montreal would secure enough business to warrant its establishment ;

That there is no doubt that the reason that Canada is exporting so little to the West Indies is the lack of direct steamship communication from Montreal, the present service from the maritime ports being too far removed from Montreal to ensure its successful operation in the summer months.

In connection with this resolution a statement was prepared and submitted to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in order to show the freight possibilities of the port of Montreal for such a line; and from this statement I make the following citation:

STATEMENT for the year 1903-4 of the principal imports into British Guiana, Barbadoes and Trinidad of products that are produced in Canada.

—	Flour.	Meats.	Lumber.	Butter.	Grain.
	Brls.	Brls.	Feet.	Lbs.	Bush.
British Guiana	210,226	10,000	7,000,000	497,000	.....
		Lbs.			
Barbadoes	52,664	2,490,000	4,800,000	403,505	20,000
Grenada	30,725	495,000	1,000,000	30,275	23,046
Trinidad	231,160	.....	11,999,000	654,000	201,525

In addition, there are large importations of lard, oil cake, boots and shoes, live stock, machinery, cement, hardware, cottons and potatoes.

While only four of the islands are mentioned above, many of the others might be made ports of call if trade offered. There are no stocks held at St. John and Halifax from which to make shipments, and there being no steamers from Montreal to the West Indies, Ontario shippers prefer to ship by way of New York rather than via St. John or Halifax; but with a line from Montreal such shipments would naturally come here, the more especially that advantage could be taken of cheap water rates from the west to Montreal.

Last year raw sugar to the aggregate value of $13,000,000 was imported into Canada by way of New York, refiners preferring to import by that route rather than by St. John or Halifax, because they can get better railway rates and quicker dispatch; but with a line running to Montreal these importations would of course come direct.

Now, I make these citations because this is a matter that has been very seriously considered by the Montreal Corn Exchange Association. The memorial was presented to the Department of Trade and Commerce fully six months ago, and I hope the memorial was considered, because I think the matter is well worth the attention of the department. The present service is wholly inadequate and unsatisfactory, and it seems that the time has come when the service should be either a mail service and paid for at mail-subsidy rates, or it should be made an adequate freight service and paid for accordingly. An article in 'Industrial Canada' is authority for the statement that Canada's trade with the West Indies is not as extensive as it was thirty years ago, although the trade of the West Indies has increased enormously in that time. I wish to cite from 'Industrial Canada,' which, as is well known, is the official organ of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which body has given considerable study to this matter. Here is what they say of the Pickford & Black Line, and I think it is worthy of consideration:

The Pickford & Black boats that call at only the important islands have nine days' delay in Demerara before starting on the homeward trip, and nine days' delay in St. John or Halifax before starting again for the islands. The explanation is that the boats are under contract to carry mails to the islands at stated intervals, and the smaller islands are passed by to give the more important ones a faster service.

I am informed that if the delay at each end of the right trip was done away with, the existing boats could give a ten days' service to the large islands at least and a twenty days' service to the other, which would be a decided improvement, but it is plain that until we have a weekly service to all the islands, we will be handicapped in our competition with the United States manufacturers, unless we are able to secure equally favourable freight rates via United States ports.

And again, in this same magazine, 'Industrial Canada,' in the issue of April, 1904, we have another reference to this Pickford & Black service, written by Mr. Cooper, the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association, who made a special trip to the West Indies for this purpose:

There is one great obstacle to a growth of direct trade; I refer to the inferior steamship connection. While due credit must be given to the company now operating, for the energy they have shown in developing the trade, it must be pointed out in the interest of the public generally, that the West Indian merchants regard the Canadian line (in the words of one gentleman whose opinion I esteem highly) as 'running to little purpose.' For each trip to Demerara and return the company is paid by the imperial and Canadian governments about $4,885, and from all I have learned in the West Indies, if that amount cannot secure a more frequent and superior service, with cold storage accommodation for fruits, it would be advisable to

follow the example of the United States government and pay out the subsidy in the form of a fee for carrying mails. There would at least be competition where at present there is none. The chief results of the present contract under which the subsidy is paid are (1) to prevent the establishment of a competing line ; (2) to make the route a slow one for the principal ports, Barbadoes, Trinidad and Demerara, by forcing the boats to call at all the northern British islands. At all events it is hopeless to expect the boats now running to compete with the larger and more modern ones running from New York with a comparatively smaller coal consumption.

The present service does not do the work properly, but it takes enough of the work to make it impossible for a competing line to live and thrive. In the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce published in 1904 you will find this comment on the transportation facilities in connection with Jamaica :

Messrs. Pickford & Black's steamship 'Beta' has been making her usual monthly trips with regularity as regards time, and as far as this end is concerned has accorded every satisfaction in keeping with the terms of the contract. Good care seems to be taken in handling the cargo both ways and consignees' claims when arising, are usually liberally met.

When all the above, however, has been said, there is still a persistent wail regarding inadequacy of the service. And this will certainly be more keenly felt in the coming year when the demand for space will be decidely multiplied. However, with the coming of the new contract it is confidently expected that all defects and drawbacks will be remedied.

Now, if it is the intention of the government to renew the present contract with Messrs. Pickford & Black, making no modification further than to render it less efficient than it is to-day by cutting out the port of St. John and leaving only the port of Halifax, in my opinion the government is making a mistake. It seems probable that this trade with the West Indies can be worked up to a considerable business and one that will be valuable for Canada. It would seem worth while for the government to ascertain whether a first-class service of proper frequency and calling not only at the maritime ports but at the head of navigation on the St. Lawrence, could not be created which will give satisfaction to the exporters and merchants of the Dominion.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no doubt that if you like to pay for it you can get such a service as my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) suggests. You can get the 'Lucania' and the 'Campania' in this service if you are willing to pay the price. But, being Finance Minister, I have to sometimes consider the financial side of these questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Just what amount of money is being paid ?

Mr. FIELDING. The amount we pay for this service is $65,700.

Mr. FOSTER. What does Great Britain pay ?

Mr. FIELDING. Great Britain pays an equal sum.

Mr. FOSTER. A total of $130,000 ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. That is a very considerable sum of money——

Mr. AMES. For what you get for it.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) is a business man and knows something of the effect of the law of supply and demand. One hearing my hon. friend's remarks would naturally think that steamship companies should be running after this grand privilege. But, instead of that, you find that Messrs. Pickford & Black are practically the only company willing to do the work at that price. So, it does not seem that we are paying too much when they are allowed to hold a monopoly and, when the opportunity of competition comes, nobody is ready to take over the work.

Mr. AMES. Has the hon. minister made any endeavour to secure a service which shall call at the port of Montreal ?

Mr. FIELDING. No, we publicly advertised for tenders for this service in accordance with the practice of the past. My hon. friend argues that it is desirable that we should have communication with Montreal. In what I say, I do not wish to be understood as arguing against that. But I am afraid it will not be found convenient to combine this service with the one that exists. The paper the hon. gentleman quoted from points out that there is considerable delay, that these steamers call at a number of places and make a rather long voyage. That is one of the difficulties compared with the New York steamers. After some correspondence, it was proposed by the contractors—and it is a point we have not yet decided upon—to shorten the voyage by cutting out some of these ports of call, thereby creating a more efficient service for the remainder of the ports.

Mr. FOSTER. What average speed do they make ?

Mr. FIELDING. About ten knots, I am informed.

Mr. FOSTER. All the voyage ?

Mr. FIELDING. The speed at sea is about ten knots, and against that there is the delay at the islands. Undoubtedly, calling at many islands is a serious trouble. The principal markets of the West Indies may be described as Trinidad, Barbadoes and Demarara, British Guiana, which is on the mainland, though we commonly speak of it as the West Indies. These are the principal markets. But there are a number of smaller islands which have some little trade which we naturally desire to cultivate, and

the British government being parties to the contract, also desire that the smaller islands shall be considered. We have been working in harmony with them in a policy which would develop trade in the smaller markets as well as in the larger ones.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the islands give anything?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no local subsidy at all. But the point of view of the British government is not perhaps exactly the same as ours; ours would be purely the commercial view, the imperial government would have another view besides. Even though the islands might have a small amount of business, and though for ordinary commercial reasons the contractors might be willing to drop an island, it is conceivable that the British government, for imperial reasons, might feel that the little island should not be ignored. That creates some little difficulty, and makes necessary some mutual negotiations in order to maintain co-operation between the British government and ourselves. I fear that if we started a line of steamers from Montreal and attempted to call at maritime ports as well, we would but add to the disadvantage under which we now labour in our competition with New York. The voyage to a distant point, say Georgetown in British Guiana, would be long, and we would find ourselves entirely beaten in the race with the New York steamers. I am inclined to think that if it becomes necessary to develop trade in the line suggested by my hon. friend, it would almost involve a separate service. We have been doing something in the direction of trade from Montreal this year by making provision for a line from Montreal to Cuba and Mexico, calling at Halifax, and that is one of the things that we have now in hand, and which it is hoped will be realized. I think if we were to insist on this line of steamers starting from Montreal, calling at the maritime ports, at one or both, and then go on to the West Indies, we would find ourselves at a great disadvantage in the competition; and that would lead to the conclusion that if there is a prospect of business at Montreal to the degree the hon. gentleman suggests, it would necessitate an independent service during the summer months.

Mr. DANIEL. This West India service originated quite a few years ago. It was begun by St. John people and started from the port of St. John, and it is really a St. John conception entirely. The service up to the present time has been regularly proceeding to and from St. John. Lately the board of trade of the city of St. John made some complaints, and sent a memorial to the government in regard to this matter. They referred to the delays, which have also been referred to by the hon. member from St. Antoine Division, Montreal (Mr. Ames),

and the great number of lay days. They think that is a serious objection to carrying on successfully the business. It does appear to me that one of the difficulties with regard to this service is that the contractor, instead of fitting his steamers in size and accommodation to the business, is rather trying to make the business conform in size to the equipment of his steamers. The memorial which the board of trade sent to the government requested that the government, in asking for tenders, should ask for an improved service, with modern steamers, with greater capacity, from 3,500 to 4,000 tons, with a maximum speed of 13 knots an hour, with fan ventilation and ample cold storage for carrying perishable cargoes. We know that to do a successful business with a tropical country like the West Indies, steamers should be equipped with proper cold storage and fan ventilation facilities, not only on account of those products and commodities which we export, but also on account of those commodities which we import from the West Indies, especially fruits and things of that kind. We could only expect to do a successful business by having vessels properly arranged for that business. From the standpoint of the members of the board of trade in St. John, they complain very bitterly of the number of lay days at Halifax, and they state that in consequence of the large number of lay days, perishable goods on these steamers were injured very materially, and to that fact it is due to a large extent that we are not doing that extensive flour export business from St. John which would otherwise be done. That business is going to New York, whereas, with an efficient and proper service, the export of goods from the port of St. John would be very materially increased indeed. As a matter of fact, that business has increased in the port of St. John during the last three years from 17 to 24 per cent, and it is increasing all the time. The complaints that our people make there is largely on account of the unnecessary delays which this steamer makes in the maritime ports, instead of going rapidly to the port of destination. I hope that the government will not entertain any idea of throwing the port of St. John out of this business. I think it would be a mistake in so far as the business of this country is concerned. Not merely the commercial business of handling which accrues to the port of St. John would be increased, but if a proper service were inaugurated, the exports from that port coming from the west as well as from the immediate vicinity, would be very much increased. Now the contractor makes arrangements in order to increase the exports by his line from the port of Halifax, to pay the excess of freight on goods coming from the north shore of the province of New Brunswick to Halifax, which goods, on account of the

shorter haul and less freight, would naturally find their port of export at St. John. The contractor himself pays the difference, and gets that business carried over the line to the port of Halifax ; whereas, under ordinary circumstances, that business would find its way to the port of St. John and thereby increase the total export business from that port. However, if the hon. minister is not in a position to state to-day what the mind of the government is with regard to that matter, since I am very much interested in it as representing the city of St. John, I would ask that this matter stand over, and not be considered until the government has made up its mind with regard to what policy they will pursue. I think that is not asking too much.

Mr. FIELDING. There can be no objection to the item standing over. But I do not think it is profitable that we should enter to-day into the conflicting statements that have been made with regard to the amount of business that is offered at St. John. I offer no opinion, except to say that the contractors made representations as to the amount of business they had been able to get at St. John, and their representations do not harmonize with the information which my hon. friend representing that city has received. However, I did not think it was worth while our discussing it to-day, because we desire to hold the matter over so as to allow us to look into both sides of the question, and I will undertake to say that it will be thoroughly investigated before any decision is reached. In regard to the efficiency of the service it is well to remember that if you are calling at a number of islands there will be inevitable delay. You may get a vessel that in some respects will be better at sea, but not better suited to the different ports, and perhaps not so well, because, if you have a larger vessel with a heavier draught, she cannot approach many of these islands. You could not make some of these islands except with the assistance of lighters.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the case now.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has been over the ground and so have I, and we know the difficulties of it. However, we all have a common desire that we shall encourage our West India trade as much as possible and if by a separate service by the St. Lawrence, or if by any arrangement we can make with this present line of steamers, we can get a better service I am sure the government will be no less desirous than my hon. friends opposite to accomplish it. Although we are told that this service is not a very efficient one, and that this is a liberal subsidy, we must still bear in mind that there is nobody chasing after it. Messrs. Pickford & Black are not making a very large sum out of it ; in fact, they have been having a very uphill fight. My hon. friend is correct in saying that the service originated in St. John, but my information is that the contractors who undertook it from St. John found it so unprofitable that they were glad to get rid if it. It has not been a very big bonanza for anybody. There is not a great deal of money in it.

Mr. DANIEL. The parties who originated the business at St. John undertook to do it with unsuitable vessels—vessels not sufficient for it in any way and the consequence was that they did not make it a success. The amount of business which this line has done during the past year is over a quarter of a million—$268,000 odd, I think is the amount.

Mr. FOSTER. In and out ?

Mr. DANIEL. In and out. I am quite aware of the case of the contractors. Mr. Pickford supplied me with a complete statement of the case which he laid before the government, and I know the position he takes, but I think if the hon. minister will allow this item to stand it would be better.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. Before the meeting of the congress of the Chambers of Commerce which was held recently in the city of Montreal the matter of trade with the West India Islands came up before our board of trade and a delegation was appointed, of which I was one to go to Montreal to meet the representatives of the West India Islands, particularly those from the island of Trinidad and see if we could not arrange to send them goods from our own section of the country. We had an interview with them and ascertained the things which we thought we could ship to the West Indies. Among other things we thought we could ship cheese, which we produce in large quantities, butter, flour and what they call bread. Perhaps I might inform the House that what they call bread is what we call shanty biscuit or sea biscuit, the flour to manufacture which we could supply. We could also send them pot barley which they use in very considerable quantities, boots and shoes and that kind of thing. We found among the other things that they required different grades of flour—low grade and high grade. It is sometimes very important that we should know where we can send our low grade flour which is not very easily sold sometimes. We can always sell the finest grade of flour, but sometimes, if we have a grade which is not very good, to get a market for that is desirable and important. After the representatives of the West India Islands had gone away we had considerable correspondence with them. I conducted the correspondence myself. I think the time is not far distant when we shall undertake to ship goods from our section of the country to the West Indies. But, our people have always urged

upon me that they did not like to go to the trouble of sending goods all the way to Halifax and shipping them from there. They thought there should be a service from Montreal so that they could undertake the shipment from there. I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to this fact too: There has been a great deal of difficulty in having our beet sugar factories maintained in western Ontario, and in fact in any part of the Dominion of Canada because they could not get a sufficient supply of beets to run these factories long enough to make it pay. My hon. friend from East Kent (Mr. Gordon) who is interested in a beet root sugar factory at Wallaceburg undertook to solve that difficulty. When the supply of beets became exhausted he brought in raw sugar from the West India Islands and has been using that instead of the beets and making a complete success of it. If we could get a supply of raw sugar from the West Indies and in this way secure facilities for sending our own goods back in the same vessels, I think it would be an advantage and I do not see why it could not be carried out. I wish to direct the hon. minister's attention to the fact, and when this question comes up for discussion again I may have something further to say upon it. If there is anything I can do which will assist my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. Although the hon. Minister of Finance is going to keep the item over, probably, as we have commenced the discussion of it, it might be as well to say what we have to say to-day. I acknowledge, in the first place, the difficulties of establishing a satisfactory service with the West Indies. They have been greater probably than they are now. It may be that the late changes in the sugar business, in its aspect towards the governments in Europe, has made the conditions a little more favourable in that one direction, but favourable as they may be made in that way there are some very great difficulties in having a satisfactory line and establishing a satisfactory commerce with the West Indies. We have to take that in as the first idea, but right alongside of that we ought to put this idea: I do not know that there is any section of the world with which we ought to be, comparatively speaking more anxious to establish and sustain a good trade than with the West Indies. For various reasons. They form a counterpart to our temperate and cooler zones, they are kindred countries and the future may hold within its possibilities a union between Canada and these British West Indies of some kind or another, and ought to hold without doubt the possibility of closer and better trade relations as between the two. So, we ought not to be discouraged by difficulties to the point of discontinuing a service which does not seem to be as satisfactory as it might be. On the other hand you must take this into consideration: We give now $132,000 or $133,000 a year as a subsidy. Everybody will admit that it is better to give a larger amount for a proper service with the view of establishing something which shall be self-supporting, or which will gradually grow to be self-supporting than fritter away the very large sum of $130,000 a year and make a fair or reasonable progress towards a self-supporting service. Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to offer a larger amount for a proper service which would stimulate trade, which would gather legitimate trade between the two countries which is now carried by the United States of America and make the service self-sustaining in the end.

I think we ought to very carefully look over the whole matter. I do not want to find fault with any department, but I know what most of the departments chronically suffer from. They get into routine habits; we vote the money and they pay it out, and not very much activity is displayed towards bettering or even keeping track of these services. We are paying out over $2,000,000 yearly on steamship subsidies of this kind, and earlier in the session I found on inquiry that the Department of Trade and Commerce could not give to the House a statement of what is done in the way of traffic by these different lines to which we are paying so much of the country's money every year. I made a plea then that the department should keep its hand on every subsidized service and be prepared to lay on the table of the House a report as to what these steamship services were doing in the way of developing trade, especially with a view of ascertaining whether it is ever possible to make themselves sustaining or whether the money had not better be given towards some prospective self-sustaining services. We cannot discuss this matter intelligently now; we do not know the amount of commerce carried on between Canada and particular ports in the West Indies so that we may determine whether some of these that are useless should not be cut out. What I am pleading for is, that we should have a thorough supervision, so that parliament could have from the department all the information possible with regard to the expenditure of this $2,000,000. You cannot carry on such a service between Canada and a tropical country like the West Indies unless you have modern machinery in your vessels. Outside of salt fish, you may say that almost everything we export to the West Indies is of a perishable nature. Any one who has been in the West Indies knows how quickly things perish there, not only to satisfy the capacious appetites of the coloured population but from the efforts of the torrid heat. We will find it a very hard task with slow vessels and no

refrigerating machinery to do any kind of a decent trade with the West Indies. If it is worth while doing this it is worth doing well, and if we do it well we must pay for it. Sooner or later I want to see every one of these services self-sustaining, or cut off. I have had a talk with Mr. Pickford, not to any very great extent; my hon. friend has had all Mr. Pickford's figures and has gone through them. I understand the point of view of the contractors and they have a great deal in their favour, but I hope the minister will not make any change at present. I would suggest something like this: Let us utilize the good common sense we have in this country. If the department would gather together representatives of the Board of Trade of St. John Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Toronto and the western cities, and go into this whole question either here or in Montreal, with a view of solving how best we can increase our trade with the West Indies, I think good would result. That is the first point; there is another point which ought to come subsidiary to that but which very often has taken precedence of it, and that is the question. Can anything be done for a particular town or particular city? I confess to a weakness with regard to particular cities just the same as other people, but the prime idea should be as to what is best to make greater the commerce of the entire country. Then, as far as you can, utilize such place as will best suit that plan. But I do not think we should lean altogether to the sentimental idea in reference to a city which wants a steamship service. The department should next year keep its hand on this and other services and find out exactly what we are doing; which are the ports that give most return and what they give, and then in this conference of level-headed and wide-awake business men a conclusion could be come to as to the service between Canada and the West Indies which would be best adapted to our needs. If it is impossible for us ever to have a self-sustaining traffic between the two countries, then perhaps we should reconsider our policy. If the conclusion should be arrived at that not only for trade reasons, but for national and imperial reasons we should persevere in this policy, then let us persevere along proper lines. These are some thoughts that have been running through my mind; I have not given expression to them in the way of captious criticism for I would be very sorry to see the service between Canada and the West Indies fail. Its record has not been as good as it ought to be. There may be some reasons why we have not a larger commerce now than we had 15 years ago, but it is not very encouraging, and it ought make us pause to consider whether or not we can do better.

Mr. AMES. One last word before leaving this subject. I should like very much if the government would take into serious consideration the idea of endeavouring to obtain offers from some responsible steamship company for a service between Montreal and the principal commercial points in the West Indies. I believe that the amount of trade now offered and that will offer at Montreal for a service of this kind, and which now passes to American ports, would be sufficient to induce responsible lines to put on a good service. For a great many years we have been carrying on via Halifax and St. John this service to the West Indies, and our steamers have been stopping at many points at which there is little more than mail matter to be left off. That is an accommodation train service accomplished by boats that have been in this trade for 30 or 40 years. It seems to me that the time for such a service is about over, and that we should now consider the establishment of an express service from the principal shipping port of the Dominion to the most important shipping ports of the West Indies. Just by way of ascertaining what may be done in that respect would it not be advisable for the department to put themselves in communication with some possible tenderers to ascertain whether a new line of this character might not be established largely as a commercial enterprise without such immense assistance from the government as the minister has intimated may be necessary?

Mr. WM. ROCHE (Halifax). Any person cannot fail to notice the very wide discrepancy between the member from Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the member from Montreal (Mr. Ames). The latter wants an express service conducted by the most roundabout way. The member from Toronto wants to expedite it. The only way to expedite ocean communication is by going on the shortest route with the fastest possible speed. To get high speed on the Atlantic towards the tropics requires vessels of high engine-power and correspondingly small carrying capacity. This, of course, must increase the rate of freight and also may damage the products. Large engines and boilers in the tropics make a vessel very hot, and consequently the products are heated so that when the article is removed from the ship and brought into contact with the hot air of the tropics, decay sets in very rapidly. The reasons why the trade in the West Indies is diminishing are twofold. First of all is the very high price of fish, which brings other articles into competition. Fish is about twice the price it was. Secondly, the acquisition of Porto Rico and Cuba, the two best markets in the West Indies, has very much diminished the spread of our markets in the West Indies, and the steamers require to call at such a large number of ports in order to obtain the volume of trade. These little islands, which were formerly insignificant, are now very necessary items, because we cannot find the consumption unless we use all the ports,

and that is the cause of the falling which was reprobated by the member for Montreal, to endeavour to secure markets and also to endeavour to obtain services through all these islands. Although the speed of the ships may not be very great, they are adapted to the carriage of the articles. If you have boats of high speed you run extreme risk, and also the increase in the carriage of freight is material. The next desideratum is to have the nearest port of shipment, and we all know that Halifax is the nearest point in Canada to any other part of the world.

Mr. FIELDING. The discussion is a very interesting one, and I am sure will prove advantageous to the Minister of Trade and Commerce in considering the action to be taken. I may say that some portion of the information which the member for North Toronto suggests is already in the possession of the government, and we could, if necessary, furnish statistics showing the volume of business annually done by these particular vessels. But if it is thought well to have that branch of the departmental work made broader and fuller in the future, I have no doubt we will be able to get somewhat fuller statistics and interesting information. There is one other thought worth remembering, not as a reason for doing nothing, but to enable us to realize the difficulties, and that is that the West Indies are not large customers for the class of products which Canada is most anxious to make. Canada is making a high grade of goods, but the West Indies, after all, can only be a limited market for that class of goods, because, as is well known, the bulk of the population of the West Indies are coloured people who are not very wealthy, and they are not seeking for Manitoba hard wheat and the finest bacon and cheese which Canada makes. There is a limited demand for these things, but if we are to have a very extended trade in the West Indies for these goods, I am afraid we will have to work down instead of up and be prepared to sell goods cheaper. That is a difficulty in the way; the bulk of the people there are poor. There is a smaller number of white people who desire a better class of goods, but the merchant who sends goods to the West Indies is made aware of the fact that the people are generally poor. Many shippers will tell you that it is not profitable to send goods to the West Indies, because the people will not pay the prices they want. I suppose we are only human; and if they desire cheaper goods, we will find some one in Canada to make them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is their business done now?

Mr. FIELDING. Largely in the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. They must make the goods cheaper.

Mr. FIELDING. They do in some cases; the goods are cheaper, but not of as high grade as the Canadian goods.

Mr. FOSTER. But they are a go-ahead people.

Mr. FIELDING. They are, but they cultivate the market and make what is wanted. That is the objection made against the English manufacturer. It is said that he makes the thing you ought to want, whether you want it or not, while the American or the German will make what you want, and if you want it bad he will make it bad. We have not been educated in Canada up to adapting ourselves to the markets.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the discussion ceases with regard to this item, I would like to urge that it is extremely desirable that our commercial connections with the British possessions in the West Indies should be preserved; and even if assistance to the steamship service, looking at the present, does not seem to be a paying proposition, regarding it from a commercial standpoint, I would be very reluctant indeed to cease any subsidy or take any step which might to a still greater extent divert the commercial interests of the British West India Islands to the United States. At the present time I think the United States have a very great advantage, with regard to some of the islands at least, by reason of the better steamship communication they possess from the port of New York and possibly from other ports. There are those in this country who look forward to the possibility that some time in the future this country may have more than a commercial alliance with the British West Indies, that some time in the future those islands, or some of them, may be brought within this Canadian confederation. Whether that be a dream or not, it certainly is extremely desirable that we should not take any retrograde step, nor withdraw from any policy which was designed to preserve commerce, so far as it can be preserved, between the British West India Islands and Canada.

With respect to the maritime ports, I fully appreciate the point of view which has been put forward by my hon. friend from St. Antoine division of Montreal (Mr. Ames). At the same time, so far as the maritime ports are concerned, there is this to remember, that, in the first place, during the winter months the maritime ports are the only ports by which that service can be kept up, and, so far as the summer months are concerned, one would suppose that if the Intercolonial Railway is ever to fulfil any of the functions which it certainly is expected to fulfil under the scheme of the government brought down to parliament last session and the session before, it ought to fulfil the purpose of making the necessary connection between the city of Montreal and points

west of that city and the steamship service between Halifax and the West India Islands. If the Intercolonial Railway cannot fulfil that object, it seems to me its usefulness has, to a very great extent, departed. A steamship service from Halifax and St. John to the West India Islands is, I think, desirable. It may be desirable at some time in the future to establish, possibly upon a more commercial basis, as the member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) has suggested, a steamship service from Montreal. Perhaps that should be done in the immediate future, but the maritime provinces of Canada have had in the past a very large trade with the British West India Islands ; they have a very considerable trade at the present, and I believe that with the expected development of the fishing industry of the maritime provinces that trade ought to increase rather than diminish in the future. I am speaking in the presence of the members for Halifax, one of whom at least, the junior member for Halifax (Mr. Carney), has had a great deal of experience in this trade in the past, although he is not engaged in it at present, and his opinion on the subject would, of course, be very valuable.

I would desire that the service between the maritime ports and other ports of Canada and the West India Islands should be as expeditious as possible. But there are a great many islands to be visited ; there are a great many points from which traffic, both passenger and freight, must be gathered up ; and I do not suppose that we can at the present time have both an express service and what my hon. friend from Montreal has very aptly called an accommodation service. If we make that so-called accommodation service the very best that the resources of the country will reasonably permit, and that the traffic at present would reasonably require, we may perhaps in the future reach a development in traffic between Canada and the West India Islands which will enable us to have not only what might be called a freight service, but an express service as well. I do most heartily concur in the view that has been put forward by my hon. friend from Toronto, that parliament should be exactly advised what we are receiving in return for these enormous subsidies. We have asked for that information, perhaps not so directly as it has been asked for to-day, but in a more piecemeal fashion, in the debates on the estimates in the past. I would think it only businesslike on the part of the Department of Trade and Commerce when it comes to parliament for these subsidies, to be prepared, without any request from this side of the House, to state the exact results which the country is obtaining from every subsidy which this House votes for such purposes. That is the method which any business corporation would follow in dealing with such information when asking their shareholders for an appropriation of money. My hon. friend from North Toronto says that the departments frequently get into a rut with regard to matters of this kind. There is danger not only of the department, but of the government and the House, getting into a rut unless we have information of this kind whenever these estimates are voted. We must not get into the habit of voting them as a matter of course, because they were voted last year and the year before and the year before that.

Mr. FIELDING. What information does my hon. friend want ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know, with reference to any of these subsidies for promoting business between Canada and any other country, what the net results have been—the volume of trade, to what extent any increase in the volume of trade can be attributed to the service furnished by us, or to what extent any diminution in the volume of trade is due to the fact that the service has not been up to the standard required, in what way we are affected as to that commerce by the competition of foreign countries, and in what way the competition of foreign countries has been made formidable by better steamship services or better means of communication than ours. All these, it seems to me, are proper matters to be considered and debated by parliament. They are matters which any business man would take into consideration. I hope we shall get a little more out of the usual rut in these matters, and that the department will come down with information which may stimulate some debate and lead to some useful suggestions and perhaps to a better system in the end.

Mr. FOSTER. In speaking about this matter before, what I suggested, and what I would suggest again, is that a report be prepared. Piecemeal information of the kind we get while the estimates are being voted is not so satisfactory. You cannot sit down and size the whole business up, and make up your conclusions with regard to it. If the department would make a report on the steamship subsidy services by itself, it could easily be used, and the members could thoroughly study and digest it.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt in the future we shall be able to do more in that respect from the information now being collected.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I would like to remind the premier that during the session a delegation from my province waited on the Minister of Trade and Commerce to see if it were not possible to extend to the province of Prince Edward Island a service somewhat similar to the one that obtains with the province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. The province of Prince Edward Island labours under a great many disadvantages. In this respect I suppose it labours under more disadvantages than any other province of Canada. Before it can

have a share in the cheap freights which follow these subsibized boats, its produce has to be shipped over the Prince Edward Island Railway, over the straits, and then from Pictou to Halifax—three short hauls over a railway on which the rates are exorbitant. I do not know that there is any district in Canada of the size of Prince Edward Island which does more business with the West Indies than that province—in fish, in horses, and many other products which the West India market require ; and if the object is to develop trade with the West Indies, surely you are not going to leave that province out of your reckoning. The scheme proposed by the hon. member from Montreal, of a steamer from Montreal calling at Prince Edward Island, would be of some service ; but I am afraid, from what I learn, that it is not likely to eventuate for some time ; and if any of those boats at present running from Halifax and St. John to the West Indies could not conveniently call at a port of Prince Edward Island. I would suggest that a steamer might be subsidized for two or three trips a year from the province. If that were done, I think the amount of money it would require would be amply repaid by increased trade between that province and the West Indies. There are some trips made by steamers at present, but they are handicapped by the fact that a steamer running from Halifax has a subsidy, while a steamer running from Charlottetown has none. Then, these boats have many ports of call. Why not lessen the number of ports of call in the West India Islands and increase the number of starting points in Canada ? I brought this matter to the attention of the committee on a former occasion. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) very kindly promised that, if a line were established between Montreal and the West Indies, the province of Prince Edward Island should be made a port of call. I feel grateful for the promise. Now that the Minister of Finance seems overburdened with funds let him subsidize a steamer that will make three or four trips during the summer between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that in the application to which my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) referred, while a desire is expressed for an extension of communication, generally, there is a special wish to have communication with the Island of Cuba. We hope to have made an arrangement with a line of steamers to cover the route from Montreal to Cuba, calling at Prince Edward Island. To that extent, I hope the hon. gentleman's wish will be met. As to the other boats calling at Charlottetown, he will see at once that a vessel starting from St. John or Halifax, for the West Indies could hardly call at Charlottetown.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Why not start from Charlottetown ?

Mr. A. MARTIN.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is the first to make the suggestion. But though one can make a suggestion on this point, it takes a number to make an arrangement. For instance, there is the contractor, who is to furnish the steamer and pay the bills ;—he wishes to have something to say in the matter. We have had nothing to indicate as yet, that a commercial enterprise could be successful on the basis of starting from Charlottetown, calling at St. John and Halifax and going in to the West Indies.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Then subsidize both.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman is so anxious to be a martyr that he forgets the good things his province already enjoys. They have several steamers running between the island and the mainland to bring them into touch with the other lines. Of course, it would be very nice to have lines of steamers running from every port in the Dominion. That of course, is impossible, all you can do is to take the main ports. The hon. gentleman says that they have some lines running between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies that receive no subsidy. I suppose that what he means is that sometimes a steamer makes a special voyage over the route, but there is no regular line.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I did not suggest that there was.

Mr. FIELDING. I thought the hon. gentleman suggested that we were subsidizing steamers to compete with existing lines. Of course, the sending out of a special steamer may happen anywhere. But such a trip is undertaken at the will of the owner, and having no fixed time is not much accommodation to the public. We realize the position of Prince Edward Island, and if there were reasons to believe that a subsidized line from that province to the West Indies could promote business, there is every inclination on our part to consider it.

Mr. A. MARTIN. In this large sum of money—over $1,000,000—for steamship subsidies, the province of Prince Edward Island shares to a very small extent indeed. As to the minister's suggestion that you cannot subsidize a vessel from Prince Edward Island to the West Indies, I would remind the minister that he is doing that very thing in another case—giving a subsidy for two or three trips from Prince Edward Island to Great Britain. This is not a regular line. I feel sure that if he would do the same thing to improve communication between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies, it would increase the trade of Prince Edward Island considerably. Years ago the trade between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies was a very large and lucrative one. And the Minister of Finance himself has pointed out that our trade with the West Indies has

not increased as it ought to have done. That is a question for the government to deal with. We are paying a subsidy of $146,000 to develop trade between here and South Africa. Our whole trade with that country is only about $2,000,000. The West Indies are much nearer to us and we already have a good trade with them which our neighbours to the south are taking away from us. Now, in this 'growing time' of which we boast; now that Canada's prosperity is advancing by leaps and bounds, will the government, by penuriousness, allow this important trade to be lost?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. A good deal might be done to develop a trade in horses from Prince Edward Island to the West Indies. In those islands light horses are in demand. Under present arrangements they must be shipped either by rail or steamer—usually by rail—to Halifax. If special rates could be given to shippers by the Halifax line it would be a great advantage. Let those rates continue until a regular line from Montreal is established. The freight on the short hauls from Prince Edward Island to Halifax is excessive, so much so that the men who ship from Prince Edward Island by way of Halifax are not in as favourable a position as those who ship from Montreal, or even from Hamilton, Ontario.

Mr. FIELDING. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. A. McLean) mean special railway rates?

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Railway and steamer rates. As there is a subsidy given to the steamer, the Minister of Trade and Commerce could regulate that. It is a recognized practice with the railways to grant a cheaper rate on goods intended for exportation than on goods intended for consumption in Canada. If that principle were applied to the trade between Prince Edward Island and the West Indies, it would be a great boon.

Mr. FIELDING. I was under the impression that the railway rates in that region were pretty moderate, and that no grievance could arise on that account either as against either the Intercolonial or the Prince Edward Island Railway. Sometimes the criticism is made that the charges are too low.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not think the minister (Mr. Fielding) was in the House when I made a statement which he will find can be verified. Take a car of cattle from Prince Edward Island and land them in Halifax and the freight on those cattle to Halifax will amount to $65. The distance is about 200 miles. You can take a car of cattle from Guelph, Ontario, and land it in Halifax, after a trip of 1,000 miles, for $65.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. What is the Intercolonial portion of that?

Mr. A. MARTIN. That has nothing to do with the question I am discussing. I am simply showing the minister that we do not get the benefit of the long haul to Halifax. We want a rate per mile over these 200 miles the same as is charged over any other part of the Intercolonial, and more especially if these goods are intended for export. I do not think that is an unreasonable suggestion, and I hope the minister will try to have it carried out.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I venture to suggest to the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) that if he makes a calculation he will find that the rate charged on the Intercolonial between Pictou and Halifax is lower than the rate charged by any other railway in Canada. I think he will also find that the higher rate charged between Charlottetown and Halifax is due, to a large extent, to the steamboat charge between Charlottetown and Pictou. That is unfortunate. But I want the hon. member to recollect that a few years ago a proposition was made to this parliament to bring about a state of affairs which would result in lowering that rate. The hon. gentleman was not here at the time, but a number of his friends from Prince Edward Island appeared before the Railway Committee of this House and protested against any interference with the present system of transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Who was it that appeared here, and what was the proposition?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The proposition was to establish a rival line of steamships, a rival line of transportation between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, and delegations appeared before the Railway Committee from all parts of Prince Edward Island protesting against any interference with the present system of transportation.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I do not know what the hon. gentleman's remarks have to do with the question under discussion. I think a transportation company was incorporated, the Act passed this House and was sent up to the Senate, where it was given a three months' hoist. The hon. gentleman says the Intercolonial is not responsible for these rates; I think it is. I know that the Intercolonial is the route over which this freight goes, and I know the Intercolonial is the road which charges these rates.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Does the hon. member mean to say that the Intercolonial charges a $65 rate from Charlottetown to Halifax?

Mr. A. MARTIN. A part of that rate is paid to the boats, about $15 or $20 would be the water charge, the Intercolonial would charge the rest. It is the short hauls which

make the rate from Prince Edward Island so high.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has to recognize the fact that Prince Edward Island is an island—for the present, at all events, until certain events happen. Now if he is correct in his impression that the ralway rates on the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island lines are excessive, that is a matter for investigation. I am glad my hon. friend takes that view, for sometimes we have to fear criticism, not in the maritime provinces, that the rates on these roads are too low. I am glad the hon. gentleman puts forward the other side of the question I think, however, he will find on inquiry that the railway rates on the Intercolonial and on the island are not excessive, they are probably as low as the railway rates for an equal distance in any other part of Canada. If that is not the case, then it is a proper subject for investigation; because, while we are trying to run the Intercolonial as a public convenience, we have certainly no desire to charge rates higher than those which are charged by a private company. I think it will be found on examination that if there is a difference between the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railway rates on the one side and the company rates on the other, for a given mileage, it is in the way of higher company rates.

Mr. A. MARTIN. It is the short haul rates which we complain of. As to Prince Edward Island being an island, the province can't help that. We joined the confederation at the urgent request of the other provinces, but I do not know that they appreciate us now, they do not at least show it in the treatment they give us. On our side we are losing our population, we are losing our trade, and I am sure the Finance Minister does not desire that. I think this is one of the means that will check it, and if the Minister will take that means, he will do a service to the province; if he does not, the population will continue to decrease. We have lost 18,000 people since the census of 1891, taking into account the natural increase, when there should be a large increase.

Mr. HENDERSON. Coming back to the question before the chair, I notice that the government seems to be taking power to subsidize a line of steamers from either St. John or Halifax, or from both. I understand that the subsidy has heretofore been paid to a line of steamers from Halifax by way of St. John, and thence on to the West India Islands.

Mr. FIELDING. From St. John to Halifax and the West India Islands.

Mr. HENDERSON. Now I understand the government have under consideration the idea of running this line of steamers only from Halifax, and leaving out the port of St. John. Now I wish to draw the minister's attention to this point: These two cities are rival cities, they are both looking out for trade; and after so many years of a service between Halifax and St. John and the West India Islands, assisted by the government, I do not think it likely that either of these cities will quietly submit to seeing an advantage given to the other. I think the minister can rest assured that if he limits this service entirely to the city of Halifax, he will find an agitation at once started for another service from St. John, and that instead of one subsidy he will be called upon to provide for two subsidies. I think that is a very likely thing to occur, and I know the hon. gentleman has no desire to waste the resources of this country in subsidizing more lines than are necessary. Even at the expense of perhaps saving a day's time in this voyage I do not think it would be wise to limit the service to the one city only. It might be that the government would meet all interests better and save money to the country by continuing the service as it has been in years gone by, and not now taking it away from either one city or the other and giving the rival city a decided advantage over the one which is not to receive the service. That is the only point I desire to make, and I draw the hon. minister's attention prominently to the fact that he can rest assured from what I know of the people living in the city of St. John that they will not quietly submit, but that they will at once begin to agitate and continue to agitate until they secure the service which has been provided for them in bygone years if it should be taken away from them.

Mr. INGRAM. Just a few words in respect to the freight rate question. I did not understand my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. A. Martin) to complain of the rates in the sense in which the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has referred to his remarks. We have the statement of the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals to the effect that if the rates were the same on the government railways as they are on the other lines of railway, instead of having a deficit, the government would be able to show a surplus. No doubt hon. members on this side of the House will find fault with the administration of the government railways because they charge rates that are complained of by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. If the government are charging a lower rate on their line of railway than other lines are charging then I think other roads will have good ground to complain. As I understand my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island he complains that it costs the same amount to transport a car of cattle from Prince Edward Island to Halifax, $65, as it does to carry it from Guelph to Halifax, and that therefore an unfair charge

is imposed upon the people of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. I did not complain particularly of the rate on the car to the other point, but I complained of the high rate charged on the people of my province.

Mr. INGRAM. Quite so. But the hon. Minister of Finance must not run away with the idea that we in Ontario do not complain in the same way. They complain in every province of the Dominion of the rates which are charged by some railway companies for the short as against the long haul. That is a general complaint throughout this country; farmers and shippers all over this country are complaining. They think it is unreasonable and that is one of the very questions which the Railway Commission should inquire into and readjust. This has been the complaint all over this country for years. Personally I take the view that if the railway companies did not take advantage of their lower rates for long hauls they could not give the rates they give now for short hauls, that if they charged high rates on long hauls that would be cut out by American competition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Alex. Martin) will profit by all this.

Mr. INGRAM. There are many other hon. gentlemen in this House who take exactly the view of my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island, but the railway companies take a different view. They make their argument something on the line that I have already stated. On shipment from Chicago to Portland through Canada the proportion of the rate which the Canadian roads handling that trade receive is very low, and if they did not carry it at a low rate the trade, instead of passing through Canada, would pass through the United States to Portland. As a result of making this low rate they are in a position to get the trade, and by reason of getting the trade are in a better position to offer low rates to the Canadian people for short hauls. That is the argument, and I think there is common sense in it. Let the Railway Commission hear the complaints of shippers, farmers and others, especially those shipping cattle, let the question be fully discussed, and let the commission give their ruling as to what should be done in the matter of the long and short haul. In reference to the government railway do I understand the hon. Minister of Finance to say that the people of the lower provinces who have the advantage of government railways in their provinces are not satisfied with freight rates even though the rates are lower than the rates charged on other competing lines? Do I understand that the people of the eastern provinces insist on having lower rates than competing lines are able to give them, and that as a result there is a deficit in respect to the service of the government railways? If that is the position, then we will argue it from that point of view. Am I correct in understanding that to be the hon. gentleman's statement?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know what my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) may or may not understand. He could not have received that understanding from anything I said because I did not touch upon the subject at all. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Martin) said that the railway rates are too high and I said in reply to that, that the statement was sometimes made that the Intercolonial Railway did not charge enough. I cannot put my hand on any particular member but I have heard it said a dozen times and I was glad to have my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island bear testimony to the fact that the rates were not too low, at all events. He wants them lower.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. I have here a copy of a resolution passed at the annual meeting of the Maritime Board of Trade. I suppose my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would pay a good deal of respect to the opinion of the Maritime Board of Trade on a question of this kind?

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly. I respect my hon. friend's opinion too.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. The Maritime Board of Trade at a meeting held at Moncton on August 17, 1904, passed a resolution, and I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will agree that it bears out what I said on the subject. The resolution is as follows :

> Whereas, shipments from points on the Prince Edward Island Railway to points on the Intercolonial Railway, and shipments from stations on the Intercolonial Railway to stations on the Prince Edward Island Railway, are subject practically to three short haul rates, winter and summer, the ferry service on the straits charging a short haul rate, and
>
> Whereas, shippers on the Intercolonial Railway from points on the mainland to stations in Cape Breton, notwithstanding the ferry service at the straits or Gut of Canso, are only charged a continuous railway haul——

How is that? From points in Nova Scotia, the province from which my hon. friend the Minister of Finance comes, to Cape Breton across the Gut of Canso, there is no such thing as a short haul railway charge. A long haul rate is charged for goods shipped to Cape Breton which also has the misfortune to be an island. It appears that the hon. Minister of Finance has some antipathy towards Prince Edward Island, but in the case of Cape Breton the antipathy does not show itself to such

an extent as it does in the case of my own province.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Alex. Martin) whether the cars of the Intercolonial Railway run over the Prince Edward Island as they do to Cape Breton and whether in his opinion that does not make a difference.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN. Our complaint is that they do not. We hope they are going to do that very soon.

Whereas, shippers on the Intercolonial Railway from points on the mainland to stations in Cape Breton, notwithstanding the ferry service at the straits or Gut of Canso, are only charged a continuous railway haul, the resulting overcharge on shipments to and from the island on fifteen ton carloads of eighth-class produce on an eighty-mile haul is equal to the difference between $45 and $28.

That is quite a difference on a 15 ton car; you pay $45 in Prince Edward Island and it goes to the island of Cape Breton which is attached to the province of the Finance Minister and it gets there for $28.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Is the hon. gentleman aware that there is a special ferry charge on freight going to Cape Breton?

Mr. A. MARTIN. This is what the Marine Board of Trade says, and the ferry charge is included.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Never mind that; is it not a fact that there is special charge for ferriage across the strait of Canso?

Mr. A. MARTIN. This includes the ferry charge because the resolution says so. It says:

The resulting overcharge on shipments to and from Prince Edward Island on fifteen ton car loads of eighth-class produce on an eighty-mile haul is equal to the difference between $28 and $45, as compared with an equal haul on the Intercolonial. Rates on first-class goods show a much greater injustice against Prince Edward Island shippers to the mainland than mainland shippers to the island.

Therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this board the rates of freight from all points on the government railroads to and from Prince Edward Island should be adjusted on the basis of a continuous rail haul.

That is what I suggested before; put it on the basis of a continuous rail haul in place of three short hauls.

Resolved, that the same principle apply to shipments originating at Prince Edward Island points and transferred to the Intercolonial Railway.

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to the Minister of Railways and our maritime representative at Ottawa.

I suppose this resolution was sent to the Minister of Finance, and I am not astonished he has overlooked it in the multitude of business he has to attend to. That is what the people of Prince Edward Island want, and if they had a proper rate from Prince Edward Island to Halifax for export to the West Indies they would be satisfied without a subsidized boat at all. We are at present handicapped with these high inland rates and shut out of the market. We have to depend on the speculative genius of the people of Prince Edward Island to do for themselves a trade with the West Indies, whereas the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are doing it at the public expense.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to set my opinion against the view which my hon. friend presents, but as I understand what the Maritime Board of Trade asks, it is that we should deny the existence of these three short hauls and call them one. There is a short haul in Prince Edward Island over a narrow gauge railroad, there is a short haul over an independent steamship line to the mainland, and there is a short haul over the Intercolonial Railway. We are to deny the existence of these and say that there is only one haul. That is a very simple proposition, but I am afraid it is expensive.

Trade and Commerce—administration of Chinese Immigration Act, $4,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This item is solely for the payment of salaries for the administration of the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the tax now?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $500, since the 1st of January, 1904.

Mr. FOSTER. How many Chinese have come in?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For the year 1904 we collected $3,200, but out of this sum there were $1,700 collected from 17 Chinamen who had entered previous to January 1, 1904, the tax not being collected until after that date. Only three Chinamen have come in paying $500 each, and that was paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of three Chinamen deserters.

Mr. FOSTER. Only $1,500 has been received?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And $4,000 paid out?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. To whom is that $4,000 paid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To Mr. Newberry, collector at Victoria, an extra salary of $400; to Mr. Beckwith, preventive officer, $200, to Mr. Mong Kow interpreter, $1,000; to I. G. Pickard, stenographer, $60; and to George Wynne, caretaker, $60. At Victoria there is paid to J. M. Bowell, collector of customs extra salary, $400; to C. E. Yip Yen, interpreter, $800, and to F. Bowser, landing waiter, $200.

Mr. FOSTER. What really is aimed at is keeping these Chinamen out of Canada ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is practically what is aimed at.

Mr. FOSTER. And the $500 fee is practically prohibitive ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So it is.

Mr. FOSTER. For what reason in the world can you want two interpreters paying them an aggregate of $1,800 a year. The steamship companies do their own interpreting and the only reason you want an interpreter would be that when you pounce upon an unfortunate Chinaman and tell him to whack up his $500 or get out, he may talk to you then you want to understand his frame of mind just at that moment. It seems to me you could easily get an interpreter for these three Chinamen without having one interpreter kicking his heels up at $1,000 a year and another at $800.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The present law has been in force only one year and the service has been continued as it was before. We did not know how events would turn out ; they have turned out practically to prohibit Chinese immigration, but it has not altogether prevented and extinguished Chinese trade. There are a good many Chinamen who come in bond.

Mr. FOSTER. How many have come in ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know how many have come, I have no information but at all events there is a Chinese population of about 20,000 on the Pacific coast in Canada alone. It is not increasing at the present time, but, as far as my memory serves, at the time of the last census it was about 20,000 and it is still at that figure. There is no increase but there is a movement of population going to and fro between China and British Columbia. The services of this interpreter are not only for the purpose of collecting the $500 from the men who come in, but are also required owing to the fact that there is a China trade going on constantly. I said a moment ago, and I think I am right, that the services of the interpreter are attached to the customs generally, although these services are mostly required for the purposes of the passenger traffic. I think they are also required for the purpose of the freight traffic. I met in 1894 one of the Chinese interpreters in Victoria, and from what I gathered he makes himself generally useful in the Customs Department. Perhaps I was misinformed, perhaps his chief services were connected with the collection of the Chinese tax which was in existence at that time, but I was under the impression that he made himself generally useful in the customs and I can assure my friend that at Victoria and Vancouver these interpreters were necessary to the Customs Department.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister had bettter look into that. It seems like an illustration of what I said a while ago that you get into a certain rut in the department and you go on voting and paying whether the business is going on or not. I cannot see why if the Customs Department want an interpreter it is not the business of the Customs Department to employ and pay him? I imagine we paid them because of the large number of Chinamen coming in and that no doubt kept them employed ; now when you have a prohibitive tax you cannot need these men for the administration of the Chinese Act, so I should think the Prime Minister had better look into that and see whether that vote cannot be done away with. You pay $600 and $800, altogether $1,400 to collectors in connection with Chinese immigration. If your immigration tax is really prohibitive, and you are only getting in three or four Chinamen in the course of a year I do not think you can justify that vote. If the customs officers are not getting enough pay as customs officers, give it to them, but let the customs pay it, certainly they cannot have much to do in connection with Chinese immigration. That looks also like the survival of an old vote which there has not been enough energy in the minister of the department to revise. I must say again to my right hon. friend that we find it very inconvenient to have what ought to be a live department like the Department of Trade and Commerce administered from the dead house, so to speak, that is from the house that my friends opposite used to signify as the moribund house. It would be a great deal better in these live matters if we had the minister here. We have had examples of that this year. You cannot expect the Minister of Customs who has a large department to administer to bring these estimates down and show any knowledge of them and he did not do that ; it is not to his discredit. The Minister of Finance is also a busy man or makes a pretense of being busy.

Mr. FIELDING. It is the same thing.

Mr. FOSTER. About the same thing I suppose as far as his conscience goes. I think he has enough work to keep him going, and he cannot be expected to understand this department ; he cannot understand it unless he lives in it; and I would suppose you could take one of the supernumerary departments, such for instance—when you get through this Autonomy Bill—as the Department of Justice ; you might put the Minister of Justice up there and bring the live department down here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He has had enough to do already.

Mr. FOSTER. Well he has to keep a check over the Department of the Interior and so long as that is run in the way it is I think it is well he is down here but we want to have the Department of Trade and Commerce down here also.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would have no objection to have the Department of Trade and Commerce here as it was before; I would have no objection at all but I do not know that it is less effective because the head of the department has been transferred from one chamber to another. The only inconvenience is that the man who has to handle the estimates in this House cannot be so well supplied with the information to which the hon. gentleman is entitled. I am sorry I have not all the information because I learn myself as I go on in this matter. My hon. friend must not suppose that there are only three Chinamen who have come into Canada because only three have paid the capitation tax of $500. There are others, there are three classes of Chinamen and my hon. friend will realize that when there is a population in our own country of 20,000 Chinamen and when they insist on going back to China during their life—because if they do not they must go back when they are dead,—there is necessarily a trade going on all the time. There are four classes of Chinamen, first of all there is the Chinaman who is subject to the capitation tax, that is to say on his first arrival when he comes here to work in Canada. Then there are Chinese who are living here, and are returning under registration to China. A certain number are registered, those who have their certificates and have paid their capitation tax, and they are entitled to go back to China for one year. Therefore there must be an examination of these men at the customs house, to see that they are the proper men they must be examined orally and their papers must be examined also, and therefore the services of the interpreter are required for that purpose. Then there is also the Chinaman in bond.

Mr. FOSTER. Dead or alive?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are very much alive sometimes. We are a growing and progressive country and we do not import only goods in bond, but Chinamen also. We have to look after these men; they have to be carefully checked, because we do not want to mix our Chinamen with the American Chinamen, we must keep them separate. Then there is the Chinaman who is exempt altogether, the trader or the student who is above these little inconveniences, and for these reasons it has been found that the services of the interpreter were necessary. I am quite sure if my hon. friend had been here two years ago and had these estimates when the capitation tax was $100 and there was a pretty brisk trade in live flesh between this country and China, he would have had no fault to find with the employment of these two interpreters. Since that time the capitation tax has been increased, and it has almost prohibited that passenger trade. It was increased only two years ago, and my hon. friend I think cannot expect, and I do not think that on reflection he will insist, that the department should at once have cut off its employees. We have to see how it will work out, and therefore perhaps it will be advisable in the future if the trade is so restricted——

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you need one at Vancouver, as well as at Victoria. Victoria must be the first port of call?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some are landed at Victoria and some at Vancouver, There is a Chinatown in Vancouver and one in Victoria also.

Mr. FOSTER. Which is the first port of call?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Vancouver.

Mr. INGRAM. The right hon. gentleman referred to examining the Chinamen orally and also examining their certificates. As I understand it there is a further examination required. All Chinamen I think look very much alike.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. And in order to get over the difficulty you have to have measures as to the height, &c., and these are recorded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These would require to be examined as well.

Mr. INGRAM. You will continue I suppose to measure them in the same way?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This can be done by somebody else than the interpreter. They are all carefully examined and marked.

Mr. INGRAM. I presume that the Chinamen who leave Vancouver or Victoria for China and return are remeasured, so as to make sure that others are not being smuggled in, in place of those who left.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. With regard to the item of $50,000 for commercial agencies, I suppose my hon. friend will expect me to give a statement of the agents and their localization. Mr. J. S. Larke is stationed at Sydney, Australia, D. H. Ross, at Melbourne, Australia, C. M. Kittson at Cape Town, South Africa. He was the representative of the Ogilvie Milling Company in South Africa for the last three years, and we appointed him on the death of Mr. Jardine. He is a Montreal man.

Mr. FOSTER. He devotes all his time to this?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. A. F. A. Poindron is in Paris, France.

Mr. FOSTER. You have a commercial agent there besides Mr. Fabre?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Why could not Mr. Fabre attend to this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because I do not think Mr. Fabre, who is a success in

other directions, would be a success as a commercial agent. Mr. Poindron had been stationed in Montreal for a number of years in connection with Canadian trade, and is a very competent man. Mr. Fabre, as my hon. friend knows, is not at all versed in commercial matters, and we thought it better to have a man who made trade his business.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has this gentleman been there ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Since the fall of 1902.

Mr. FOSTER. How often has he reported ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He reports regularly. I will give a statement by-and-by in regard to the reports of all the agents. The next is P. B. Ball, at Birmingham, Eng.; J. B. Jackson, at Leeds and Hull, Eng.

Mr. FOSTER. Has not my hon. friend ever had any thoughts as to whether this is an acceptable appointment for Canada or not ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come to that in a moment. I am now giving the list. P. B. MacNamara, at Manchester, Eng.; W. A. McKinnon, at Bristol, Eng.; Alex. MacLean, in Japan ; A. W. Donly, in Mexico ; C. E. Sontum, in Norway ; E. E. Burke, in Jamaica ; Edgar Tripp, in Trinidad ; S. L. Horsford, in St. Kitts ; R. Bryson, in Antigua. With regard to the system followed, this is the way it works. The Canadian commercial agents in various parts of the world are under the constant and direct supervision of the department at Ottawa.

Mr. FOSTER. What officer is in charge of them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. O'Hara. Their reports are forwarded regularly upon a very large variety of commercial and general topics of information. Their reports are carefully edited and promptly printed in the Weekly Report issued by the department. The Weekly Report is distributed free all over Canada to any persons interested.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you find out the persons interested ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By circulars and inquiries.

Mr. FOSTER. As a matter of fact, how many of these go out monthly ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1,150 every week.

Mr. FOSTER. How many are published ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. About the same number. All commercial agents, when in receipt of trade inquiries, forward the same to the department and the inquiries are published in the Weekly Report. Parties in Canada requesting addresses of the same obtain them by return mail, upon application to the department. When an address is furnished a correspondent in Canada, the commercial agent is advised, so that he can notify his client of the name and address of the interested party in Canada. Uniform instructions have been sent to all the commercial agents, which has reduced their work to a systematic basis. A complete index of the Weekly Report is published every six months and sent to the regular recipients of the report. A comprehensive index of all the trade inquiries received from commercial agents is kept in the department.

With regard to Mr. Jackson's appointment, which I know has received some criticism, and as to which we had a debate in the House last year, I would like to read to my hon. friend the following letter :

The 'Trade Review' Publishing Company,
687 Craig Street,
Montreal, April 22nd, 1905.

F. C. T. O'Hara, Esq.,
Superintendent of Commercial Agencies,
Department of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—We take the liberty of congratulating you upon the splendid reports issued by the commercial agencies throughout Great Britain. It seems to us that you could make arrangements with trade publications in Canada for a larger issuance of the information contained in the reports, as we think it would be a good thing for the manufacturers in this country. We are satisfied in many instances the commercial agencies could be used direct by manufacturers to extend their trade in the various districts throughout Great Britain where your agents are located ; at any rate they could ascertain the possibility of doing business in their respective districts and thus save the manufacturers the necessity of incurring the expense of sending a representative there direct.

It seems to us that the manufacturers of this country are not availing themselves to the extent they might of the valuable information issued each week by the commercial agencies throughout Great Britain. You will observe in our issue of April 7th, on page 43, we publish in full the report of Mr. P. B. McNamara. At that time we also had at hand a report from Mr. J. B. Jackson, which we would have given at length, but the space at our disposal did not allow us to do so.

We would simply say in conclusion, we have been closely following the reports issued by Mr. Jackson since he has received his appointment, and we are pleased to go on record as saying, said reports compare favourably with the reports issued by any of the American consuls throughout Great Britain, which we receive from week to week. We make this statement in reference to him because of the somewhat unfavourable criticism that was passed upon him at the time of his appointment. And we further make this statement for one who is and always has been a staunch Conservative, and believe it is only right that when an injustice is done an individual it is a duty to repair that injustice as far as possible.

We beg to remain
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) HENRY HARVEY & COMPANY,
Proprietors 'Trade Review.'

With regard to the general work of the agencies, I would like to communicate to the House the following from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association :

Canadian Manufacturers Association.
Toronto, April 29, 1905.

The Right Honourable
Sir Richard Cartwright,
Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to inclose herewith a resolution adopted at the last meeting of the executive council of this association with reference to the commercial agency branch of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Submitting the same for your consideration, I have the honour to be,

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) R. P. YOUNGE,
Secretary.

Resolution adopted at the regular meeting of the executive council of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, held at the head office, Toronto, on Thursday, April 20, 1905 :

Resolved, whereas, the Department of Trade and Commerce of the Dominion government has increased during the past year the usefulness of its commercial agency service :

(1) By publishing the reports of the commercial agents and the foreign trade inquiries weekly instead of monthly ;

(2) By extending the scope of its work and appointing agents to new fields, and

(3) By providing for more frequent visits to Canada by its foreign agents in order that they may be kept familiar with Canada's increasing possibilities in export trade.

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Canadian Manufacturers Association express its appreciation and tender its best thanks to the Honourable the Minister of Trade and Commerce, for the assistance given to increase Canada's export trade by the development of the commercial agency service as above.

Mr. INGRAM. I have read many of the reports of our different commercial agencies, and in nearly every instance I have found complaint of the way goods were parcelled and shipped and of the state in which they arrive at their destination. This you find, for instance, in the reports of Mr. Larke. He has been in Australia for several years. I am not aware he has ever paid Canada a visit since he first went to Australia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He sails tomorrow for Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. It seems to me that if the commercial agents were brought home to Canada for an occasional trip, and, while here, addressed meetings in Toronto, Montreal and other important centres explaining to the people what is necessary in the shipment of their goods to the points in the territory for which the agent is appointed, it would do much to educate manufacturers and shippers on these points and so would overcome this difficulty. I believe that some organized body have already made this suggestion to the government. I am not sure, but it runs in my mind that that is the case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these reports sent in weekly?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are asked to report at least once a month and more frequently if they have anything to report.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not in a position to criticise very much the reports of the commercial agents, for I have not been receiving them. I would like the minister to ask that my name be put on the list of those to whom these weekly bulletins are sent so that I may see what is in them. We are paying about $45,000 for our Canadian agencies, so called; and the field covered is not as wide as it should be, even at that amount of money. In fact, our agents do not cover a very large territory. I see that there are none in the United States of America.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I omitted one name. We appointed an agent in Chicago last March—Mr. Arnaud from Annapolis.

Mr. FOSTER. The United States consular service, although a poorly paid one, is most thorough.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. And I notice, in reading the United States consular reports, that those who make them take a great deal of pains in gaining and compiling information. They do not distribute themselves over a large area, with a paragraph referring to each thing, which is a very discursive and not very satisfying method. They take one particular subject at a time and make a thorough examination of it; and, when their report is sent in, their government has in it almost everything that can be said upon that subject. The Prime Minister will see what I mean if he will examine the United States consular reports. I notice that our reports are fragmentary—very fragmentary. For instance, take Mr. Jackson's report of May 3rd. He has four items. One is the trade of Bradford with the United States during the month of April; the second gives the trade of Huddersfield with the United States during the month of April ; the third gives the expenditure, income, &c., of the Leeds tramway; and the fourth notes that a good deal of dissatisfaction is being expressed as to the shipments of stale and over-kept bacon from the United States, and that Canadian bacon is steadily gaining ground. While all this is good information, I do not know that it is information that greatly stimulates the trade of Canada. It is a nice thing for a man to know just what the trade of Bradford with the United States in the month of April was, but it does not lead to anywhere. It is not merely a fragment, but it is a mere point of a fragment. When you have got it read. there is not much of it that you can keep

or use. While such things may be good if they are well selected, I think it would be still better—if our men are capable of doing it; and I am sure that they are, many of them at least—if they would take up one subject of trade and make a thorough investigation of it and give all there is in it, so that those who read can make up their minds as to what field it opens if any, and whether they should go in to possess that field.

Further, the sending out of 1,100 copies of these reports each week is something; but it is not very much. If you take the trouble to gather this information, tabulate it and print it, then, it seems to me you ought to give it a wider circulation. I suppose the present circulation is mainly among producers and shippers, but, no doubt, a good many of the 1,100 copies circulated go to persons not actively engaged in commerce. What the government ought to do is to get this information before the trading and producing public, and it might be worth while to consider whether means cannot be taken to give this information a wider distribution.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What would my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) suggest?

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest a little active propaganda. I would communicate with the members of parliament and ask them to give the names of manufacturers, producers and shippers in their constituencies to whom these reports could be sent. That is a thing that members would like to do, because they would like to have this information in the hands of those of their constituents who are interested. Then, boards of trade, manufacturers, associations and other bodies of that kind ought to co-operate. I daresay they do co-operate but that co-operation might be made more active. It may be worth considering whether the information could not be utilized in the trade papers. The point I make is that along with the fragmentary information, our agents ought to be asked to take up certain subjects so that the department here could make a thorough examination into the conditions. Take the fruit trade, the bacon trade, those are pretty well established, but there are other trades which are not, a lot of things we produce and that we want a market for.

Mr. TAYLOR. Butter and cheese.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but these are pretty well developed now. But there are many other things for which we want to find a market. Now if they would take up these and make an exhaustive examination and put into brief form all the information there is, where the demand chiefly is, the prices paid, and everything of that kind with reference to any article of export, they would give very valuable information, which I think would be more useful than the fragmentary information now given.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The suggestions of my hon. friend are very practical, and I am happy to tell him that in part they have already engaged the attention of the government. I will ask the department to send my hon. friend the bulletins which have been issued in the past, and which will be issued. He will find in them something that will interest him.

Mr. FOSTER. There is another remark I would like to make. I have been led lately to question whether these monthly returns of exports and imports, and tabulations of trade, were fulfilling the object which the department had in view. Are they really read? They are pretty bulky, they are a blue book, and there is a general disposition, when one gets a blue book, to throw it away somewhere. A blue book requires almost a technical education to understand it. A new member coming to this House knows what I mean. He gets a blue book, and he goes to an older member and says: Where am I to find out this thing? Well, it is in the book, but it requires a particular training to find and utilize it. If that is so with a new member of parliament, it is a great deal more so with a busy man outside. I have been led to question whether these monthly reports, coming out so long after the month in which they are dated, being so voluminous, and in part technical—whether they are not largely defeating the purpose we had in view, and whether better results would not be attained by the government in picking out certain points of interest and issuing a bulletin with reference thereto, putting the facts clearly so that the lay mind could understand them. I have been looking over some of these this morning, they are almost the size of a blue book, and they are incomplete. I doubt whether our commercial men freely read them. I would like to have the views of some commercial men here as to whether they do use them, whether they are of much value, whether it would not be better to take up some particular subject in the form of a bulletin and present the statistics in regard to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not like to give any opinion on the question raised by the hon. gentleman, in the absence of the Minister of Customs, under whose purview this subject comes.

Mr. FOSTER. The Department of Trade and Commerce issues them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think they are prepared by the Customs Department, and issued by the Trade and Commerce. But I can say from my own knowledge that there is one class of the community which scans these reports very closely, and I think would not like to have any change, and that is the manufacturers. To my certain know-

ledge they follow these reports very closely from day to day, from week to week and from month to month, in order to see in what line and in what direction trade is moving. As to the rest of the community, I have no personal knowledge how much interest is taken in them. I think my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) will corroborate me in saying that these reports are closely scanned by the manufacturers.

Mr. INGRAM. In comparing the reports of the Department of Trade and Commerce with those of the Customs Department, I find in a few instances that the figures do not agree. Now in the reports which have been referred to by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the title itself would lead one to suppose that the figures were not correct. That matter has already been brought up in the House this session, and the Minister of Customs stated that the figures were correct. If that is true, then why put in the title on these books the word 'unrevised.' That alone would lead the public to suppose that the figures were not as accurate as they might be.

Mr. FOSTER. The unrevised figures would have reference to the last month.

Mr. INGRAM. They are a monthly report, and the title would lead one to suppose that the figures are not vouched for by the department as being accurate. Therefore the public cannot have full confidence in it. Here is a report to the end of the year, and you desire to find out some information for the first two or three months of the following year when you go over the monthly reports and have your figures worked out, you are not certain whether the figures are accurate or not.

Mr. FOSTER. In the desire to get up as nearly as possible to date, they put in the figures of the last month, even though they have not been revised. It is a close approximation.

Mr. INGRAM. I presume we have a right to assume they are as nearly correct as they can be. The Minister of Customs says that they are as correct as they are in the yearly report. If that be true then the words used make a person who is looking up the facts believe that he is simply getting the figures of the total amount of the supposed actual trade done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from North Toronto has just given the exact reason why they are issued in that form. To come back to the subject that he mentioned a moment ago I may say to my hon. friend from North Toronto that the subjects which have already been treated in the weekly reports of the Department of Trade and Commerce are as follows: Butter and cheese to the West Indies; butter and bacon in Great Britain; Danish methods in marketing products in Great Britain; boots and shoes in the West Indies, and Canadian flour in the West Indies.

Mr. AMES. I notice there the item of boots and shoes in the West Indies. When that statement was prepared was it sent to the manufacturers of and the wholesale dealers in boots and shoes throughout the Dominion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that to a large extent it was and to everybody on the list. I am informed also that a large number of circulars are going out daily to firms not already on the list asking if they desire the report.

Mr. AMES. With a particular report such as this which so obviously interests a class of manufacturers, the manufacturers of boots and shoes for example, I should think it would not be necessary to write in advance and ascertain if they wished bulletins sent, but that bulletins or instructions from the department should be sent to all of that class throughout the Dominion. They would all appreciate it. While the probabilities are that the regular reports of the department published by the department would not be read and considered, this one special report which affects their business would be welcomed, I am sure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Bounties on iron and steel, manufactures of steel, on lead contained in lead ore, and on crude petroleum—to cover expenditure in connection with the administration of the Acts, $11,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the whole expenditure on these items up to date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The total amount paid last year is a pretty large one. The different amounts are as follows:

Pig iron	$ 553,982 15
Puddled iron bars	11,668 99
Steel ingots	347,990 17
Articles manufactured from steel	15,320 85
Lead	195,627 09
Binder twine	25,452 04
Crude petroleum	167,204 47
Total	$1,297,245 76

Mr. INGRAM. How does this amount compare with the estimate of the amount which would be paid out on account of these bounties made by the hon. Minister of Finance last year?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not remember that I made a definite estimate of the amount. If so I do not recall it at the moment. I will look it up however.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the right hon. Prime Minister say whether the bounty paid on crude petroleum is for the full twelve months or only for a fraction of the twelve months?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is from the 8th of July to 18th of January.

Mr. HENDERSON. So the amount paid does not give us an idea of what the yearly amount will be. The statement is only for a little over half a year.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the estimate of the hon. Minister of Finance was about $300,000.

Mr. FIELDING. I did give an estimate in regard to the bounty on petroleum.

Mr. INGRAM. I think it was about $300,000 but I would not be sure.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot recall it. I think that is the only case in which I gave an estimate. It entered into the calculation as to the duty.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the bounty on petroleum is paid monthly or at short periods. Why have we not a statement since January? It seems to me that the statement should be brought down from a later date.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These statistics were prepared some time ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. They are somewhat ancient.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, somewhat ancient. We can give him some more modern history if my hon. friend desires it.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will get it on the supplementaries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. My object in asking the question was to ascertain what is the probably yearly amount we are called upon to pay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will have it here the next time.

Mr. FOSTER. It may be over $300,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, this fact we have just brought out sets one thinking. But, I suppose this is not a proper place in which to criticise the system of bounties. I never thought when I used to be here that I would ever look into the face of a Liberal government and have the information given to me by the head of the government, especially its present head, that the enormous sum of one million and nearly five hundred thousand dollars would be paid out for bounties.

Mr. HENDERSON. It avoids the adoption of a protectionist tariff.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the right hon. First Minister give us the details of the expenditure?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The expenditure in connection with the iron and steel bounties is as follows: James A. Russell, supervisor for Nova Scotia, salary $1,400 a year; James McNeil, assistant supervisor, Sydney, $900; James G. Parmelee, Sault Ste. Marie, $1,000; Hugh Murray, $250; lead, G. O. Buchanan, Kaslo, $2,400; James B. Harvey, supervisor, Petrolia, $1,200; L. B. Jackson, clerk, Petrolia, $420; James Spierman, excise officer, Sarnia, $200; C. J. Coffey, Moncton, $200. Then with regard to binder twine there is a name which is somewhat familiar, J. L. Haycock, Kingston, Ontario——

Mr. FOSTER. How do you spell him: Hay——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought my hon. friend was familiar with the name.

Mr. FOSTER. I wanted to see how it was spelled so that I would be sure of it. Is that the last surviving remnant of the Patrons of Industry?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I only know him as inspector of binder twine and supervisor of bounty.

Mr. FOSTER. What do you pay him?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $1,600.

Mr. FOSTER. It is worth $1,600 to collar the whole business.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is money thrown away.

Mr. INGRAM. He is a little Czar to administer the law.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 165 respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

On the order being called for,

Second reading of Bill (No. 172) for the relief of Philip Vibert.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I know nothing about this Bill. It has been put on the order paper in my name and I decidedly object and ask my name to be withdrawn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Order allowed to stand.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Trade and Commerce, $65,600.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked for some explanation as to the methods which were observed by the gov-

ernment for the payment of the bounties which we were discussing this afternoon. Under the Acts providing for these bounties it is enacted that regulations shall be made by the Governor in Council for the purpose of checking the way in which they are to be paid. Orders in Council have been passed providing that the work shall be superintended by an officer of the government who is stationed in each of the different premises, the regulations provide further that the officer in charge is to see that all quantities of ores and the different ingredients which go into the making of the metal shall be carefully examined into, that they shall be weighed and that he shall satisfy himself of all the quantities that have entered into the metal, so that the officers in charge at the different works at Sydney or Sault Ste. Marie follow from day to day all the operations of the manufacturer. They weigh all the quantities of ore that go in and satisfy themselves from day to day of everything that takes place in the manufacture. When that is done the company makes a claim for the quantity upon which they think they have earned bounty, and the claim is checked by the officer on the books of the company. Then it is transmitted to Ottawa to the accountant, who goes over it as far as he can and then the claim is sent to the Auditor General for payment.

Mr. FOSTER. If the payment is so much on each ton of pig-iron then what about the payment on puddled bar ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same methods are followed.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is paid now on pig iron ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $2.25 on Canadian and $1.50 on foreign ores.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that decrease each year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It decreases each year. It has to run, I think, two or three years more.

Mr. FOSTER. After you have paid the $2.25 on pig-iron that pig-iron is put through processes which make puddled bars ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And then you pay on it again how much ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On puddled bars $2.25.

Mr. FOSTER. What does the steel ingot come from, puddled bar ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is made into pig-iron and then steel ingots afterwards.

Mr. FOSTER. The next is steel ingots, what are they made from ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are made from the pig-iron, as I understand.

Mr. FOSTER. And how much is paid on steel ingots ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. $2.25 a ton upon the steel ingots.

Mr. FOSTER. And the steel ingots are made from the pig-iron ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. So that you pay really $4.50 on the perfected process in each case ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is $2.25 and $2.25. On pig iron which is made of ore 50 per cent Canadian, $2.25, and on pig-iron made from 50 per cent foreign, $1.50.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume that is about right. The bounties originally were $3 for converting the ore into pig-iron, $3 more for converting the pig-iron into steel, but there is a gradual reduction year after year, until the whole thing is wiped out, I think in about seven years from the time the law was passed. I think that the Prime Minister is about right when he says that it is $1.50 for this year, as this reduction has taken place during the last three years.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the process with reference to the crude petroleum?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have an officer by whom the quantities are ascertained. The claims are made by the companies, and, when verified by the officer, are transmitted by him.

Mr. FOSTER. How much is paid per gallon?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. One and one-half cents.

Mr. FOSTER. For every gallon pumped —is that it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, the bounty was applied in July last. It was paid up to what was in store, and since then it has been paid upon what was pumped.

Mr. HENDERSON. How frequently are the payments made?

Sir WILFRIL LAURIER. About monthly.

Mr. FOSTER. This crude petroleum is pumped at the different wells and then run into a central tank?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And the quantity is calculated at the central tank?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And the bounty paid on that? Then, the bounty is paid to the purchaser and not to the producer?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, to the producer.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, it must be measured in some way before it goes into the central tank?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that there is no difficulty about that. There is a system of checking the amount pumped from each well into the tank.

Mr. INGRAM. Many of the wells are owned by private individuals. A man may have an oil well in his garden. But the pumping of the oil from that well is done by a power which is used to pump perhaps twenty other wells. The well owner pays so much for the pumping and he gets so much for his crude oil. To pay the bounty, of course, it must be known what each well produces.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that the quantity pumped from each well into the central tank is measured as it goes into the central tank. I may say that all the expenses that were mentioned this afternoon of checking the operations for the payment of the bounty are borne by or recouped to the government by the companies to receive the bounty.

Mr. FOSTER. Tell us how the binder twine is done and how many pounds were made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have here the figures to show the production in detail.

STATEMENT showing Bounties paid on Binder Twine during the Fiscal Year 1903-4.

Firm.	Quantity of Binder Twine made.	Manilla Fibre used.	Bounty paid.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	$ cts.
Canadian Cordage Mfg. Co., Peterborough	6,352,835	1,137,696	3,873 26
Brantford Cordage Co. (Ltd.), Brantford	2,245,488	1,430,131	4,870 59
M. J. Wilson Cordage Co., Chatham	575,578	221,728	754 82
Independent Cordage Co. of Ont., Toronto	637,786	378,173	1,287 81
Consumers' Cordage Co., of Montreal and Dartmouth	3,724,150	2,432,024	8,276 93
Brandon B'inder Twine Co., Brandon, Man	973,832	516,360	1,760 32
Walkerton Binder Twine Co., Walkerton	822,808	565,449	1,927 66
Kingston Penitentiary Binder Twine Factory, Kingston	832,571	792,193	2,700 65
Totals	16,165,048	7,473,754	25,452 04

Mr. FOSTER. That bounty was paid to the Kingston Penitentiary binder twine factory as a matter of bookkeeping ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. The total production was 16,165,048 pounds ; the manilla fibre used was 7,473,754 pounds ; and the total amount of bounty paid was $25,452.04.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any restriction put on the sale price of bounty-fed binder twine, or do the manufacturers fix their own prices ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They fix their own prices.

Mr. TAYLOR. I notice that most of the factories produce about two pounds of binder twine to one pound of manilla used, all except the Kingston penitentiary, where they use a pound of fibre to a pound of twine.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that take in all our bounties ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That takes in all our bounties, so far as I know at this moment.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is the bounty on binder twine ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 75 cents per 100 kilos, and one kilo is equal to 2·20 pounds.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the lead bounty work satisfactorily in British Columbia ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that it does.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that some of the newspapers say that it is not satisfactory, and that the miners would prefer a straight duty on lead.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not be surprised at that. It is difficult to satisfy everybody. If a duty were placed on lead, it would seriously interfere with the manufacture of paint, and therefore it would necessitate a pretty extensive revision of the tariff. The government will perhaps take that matter up for consideration on the next revision of the tariff ; but in the meantime they considered that the best way of protecting the lead industry was by means of a bounty.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before we pass from the binder twine, is the First Minister able to say whether the bounty will be a complete offset to the export duty charged by the American government on manilla coming from the Philippine Islands ? Will it place our manufacturers on a par in that regard with the American manufacturers ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that my information on that point is not such to enable me to commit myself to a definite statement. I know that such was the intention when the bounty was put on.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that $195,627 has been paid in lead bounties. Suppose the paying of a bounty on lead ceased, in what position would our lead producers in British Columbia be ? If a straight duty were imposed, they would be protected and would be receiving some benefit.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I have explained to my hon. friend last year, when the lead men came to us for assistance, representing that they had established an industry in British Columbia, which employed some 500 men in producing lead, that they had lost their market in the United States as the result of a combine there, and that unless we came to their assistance, the whole of the money which they had put into the industry would be wiped out and the men employed in it would be deprived of their work, I dare say they would have preferred a duty to a bounty. But the government considered that they could not at that moment impose a duty on lead without interfering seriously with other industries of which lead is the raw material. All the manufacturers of paint use our lead, and this is a growing industry, and a very rapidly growing industry, as my hon. friend knows. If the government at that time had been prepared to revise the tariff, I do not say but that they would have taken into consideration the request of the lead producers. Whenever the time comes for revising the tariff—and that time cannot be very far distant, for our tariff has been in existence for about eight years—the Minister of Finance may think it advisable to revise his policy in regard to lead, and may replace the bounty by a duty. I do not say that in the way of forecasting events, but the matter is fairly open for consideration.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, I understand from the right hon. gentleman's remarks, that the paint manufacturers wished to import lead from the United States. I suppose that was their objection to having a duty imposed on lead.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. I say that if a duty had been put on lead, whether it came from the United States or from Canada, it would have so seriously interfered with the price of the raw material of the manufacturers of paint that their industry would have been placed in serious jeopardy.

Mr. HENDERSON. That involves a pretty deep question—whether it would have increased the price of lead or not. Is it not possible that by means of a good round duty you would have succeeded in developing the lead industry in British Columbia to such an extent that we would not require to import any great quantity, while the competition amongst the miners would have kept the price as low as it is at present, with the bounty added ? That is a pretty big question, and perhaps the First Minister does not desire to go into it to-night; but I think that is the true protective principle—to develop that industry with a view not only to maintaining and increasing it, but with a view to bringing down the price of lead.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As my hon. friend has rightly stated, this is a very big question, and his view that the imposition of a duty does not increase the price of the manufactured article to the consumer is one which is not generally shared by those who have to pay the duty. They say that it does increase the price of their raw material. I have heard the argument of my hon. friend before, and no doubt I shall hear it again. I will refer him to the example I have seen very often when we are asked to increase the duty. We are told it will not increase the price, but there will be so much competition from within that the price will remain just as it is. But with respect to the raw material used in the manufacture of that article the man always says : Hold on, you cannot increase that duty without increasing the price at the same time.

Mr. HENDERSON. I should think the Prime Minister, with his sunny ways, might be able to persuade him of his fallacy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My sunny ways do not always succeed, with my hon. friend, at all events.

Mr. INGRAM. I was pointing out that we were paying $195,627 in bounties, and when this bounty ceased, if there was no duty put on, then our lead producers would be in no better position than they were before the bounties were put on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is another question we will have to take up in due time.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it the duty of Mr. Haycock to ascertain the quantities made by each one of these factories, and arrive at the amount of bounty they are entitled to ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When it is not in stock.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was in the past.

Inspection of staples—chief inspectors, inspectors, deputy inspectors and other employees under the General Inspection and Manitoba Grain Acts, $60,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish to make an amendment in the language of this item. I move to insert after the word 'inspection' in the third line 'grain inspection.' I will now give a statement of all our inspectors, first taking the inspectors of grain, which are the most important :

List of all persons employed under the inspection of staples, including those of the

eastern and western grain inspection divisions, inspection of hides and inspection of binder twine :

Name and title.	Salary.
David Horn, chief inspector of grain for the Dominion, Winnipeg	$ 5,000
Charles C. Castle, warehouse commissioner, Winnipeg	3,500
Matthew Snow, deputy warehouse commissioner, Winnipeg	1,800
Thos. M. Horn, deputy inspector of grain, Winnipeg	1,800
Geo. Serls, deputy inspector of grain, Winnipeg	1,800
E. Thompson, assistant warehouse commissioner, Winnipeg	1,500
C. N. Bell, secretary of board of survey and board of grain examiners, Winnipeg	750
F. E. Gibbs, inspector of grain and weighmaster, Fort William	3,500
A. F. Gibbs, deputy inspector of grain, Port Arthur	1,500
Geo. Hill, first weighman, Fort William	1,500
Fred. Symes, charge cargo shipments, Fort William	1,500
Jas. D. Fraser, chief clerk, Winnipeg	1,020
Jas. Gershaw, charge night work, Winnipeg	1,200
Stewart Langille, assistant, Winnipeg	900
Wm. Crawford, assistant, Winnipeg	1,200
F. E. Endersby, yard clerk, Winnipeg	780
Frank Collins, assistant, Winnipeg	900
W. G. Corbett, clerk, Winnipeg	720
J. T. Hollinshead, weighman, Port Arthur	960
Jas. O'Hagan, deputy inspector of grain, Fort William	1,020
R. J. Temple, weighman, Fort William	780
J. A. McTavish, cargo sampler, Fort William	780
J. D. Watson, cargo sampler, Fort William	780
W. F. Clipston, cargo sampler, Winnipeg	780
T. A. Elliott, weighman, King's elevator, Port Arthur	780
Jas. Beirnes, assistant, Winnipeg	660
Wm. Cuddy, assistant at night work, Winnipeg	720
James Cuddy, assistant, Winnipeg	660
H. McLean, assistant, Winnipeg	720
D. W. Duff, assistant, Winnipeg	660
J. A. Drummond, assistant, Winnipeg	660
	40,830

Eastern Grain Inspection Division.

E. F. Craig, chief inspector of grain, Montreal	3,500
Hospice Labelle, inspector of grain, Montreal	3,000
Alex. Boyer, deputy inspector of grain, Montreal	1,000
Ed. Boyer, deputy inspector of grain, Montreal	900
A. F. Fillion, grain sampler, Montreal	750
L. G. Labelle, clerk, grain inspection office, Montreal	1,100
E. M. Campbell, inspector of grain and hay, Toronto	2,000
A. Turner, deputy inspector of grain, Toronto	1,000
W. J. McNeill, inspector of grain and hay, Kingston	650
J. Hurley, inspector of grain and hay, Peterboro	650
Total grain inspection	55,380
Geo. Roy, chief inspector of hides, Quebec	$ 1,500
J. L. Haycock, inspector of binder twine, Kingston	1,600
Total—inspection of staples	59,480

Mr. HENDERSON. Was there not another one in Toronto, Mr. Adamson ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Mr. Adamson is dismissed. The total of the salaries for the two divisions is $59,480.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman speaks of two divisions ; where is the line drawn ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. East and west of Fort William.

Mr. INGRAM. To Montreal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To Montreal.

Mr. HENDERSON. Fort William is included in the western division?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Fort William is included in the western division. This is a very important branch of the service and perhaps my hon. friend would be interested to know in what manner the work of weighing and inspecting grain is performed. The inspection of grain in Canada has become from year to year a work of the greatest importance, constantly increasing and constantly necessitating improvements in the methods adopted to insure the reputation of Canadian grain in the foreign markets. There are two divisions at present under the Grain Act, which two divisions comprise the whole of Canada. The western division with headquarters at Winnipeg and the eastern division with headquarters at Montreal. Mr. David Horn, until recently, was chief inspector of the western division, and Mr. Edward Craig was chief inspector of the eastern division. By an Order in Council, however, Mr. David Horn has been appointed chief inspector for the Dominion, so that the two inspection divisions as at present, and any future divisions which may be erected, may be brought into harmony throughout the Dominion. Upon the arrival of every grain train in Winnipeg, when it comes in, night or day, Sundays or holidays, a staff of grain men must be on hand so that samples may be taken from each car expeditiously in order that no train may be delayed. Mr. Horn has at Winnipeg a staff of from twenty to thirty according to the season of the year ; six of these are duly examined deputy inspectors holding certificates. As soon as the train pulls in and the conductor hands in his way bill, the inspectors are allowed to make a list from it. With this list they go out to the track, open the cars as they come to them, according to the list. They usually go in gangs of three, that is to say, two samplers in charge of a deputy or foreman of experience. With a specially

contrived instrument he stabs the grain in from seven to ten or a dozen places, and places each sample in a cloth on top of the grain at the door of the car. The foreman mixes these various samples and satisfies himself that it is a fair average of the car. This sample of about two pounds is then placed in a bag, ticketed with the number of the car, &c. This sample is then taken to the grain inspection office and carefully examined by expert inspectors. A careful lookout is maintained for cars in bad condition, for leakages, &c. If any irregularities are discovered they are immediately reported. The certificates are issued accordingly and the trains proceed to Fort William or Port Arthur, the necessary documents being sent by mail to the grain inspection offices there. Samples of all the grain inspected are kept at the Winnipeg office. The system at present in vogue is found to be eminently satisfactory, as is attested by the reputation of Canadian certificates in the foreign markets. The system at Montreal is very similar; though at this point the work is not so heavy as it is in the west, and somewhat different from the large quantities of United States grain having to pass inspection at Montreal, whereas at Winnipeg the inspection is wholly of Canadian origin. I think the service has been performed satisfactorily. In so far as I know no complaints have been received against the men who do that work.

Mr. FOSTER. What grades are given in the inspection of wheat?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say at this moment, but if I had the statute at hand the only thing I could do would be to read the Grain Act passed last year. The grades are fixed by statute and the quality of the grade is fixed by a board of examiners appointed by the government. The standards are fixed every year as the quality varies from year to year; the crop is not the same every year. Samples are taken in advance and distributed among the officers who keep them as the standards of the different grades. The samples are also sent to the corn exchanges in Great Britain.

Mr. FOSTER. You say that United States grain in Montreal has to pass our inspection?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the system in regard to the grain that is taken to the seaboard in the winter? Is that accompanied by a certificate from one of the inspectors from the west or from Montreal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It applies to all grain for export. A certificate has to be taken either from Montreal or Winnipeg.

Mr. FOSTER. Are no grains tested that go through except they are for export?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are all inspected whether for foreign or domestic use.

Mr. HENDERSON. A year or so ago there was a good deal of complaint about the Montreal inspection. It was not accepted in the old country as readily as the western inspection. Have there been any complaints recently in regard to that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None at all.

Mr. HENDERSON. That was the case, I am aware. The standard did not seem to be so high. I am glad to know it has been overcome. Do I understand that Mr. Horn is the chief inspector for the entire Dominion?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then Mr. Craig is reduced to a subordinate position as the inspector for the eastern division?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who is the inspector for the western division?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Horn.

Mr. HENDERSON. He is chief inspector and also inspector for the western division?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. There is no doubt Mr. Horn is a very capable man.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think he is believed to be the best man in the Dominion of Canada for that purpose. That is the opinion both east and west in so far as I have been able to learn. In regard to the change in Toronto from Mr. Adamson to Mr. Campbell, did the government have any special reason for discharging Mr. Adamson? He was an officer who had occupied that position for some considerable time. Could the right hon. minister tell me if Mr. Campbell had any special qualification? The appointment was criticised somewhat in Toronto when the change was made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Adamson was dismissed upon the special recommendation of Mr. Horn. As to the qualification of Mr. Campbell, he passed the required examination and passed, I understand, one of the best possible examinations.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the examination passed? What is the board?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At Toronto. The board of examiners which fixes the standards is the board which makes the examination.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any record of the amount of grain examined at Winnipeg, Montreal or Toronto?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will find the information in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, page 740.

Mr. FOSTER. This whole business amounts to $92,500. Who pays that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are specified fees charged for inspection and for weighing. I am informed that the capacity of a car has now so much increased that the government are contemplating almost duplicating the fees for weighing carload lots.

Mr. FOSTER. What amount of fees were collected last year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Toronto produce grain inspection, $3,111.68; Montreal, grain inspection and samples sold, $4,599.20; Manitoba inspection division, grain inspection, warehouse licenses and samples sold, $53,157.43.

Mr. FOSTER. According to that the government is in for about $30,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I should think that the grain business ought to pay for its own certificating.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. The government should see that the fees charged would cover the expenses.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have just said that we were contemplating increasing the fees.

Mr. FOSTER. In the meantime the country lost $30,000 last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That fact has already engaged the attention of the government and it seems to be reasonable that the fees collected should be commensurate with the expenditure.

Mr. INGRAM. It is estimated that there will be 90,000,000 bushels of grain in the west this year. Our present inspecting staff costs us $95,000 a year and I would like to know if that same staff will be able to inspect the increased production. If so the chances are the receipts will double the expenditure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say as to that, but I suppose we will be guided by Mr. Horn, who the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) states is a very competent man. He would no doubt be able to estimate in advance whether he will want any extra men or whether he can perform the service with the present staff. I have no doubt that the department will confer with Mr. Horn on the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand the policy of the government is to make this business pay its own charges.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say if that is the policy of the department, but I am of the same mind as my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) and think it would be my policy if I had charge.

Mr. FOSTER. It is the certificating that gives the character to and fixes the price of the grain; it must be of great advantage to the trade as a whole and to the producer ultimately.

Mr. INGRAM. Under the Act of 1903 the Governor in Council had the right to fix the fees to be charged and I do not think that has been amended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have the right.

Mr. AMES. I have only just come into possession of the correspondence which was brought down in response to a return moved for by me on the 22nd of February, in reference to the reasons why the nominations of the Montreal Board of Trade were not accepted on the Grain Survey Board named for Montreal. We were given to understand on the 27th of February, by the Prime Minister, that good and sufficient reasons for ignoring the recommendations of the Montreal Board of Trade would be found in this correspondence. The Prime Minister then said:

> I do not mean that the fact that Messrs. Carruthers and Metcalfe were passed over would indicate anything against these gentlemen. I do not think it would be fair to imply or accept anything of that kind, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce informs me that these gentlemen have been passed over for good and sufficient reasons which will appear upon the face of the papers when they are brought down.

The papers have now been brought down and although I have looked them over very carefully I can find no good and sufficient reasons given. The reasons are referred to in one or two instances here. In a letter of the 4th of October addressed to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and signed, J. S. Norris & Co., a firm of Montreal grain shippers, these gentlemen call the attention of the government to the fact that great dissatisfaction exists in Montreal because the nominations made by the Montreal Board of Trade were not given effect to by the government. Mr. Norris writes:

> Both Mr. Carruthers and Mr. Metcalfe have been long identified with the grain trade here, and without doubt possess superior qualifications for acting on that board.

Turning to a letter of October 12th, which is a reply to this letter of Messrs. J. S. Norris & Co., by W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, I find this statement:

I do not propose entering into an argument upon the subject at all, but I know that your opinion is very different from the opinion of the Department of Justice to which the question was referred in the first instance. The decision of the department, as communicated to this office, is as follows :

Then follows the decision of the Department of Justice. In another letter of the 8th of October, signed W. G. Parmelee, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, and addressed to the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, this statement is made:

The change in the personnel was not made without due consideration and it was deemed advisable that there should be a change, the reasons for which would take up too much space if enumerated.

It will be seen, therefore, that no reasons are given in the correspondence. Now, Sir, there are two questions involved in this matter. The first question is : The slight which was offered to the Montreal Board of Trade by the government in making these nominations. Whether or not we accept the interpretation given to the Act by the Minister of Justice, the fact remains undisputed that on the 23rd of August, Mr. Parmelee wrote to the secretary of the board of trade as follows :

The Act of course provides for a recommendation by the board of trade of fit and skilful persons to compose the grain survey board, and the full provisions of the Act must be complied with before the new board is in a position to act. Your board will do well to make their recommendation so that they may be considered by the Governor in Council as early as possible.

And then, when the recommendations were made the reply which we received in Montreal was that the recommendations in a large measure shall not be adopted, that the government is not bound to adopt them and that the Minister of Justice has given an opinion to that effect : in fact that the recommendations might or might not have been made at all, and yet the government would have felt perfectly free to go ahead with their nominations. The board of trade at the present day cannot see why they should be called upon to make any suggestions at all if their suggestions are to have such little weight with the government, but I cannot help feeling—and in this I know I voice the sentiments of the grain trade and the board of trade of Montreal—that there is some personal reason on the part of certain officials connected with the grain board at Ottawa or Montreal which has operated against the nomination of Messrs. Metcalfe and Carruthers, and if we knew the whole facts it would be found that not so much the efficiency of the service is considered as certain private reasons that have not yet come out in the correspondence, and I think we ought to have some explanation that would be at least acceptable by the Montreal Board of Trade and the Montreal Grain Exchange, as to why Messrs. Metcalfe and Carruthers were not accepted when nominated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I take some exception to the first statement which has been made by my hon. friend, that the Montreal Board of Trade have reason to complain that the representations which they made to the government were not accepted in their entirety. I have only to observe to my hon. friend that the power of appointment rests upon the government and not upon the board of trade. The board of trade can do nothing but make suggestions.

Mr. AMES. Would it not have been courteous to the Montreal Borad of Trade, in case any nominations which they made were not acceptable to the government, to have asked the Montreal Board of Trade to have made other nominations until a sufficient number of nominations were made to enable the government to choose a board which would be mutually satisfactory ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend asks me if it would not have been courteous for the department to ask the Montreal Board of Trade for other recommendations since the first ones had not been accepted, I think as a point of etiquette, although I am not prepared to discuss it, there might be something in it. My point is that I do not accept the view of my hon. friend if I correctly understood his idea to be that the government was bound to accept the recommendations of the board. The government in this case has to consult somebody as to the making of the appointments, and I imagine there are no better parties to be consulted in a matter of this kind than the board of trade. But upon the advice that the government receives the government has to exercise its best judgment, and if for reasons sufficient for themselves they think the recommendations which have been made are not the wisest that could have been made, if they have reason to take some exceptions to them, I think they are quite within their rights in not accepting them. As to the matter of courtesy I have nothing to say. I do not think it is a thing which after all amounts to very much if the relations have not been as tender and gentle as they might have been. I believe there is something in what my hon. friend says that there is an impression in Montreal—in some quarters, not everywhere—that there has been some hidden reason why the nominations of these two gentlemen have been passed over by the government. In addition to that my hon. friend says : We are entitled to know what these reasons are ; the government are not expected to act on caprice or by whims, and if they passed over the recommendation of a respectable body like the Board of Trade of Montreal they must have had

some reasons for that and we should know them. The government of course must accept the responsibility of their action, and I do not know but I presume that if the government have passed over the names of these two gentlemen and substituted two other names, who I think are very competent, they had some reason for that. There could be no reason at all why the action of the government should not be scrutinized in every way. My hon. friend thinks we ought to know these reasons ; I have only to say that I cannot give him the reason at this moment. When my hon. friend brought the matter up on January 27, I called upon the Minister of Trade and Commerce and reported to him the views which had been expressed by my hon. friend when I saw his notice on the order paper, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce told me then that he had good and sufficient reason for the action which he had taken. I shall be happy to confer with the Minister of Trade and Commerce again and I shall be happy to discuss the matter with my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) at a later stage, and to give the reasons which have actuated the department in the action of which he complains.

Mr. AMES. I think it would be in the general interest of the grain trade and of that harmony which should prevail between the government and commercial bodies if the matter should be a little more thoroughly ventilated. There is a feeling—how just it may be we do not know—which is not entirely one of satisfaction with the local officials connected with the grain inspection of Montreal. I have myself been in receipt of considerable correspondence from grain importers in Great Britain making severe criticism on the grain inspection officials of the city of Montreal, and there is a feeling that the government was influenced to some extent in their action in this matter by the fact that those nominations were not acceptable to certain officials stationed at Montreal in connection with the grain trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All I can say at this moment is that if there are any reasons to suspect any official of the government at Montreal it would be the duty of my hon. friend to give his reasons, not here, but to the department so that the department may take action if it deem it advisable. I have had, so far as I am concerned, no complaint against any official, but if there are some officials who are under suspicion it is not fair that they should be held under suspicion. The matter should be investigated and if they are found guilty they should be removed from the service, but if they are not guilty their record is clear and nothing more should be heard of the charges. I think my hon. friend will find when I give them the reasons and the documents upon which the government has acted that perhaps he will have cause to change his mind as to the reasons which have influenced the government.

Mr. AMES. Possibly.

Mr. HENDERSON. On this point I regret that I have not the wording of the statute before me, but my impression is that when we passed this Act last year provision was made that the Board of Trade of Montreal and the Board of Trade of Toronto should recommend to the government the persons that might be appointed to these positions. I certainly for one—and I attended meetings on 10 or 11 days of a sub-committee examining the whole Act but my impression is that we intended to provide that out of these recommendations the government should make the selection of inspectors, and I am somewhat surprised to learn from the member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) that this has not been carried out, that the government, for some reason which the Prime Minister has not made known, had gone outside apparently of the recommendations. I think certainly that if there was any good reason why these men should not be appointed, it is just as well the country should know it, because there has been, as my friend (Mr. Ames) has said, for some time a suspicion that everything was not right in connection with Montreal inspection; in fact it was not acceptable in the old country at all. That was the reason why I asked the right hon. gentleman with respect to whether or not complaint had been made during the past year in that regard. I was very glad indeed to hear that the difficulty complained of here had been removed, but it seems that there are still some inquiries with respect to the same thing. Whether it is owing to some particular officials there not being acceptable or not discharging their duties properly, for my part I am entirely unable to say, but I would say that it is of the utmost importance to all grain shippers that complete confidence should be established in Montreal grain inspection, not only among the people of this country but more especially among the people of the old country who are receiving the shipments of grain. Had the government followed the course laid down in the Act, and named the men recommended by the Board of Trade, I think it would have tended to remove a good deal of the difficulty that seems to have prevailed in the last year or two, and have established complete confidence both in the old country and in this country. But it would seem as if political or some other influence had prevailed, and no doubt the shippers and the receivers of goods from the old country will still be under the impression that the right men are not in the right place.

Mr. AMES. May I say a word in reply to my hon. friend from Halton ? He has, I think, to a slight extent misunderstood my remarks. So far as the individual gen-

tlemen are concerned, the nominees of the government are perfectly satisfactory. The only question at issue was that the Montreal Board of Trade thought that the government could only act on their recommendation.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought so too.

Mr. AMES. That is certainly what any layman would read in the law, and the board of trade were considerably chagrined at having been invited to make nominations and having their nominations turned down. They thought they should at least have been asked to make new nominations, because, without disputing the power of the government to make the appointments, they thought that the nominations should first come from the board of trade. But I wish it to be understood that we have no criticism to make of the personnel of the board. The gentlemen composing it at present are in every way fitted for the duties they are called on to perform.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would further say that when the government received the communication of the board of trade, the Minister of Trade and Commerce thought he was bound to take exception to two of the names recommended, and he did so. But he was of the same opinion as the hon. member for Halton and the hon. member for Montreal, that the government could not go outside of the recommendations of the board of trade; and it was to clear up that point that he asked the opinion of the Minister of Justice, who advised him that he was not bound to take the recommendations of the board of trade, but that those recommendations were merely sent to them as a means of attaining an end, and that he could exercise his own judgment, which he did. I am glad to have from the hon. member for Montreal his confirmation of the fact that no exception can be taken to the gentlemen appointed.

Mr. AMES. Allow me to put one further question. Supposing a British shipper of grain is desirous of having samples of the standards that are fixed on this side of the water, in order to enable him to purchase by letter rather than by sample, can he on demand obtain such samples practically free of charge?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that he can. He can have those in England without applying in Canada at all, because all the samples, when determined in Canada, are sent to England.

Mr. AMES. That does not quite meet the case, which I have in mind, the case of a large flour milling firm in Cardiff, Wales, who import large quantities of wheat, including Canadian wheat. They recently applied to the department in Montreal for samples of grain, and received a very curt reply from the local inspector to the effect that there were no samples of the kind of grain they asked for. I transmitted this letter to the department, who I know appreciate the situation. What I wish to know is whether this Cardiff miller can secure samples direct from Canada; because it is probable that the samples in possession of the British exchange could not be divided for the purpose of distributing them among several millers. Would it be possible for this large milling concern—and it is greatly in the interests of Canada that they should purchase largely Canadian wheat—to produce direct from Canada their own samples of the current standards of wheat, corn and other grain?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give my hon. friend the information to-day, but I will have the matter inquired into, and have it given to him officially.

Culling timber,, $17,100.

Mr. HENDERSON. How many of these cullers are there now?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And what are their duties?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At present there are six.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are they located chiefly in Quebec?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are located in Quebec. The trade which necessitated these cullers is more and more diminishing, and it will not be very long before the office will have to be abolished altogether. The position of superintendent is vacant, and we have not filled it. In fact, I think the department has prepared a Bill for next session, with a view to dealing with this subject.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the object of this culling?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is to measure the square timber coming to the harbour of Quebec for exportation, and to give certificates of measurement. If there is a dispute between the purchaser and the vendor as to the quantity, it is customary to have the culling done; or if a man brings a raft down and wants to have an official statement of the measurement of the timber in it, he obtains it from the cullers. These are the principal services which they render.

Mr. DANIEL. Is Quebec the only port where this is done?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. It was formerly a very important office.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why do the owners of the timber not pay for the measurement of it? Why is it charged to the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend has asked me more than I can explain. I can only say that it has been so for fifty years.

Mr. DANIEL. In St. John and everywhere else, so far as I know, there are sworn surveyors, and the expense is paid by the owners of the timber ; and one would think that would be followed in all the cities and ports.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The office of the cullers has been in existence for some fifty years, and at one time I believe it was thought to be an absolute necessity. That was at a time when millions of square timber were shipped from Quebec every year. I remember—I think it was 1876—the lumbermen who were then in the House agreed and pressed upon the government the diminution of the number of cullers. A certain number were superannuated, each receiving a pension of $200 a year. This year, the amount asked for pensions is diminished by $200 as one of these gentlemen has died. I think we may have here a precedent to dispose of the other cullers in the same way. My impression is, as representing the city of Quebec, that the time has about arrived when we should do something with regard to that office, either to completely abolish it or to re-cast it on some other plan.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that the government ask for the same amount—$4,200—as last year, notwithstanding the fact that one of the cullers has died.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The amount for the payment of cullers is the same, $4,200, but the amount for superannuated cullers, which was $4,200 last year, is reduced to $4,000 because of the death of one of these superannuated cullers.

Public works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia, $387,260.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it the intention of the government to proceed to-night and put through all the items covered by this large vote ? We are almost defenceless on this side of the House ; we are scarcely equal to the occasion. I trust the minister will not press these matters in view of the fact that we have no Minister of Public Works in the House. I have no doubt he hopes to have one within two or three days. But in the absence of the Minister of Public Works we can hardly hope for a full explanation of these votes. Having adjourned early last night and the night before, I think we might follow in the same line, and not proceed to deal with an important vote like this with so few members present. The works represented in this list of items are scattered all over Nova Scotia. And, the opposition not having a single representative from Nova Scotia, will be obliged to get its information from some other source than its own members. So, it cannot be expected that we can duly criticise these items with such a thin House. I trust the minister will not take advantage of our weakness on this occasion and try to press through so many items as are covered by this vote.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no disposition to press these matters unduly. We have been getting along very pleasantly with our estimates—we certainly have no reason to complain. I would suggest that this item should not be proceeded with to-night. At the same time I would not like to accept the suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) that we should not proceed with any of these items unless the Minister of Public Works is in his seat. We may find it necessary, in order to keep the business of the House moving, to take up some of these votes. But, if there is any item that any hon. gentleman wishes held over, that can be done. Instead of taking up Public Works we might take up some miscellaneous items not of so controversial a character as the vote for Public Works. A number of these are merely formal votes, and, I think, will not require any particular explanation. If there is any item that is objected to, we will let it stand. And, in any case we will have an early adjournment.

Mr. HENDERSON. In half an hour.

Mr. FIELDING. All right. If, on any of these items, the information is not ready, yet, as these matters are of a formal character, the committee might be good enough to let the items pass with the understanding, that, on the supplementary estimates, further information will be given if desired.

Miscellaneous—Academy of Arts, $2,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. I thought that was disposed of.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not marked as passed. This is the usual grant to the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts. It is for the encouragement of the fine arts, and is paid to the president of the Royal Canadian Academy.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In Toronto ?

Mr. FIELDING. The Royal Canadian Academy holds its exhibition in different parts of the country. I think Toronto is the headquarters.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know whether the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is able to give me the information I desire, yet, in case he may be, I will put a question. Is it intended to introduce this session an amendment to the Criminal Law with relation to Art Unions incorporated in the old country, which are at present forbidden by our criminal law to carry on their operations in Canada ? I understood from the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) that he would

introduce this session an amendment which would allow art unions incorporated in the old country and known to be of high class, to do business in Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sorry I cannot give my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) a definite answer. I am heartily in sympathy with the view he expresses. I am familiar with the subject, for it was called to my attention when I was in the old country by gentlemen of high standing connected with the Art Union. The difficulty is to draft a clause which will distinguish between genuine art unions having for their object the encouragement of art, and other concerns that are mere lotteries. My hon. friend from St. Antoine division, Montreal (Mr. Ames) will remember that there were a number of institutions operating in Montreal under the guise of art unions which did a good deal of harm. In the effort to suppres these it appears we have shut out bona fide organizations. Now, all over the country there will be found genuine objects of art which have been distributed under their system, and no harm has come, but on the contrary much good, by supplying the homes of Canada with fine pictures at a moderate cost. I sympathize with the view that we should endeavour to get a form of words which would allow bona fide art unions to be formed without admitting the mere lotteries. But up to the present time there has been a difficulty in getting a form of words which would serve a good purpose without at the same time admitting evil. I will remind the Minister of Justice of the matter again to see if we can carry out the object which I think the most of us will concur in.

Grant to the imperial government to cover Canada's proportion of probable losses in connection with the operation of the Pacific cable, $125,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This cable is a joint concern between the imperial and colonial governments, and this is the proportion of the loss which is chargeable to Canada. This is an estimate made of what the loss is likely to be. We had to pay a sum in a previous year, I do not exactly remember the amount, but I think it corresponds with this, and this estimate is based upon past experience.

Mr. AMES. In any case, this item is one which we are in honour bound, at least to pay, whatever it may be. The amount is determined, I understand, at the end of the fiscal year, and we pay directly to the imperial government.

Mr. FIELDING. We pay to the commission, and the imperial government is the centre. It is an obligation, the proportion of Canada is fixed. The exact amount is not fixed, because that is a matter of business at the close of the year.

Mr. HENDERSON. What is Canada's proportion ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not risk saying, lest I make a mistake.

Mr. INGRAM. Does Australia pay any proportion and what ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the various colonies pay in proportion to their interest, as laid down in the arrangement. They are to be charged with the sum which will represent their share of the earnings, and of course they would share in the profits, if there were any.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems to me, either that this cable is badly managed, or else it was not necessary. There seems to be something radically wrong in the whole concern.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, it was thought to be necessary as a part of a large colonial policy in which we must take a little risk. Probably it has been somewhat disappointing financially, but all these important undertakings, in their early stages, are apt to involve some loss. But we hope to do better. My hon. friend is aware that the Postmaster General has just left for the old country in order to be present at a conference in relation to this matter, and we hope that some better arrangement may be made. However, as my hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Ames) says, we are obligated to pay our proportion, whatever it may be, and this is the estimated amount required for that purpose.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not object to pay anything that we are really and in duty bound to pay. But I would like to have a statement of the whole cost of the business. It would be much more satisfactory, before voting this large amount of money, to have the whole statement on the 'Hansard' so that members of the House may become familiar with the transaction.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a large item, and my hon. friend's criticism is so reasonable that, if it is his wish that this item should stand, I will offer no objection.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When may we have the information ?

Mr. FIELDING. Very soon.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will it be given before six o'clock on Monday ? I am here generally all the rest of the week.

Mr. FIELDING. I will promise not to give it before six o'clock on Monday.

Mr. INGRAM. Does this item cover our proportion of the loss in laying the cable in any way ?

Mr. FIELDING. No. This cable was laid at a very large cost, and bonds were

issued representing the capital outlay. Interest has to be paid on that capital, and also working expenses. There is found to be a deficiency and this is Canada's estimated proportion.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. At what rate were the bonds sold ?

Mr. FIELDING. On very favourable terms, because it was looked upon as an imperial undertaking.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have an impression that Canada's share is one-sixth.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is more than that.

Mr. HENDERSON. That was my impression, about one-sixth. In that event, the entire loss would be about three-quarters of a million dollars. The minister, I understand, is not able to inform us what the total loss is. As it is a matter of interest, perhaps the minister could give us the information on that point. I have no desire to prolong the discussion. The member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson), however, would like to have further information. Perhaps the minister would be able to tell us tonight what the entire loss is. Would it be more or less than three-quarters of a million dollars?

Mr. FIELDING. I could not give my hon. friend the information, but I think it is only reasonable the House should have the figures asked for, and I will let the item stand until the information is furnished.

Consolidation of Dominion statutes which may be paid, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act or in the Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $20,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is item 231 passed, with regard to matters between the Dominion and the provinces ?

Mr. FIELDING. That item is to wind up all these old accounts between the Dominion and the provinces that have been in the hands of arbitrators. The operations are necessarily very slow. Most of the matters referred to of this class have been dealt with, and those that remain are now being considered. I hope we will see the end of it, while some of us are still on earth. I have been urging both the counsel for the Dominion and the counsel for the provinces to push it to a conclusion.

Mr. INGRAM. What is in dispute yet ?

Mr. FIELDING. There are some questions at present respecting interest, but most of the matters have been disposed of ; some however, are still outstanding. One in particular was referred to the Exchequer Court, the matter of interest on certain balances in favour of the provinces, whether we are bound to pay them a high rate of interest, as we think, the rate of interest they demand.

Mr. HENDERSON. What interest is the government now paying to the province of Ontario on the trust money held by the Dominion ? Is it still 5 per cent, or has it been reduced to 4 per cent, as it was proposed at one time by the Finance Minister ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that is one of the points in dispute. My recollection is that we are only paying 4 per cent, but their intention is that it should stand on a par with provincial subsidies, and that the interest should be 5 per cent.

Mr. HENDERSON. If there is to be a judicial decision given, of course, we will all learn in due time if we remain here. I always had the impression that it was really a fixture by the British North America Act that we in Ontario received 5 per cent on these trust funds. The matter of subsidy, I do not think, has anything to do with it because the question of subsidy is not based upon the matter of interest. The whole question, as I understand it, is whether we in Ontario shall receive 5 per cent from the Dominion on this trust money, on account of the common school fund, the grammar school fund and the Upper Canada building fund. This view in regard to the question has been raised. I may be wrong, but I am under the impression that it was fixed by the British North America Act that these funds were to remain in the hands of the Dominion and that the Dominion was to account to the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada at the rate of 5 per cent. It did seem to me a very strange proposition when the hon. Minister of Finance proposed to reduce the interest to 4 per cent notwithstanding the fact that interest had fallen all over the country. This is part of the revenue of Ontario. However, I presume, if it is in court, it will have to be determined by the Supreme Court, or by whatever court it is being reviewed. I understood from the hon. Minister of Finance last year, I think, that after the 1st of July the proposition was to pay 4 per cent?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was somewhat curious to ascertain whether 5 per cent was received up to the 1st of January and whether he proposes to pay 5 per cent on the 1st of July and let the courts decide. Then, of course, if the province of Ontario is entitled to 5 per cent, the Dominion would have to make it up.

Mr. FIELDING. In any case we will have to abide by the decision of the court. My impression is that we never recognized the right of the provinces to 5 per cent, but whatever the judgment of the court is we will have to submit to it.

Mr. HENDERSON. How was the 5 per cent arrived at in the first instance?

Mr. FIELDING. The claim was that the rate was 5 per cent as in the case of the subsidy accounts. The word subsidy account, although it is used sometimes in our department, is not strictly correct. There are items which appear sometimes under the head of subsidy accounts whereas they are not subsidies. Strictly speaking the subsidy is only the 80 cents per head, but any balance of capital remaining at the credit of the province shall earn 5 per cent under the British North America Act. Whether this is one of the balances which should earn 5 per cent under the British North America Act is a question to be determined.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course the hon. Minister of Finance is not quite correct when he says the 80 cents per head is the only subsidy. In 1884, the provinces were granted an additional subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING. Not in that form.

Mr. HENDERSON. The province of Ontario was granted $142,414.

Mr. FIELDING. Not as a subsidy.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Act of parliament says it is to be paid as subsidy.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a sum placed at their credit. It is as broad as it is long.

Mr. HENDERSON. $142,414 certainly was the interest on a large sum which the Dominion of Canada admitted for the purposes of a settlement might be due to the province of Ontario, not actually owing, but in order to meet the demands for better terms at that time the Dominion of Canada generously admitted that such a liability actually existed, but never proposed to pay over the actual sum. They always held themselves liable only to pay over what was equivalent to 5 per cent interest, to use the term which my hon. friend is using in the Autonomy Bill in regard to Alberta—a sum equivalent to 5 per cent. Of course, it may be that the hon. gentleman's intention is to reduce that subsidy of $142,414. If he does it is going to materially affect the revenue of the province of Ontario and I do not know of any reason why it should be done. It was a matter that was settled in 1884, and we thought it was settled for all time to come. However, the item was passed, I believe, the other night, we allowed the government $20,000 to meet the expenses in connection with this arbitration, and I hope that before another year has passed we will see the end of it.

Consolidation of Dominion statutes, which may be paid, notwithstanding anything contained in the Civil Service Act or in the Act respecting the Department of Public Printing and Stationery, $20,000.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who are the commissioners who are revising these statutes? They seem to be slow in their work.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have been appointed for about three years and they will carry out their work, notwithstanding that they have the statutes for the last sixteen years to consolidate, in half the time which was taken at the last revision in 1886.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the remuneration which will be paid? Give us the system.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friends want to get many details I will have to ask them to allow the matter to remain over, because, when my estimates were on, I asked specially that that particular item should remain in order that I might make a complete statement to show the progress which had been made and also to be in a position to say when the revision will be completed. I will say, speaking from memory, that the revision will be completed within the next month or two with the exception of the Criminal Code and the index to the statutes. The Criminal Code is being done separately and has not progressed quite as rapidly as the other part of the work. The commissioners are the late chief justice of the Supreme Court, chairman of the board; my own deputy is the next commissioner; with him is associated Mr. Power, also of my own department, who has had large experience in these matters and the registrar of the Supreme Court, in fact, I may say that I have taken as many officials as I could because I thought they were perhaps more competent to deal with these matters as they have had large experience in regard to the statutes. There are also engaged on this work Mr. Roscoe, of Nova Scotia; Mr. Sirois, of Quebec; Mr. Robertson, of Collingwood and Mr. Cameron, of Goderich.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are there five?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Outside of my own department and the Supreme Court, I think there are four. I thought the House ought to be put in possession of the facts and that I would ask the Deputy Minister of Justice to make a complete statement to show first how far the work has progressed, the statutes that have been revised, the cost up to the present time and the estimated cost to complete the work.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. When could that be ready?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will have it on Monday.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Would it not be well to have that statement go on 'Hansard'?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be well to have the item stand over. When the matter was up before my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) put a question or two to me and I said if he would allow it to remain over I might give him the information he asked for.

Mr. HENDERSON. The matter I wish to refer to has no reference to the statement made by the hon. Minster of Justice. I think the hon. gentleman has made a satisfactory statement. I hope that this revision will be completed at as early a date as the hon. minister says it will be completed. Perhaps, if any mistake has been made at all in regard to this matter, it has been in the fact that the government have allowed sixteen years to pass without having a revision. It may be all right for lawyers who keep their statutes indexed regularly, but for the ordinary justice of the peace or layman who has occasion to refer to the statutes it is absolutely impossible to get anything out of the old consolidated statutes or to know what the law of the land is. But that is not the question I wish to refer to. I want to refer to the indexing of the statutes. Whatever the hon. Minister of Justice thinks of it, I desire to tell him that I regard the index as absolutely useless to the ordinary man and I believe it is next to useless to the members of the profession.

I wanted to find the Inspection Act in this volume to-night, and I had to give it up. The index is distributed all over the statutes, one part here, another part there, and sometimes not there at all. To any one not in the legal profession the index is absolutely useless and even to the legal profession I believe the index is unsatisfactory. I trust that the index of the revised statutes will be in simpler form, so that we can make some use of it. I have been told that the index to the Ontario statutes is far superior to the index to our Dominion statutes. I am referring now specially to the Acts of each session; I had occasion recently to search for a particular Act and I was unable to find it. I showed it to a good lawyer in the House and he succeeded in finding it after some trouble, but he too complained that the index was most unsatisfactory. The Minister of Justice is so familiar with statutes that I have no doubt that what is easy to him is very difficult to us, but nevertheless I have the idea that he will say that in his judgment the index could be vastly improved. I trust he will make a suggestion to that effect in the proper quarter.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am in no way responsible for the index to the sessional statutes, and so far as I am personally concerned, and without wishing to criticise those who are responsible, I have to say that this index is nothing more or less than atrociously badly done and is of very little use. The index to the revised statutes will proceed largely on the lines of the index of 1886. So much importance is attached to this index that I have been advised to secure the services of a gentleman who has no connection with the commission to do the work. This gentleman has had in the past considerable experience in making indices, and I have been told that he has had some connection with the index of the revised statutes of Ontario. I am not committing myself to employ this gentleman, but I am perfectly convinced that we should get the best expert advice obtainable for the purpose of making that index. I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) that the statutes ought to be revised as nearly as possible every 10 years. It would be more convenient to the public; the revision could be made more easily and altogether we owe it to the bar and to the general public. For one reason or another this revision has been extended beyond the time originally thought proper and the result is that a great deal of work has to be done. I have asked for a report as to what has been done on the revision up to the present time, and had I known this item would come up I believe I could have had that report before the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it the intention of the government to submit the draft report of the commission on the revision of the statutes to a committee of this House?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The work has to be approved by the House. The commission simply revises the statutes, giving effect to the intention of parliament and making such verbal changes as are thought advisable, but of course the roll must be submitted to and approved by parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. The statutes are revised every ten years in Ontario and referred to a special committee appointed for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That will be for parliament to decide next year.

Mr. HENDERSON. The consolidated statutes will not be available until next session ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Justice agrees to a large extent in what I have said respecting the index, and I hope he will take some quiet opportunity of giving a hint to the official of the government who has charge of making the index.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think he is an official of parliament.

Mr. HENDERSON. Whoever he is, I hope the hint will be conveyed to him that he ought to change the system.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I think there could be an improvement made in the index of the Ontario statutes as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I agree with the Minister of Justice and with my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) with regard to indexing the new volume of the consolidated statutes. So far as the statutes are to be regarded as a work of reference, a great deal of their value depends upon the index, for if the index is not satisfactory the labour of finding what you want is intolerable. I must say that I have never seen in any volume of consolidated statutes either of the Dominion or of the provinces—I speak more particularly of the statutes of Nova Scotia with which I am more familiar—I have never seen an index that is anything like up to the mark, and I trust there will be an improvement in the index to the revised statutes. I was under the impression, until the Minister of Justice spoke just now, that the work of the commissioners would be completed so that the revised statutes might become law during the present session.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Criminal Code will not be ready.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Minister of Justice expected earlier in the session that the work would be completed in time to be enacted by parliament his year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am afraid that cannot be done unless we deal with the Criminal Code as a separate work, and I do not think that would be advisable.

Mr. R. L. BORLEN. I do not think it would.

Expenses of litigated matters which may be paid for services in connection with litigation, $15,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not my memorandum on this item with me and I would not be in a position to give information on it to-night. It is the same amount that has been voted annually since 1896, and if there are any inquiries I shall be prepared to answer them on another item.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice might procure the memorandum and if there is anything of importance in it we might ask it on another item. If the minister would be prepared with the information on another item this one might pass.

Relief of distressed Canadians other than in the United States, $500.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it is administered by the Department of the Interior ; it has reference to distant countries.

To pay grant to Canadian Mining Insitute, $2,000.

Mr. FIELDING. This is an apparent reduction but my impression is that a supplementary vote will have to be taken. The amount was originally $2,000 and was increased to $3,000, but the increase was not noted and unless there be something I am not aware of to cause the reduction there will have to be a vote in the supplementaries. It is a grant paid to the Canadian Mining Institute, which holds an annual meeting, has a library in Montreal and is a representative organization of the mining men of Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice the Department of the Interior has asked for some money for a purpose largely on the line of this mining institute to cover just such purposes as this.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a grant to a society just as we make grants to various public bodies under various conditions. The government do not expend it but the society expends it for what we know to be good purposes.

Mr. INGRAM. My point is that an item was passed by the Interior Department to assist in mining and the like of that. It seems strange that they should reduce this amount to the Montreal organization if they are doing a good work in connection with mining.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the purposes are quite different. This is a society as I have explained. They have gatherings and then there are visiting bodies from the neighbouring country. I think it is recognized as a very excellent body and the money is well expended. It is not part of the Interior Department except as that department advises it.

Mr. INGRAM. I was referring to an item of the Interior Department for obtaining technical knowledge, &c., in connection with mining.

Mr. FIELDING. We had an item with regard to certain experiments which were made with regard to the electrical smelting of ores and things like that. These experiments are being made through the Department of the Interior directly, but I think it is rather a different class of work from this.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no doubt it is.

Grant to assist the Canadian Assqciation for the Prevention of Tuberculosis, $2,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Does this association make any report which is given to parliament ?

Mr. FISHER. They have issued a report of their annual meeting which was distributed some days ago. I think it is sent to the members of parliament but it is not laid on the table.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not often complain of an item being too small, but I honestly think that the government in this case have struck a very low figure indeed. This question is attracting a great deal of

attention in the country and a certain amount of money is required for the gathering of information and in other ways making a strong attempt to improve the condition of the people and suppress this terrible disease. $2,000 to my mind is a very small sum when we consider the large sums which we vote for other purposes. We have just voted $2,000 for a mining institute. To my mind this is a far more worthy object. We had a discussion on the matter of tuberculosis in the early part of the session and I regret very much that the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) who takes a deep interest in that matter is not in the House to-night. I think he would have liked very much to have been here and make a statement with reference to it. I simply express my opinion that the item is very small indeed considering the vast importance of the subject.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business do you expect to take up on Monday after private business is disposed of.

Mr. FIELDING. The Militia Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 12, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CERTIFICATES OF IDENTIFICATION FOR MEMBERS.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Mr. Speaker, I think it was understood the other day that in order to avoid the necessity of carrying a bundle of cards, one for each railway in Canada, as the railways in this country are obliged to furnish transportation to the members of the House of Commons, according to the Railway Act of 1903, clause 275, paragraph 5, a certificate should be issued to each member by the Clerk of the House which would serve the purpose on all railways. I therefore beg to move :

That the clerk of the House do sign and furnish to members of the House of Commons certificates of identification for transportation on railways in Canada.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF LONDON MILITIAMEN AT NIAGARA.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the House to an item which appears in this morning's 'Citizen.' I took the liberty of notifying the Minister of Militia this morning of the item and of asking him to look into it. The item reads as follows :

London, Ontario, June 11—(Special).—As the by-election here on Tuesday is likely to be close, whichever way it goes, the government is putting forth every effort to deter Conservative voters from exercising their franchise on Tuesday next. The latest scheme has been worked through the Militia Department. Six soldiers at Wolseley barracks have suddenly been ordered to report for duty at Niagara tomorrow. Every man of the six is a Conservative, and there is naturally a deal of indignation among Mr. Gray's friends at this mean political move on the part of the militia authorities.

I have not any further evidence before me than what is contained in this item ; the facts are, though, that there is at the present time a camp in the city of London, and one would naturally suppose that this is the camp where these soldiers would be employed. The headquarters in Toronto for the permanent force is the source from which instructors would usually be drawn for Niagara. It may be stated that some of the soldiers from Toronto have been drafted away to Halifax to form a garrison there, and that therefore the London camp must be called upon to furnish men for certain duties at Niagara, but the fact stands forth that the camp at Niagara does not open until to-morrow, the date of the election, and the troops will not reach Niagara until tomorrow night. Therefore, there was no necessity, under any consideration whatever, to order these men from London before they had an opportunity of casting their ballots in the election to-morrow, whichever way they cast them. It does not matter to me how they vote, but they should have had this privilege, and then they could be in camp at Niagara to-morrow night in ample time for any instructional duties they may be called on to perform. The camp will not begin instructional work until Wednesday at the earliest. I trust the minister will be able to let us have full information in connection with this matter. It must be borne in mind that although these men are members of the permanent corps they lose none of their rights as citizens, that a soldier has every right which is possessed by any other citizen, and he should have his franchise the same as if he were an ordinary citizen. For some reason or other, the permanent corps, although the wages paid are high, as the rate has been increased, is not kept up to the establishment at all ; they are several hundred, I believe, short of the establishment at the present time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Although the pay is better than the men would get in the ordinary walks of life. The minister will

be able to tell what the situation is. While explaining this matter, the minister might take the opportunity of explaining some correspondence which I understand he had with the Liberal candidate in Toronto in relation to the increased pay of the soldiers on the eve of the last election. It is very strange that this correspondence should take place between the minister and an ordinary candidate, but perhaps the minister knows nothing about this London affair; it may be another case of the Minister of Agriculture and the Eastern Townships—that he is the minister of the district; it may be that this time the minister of the district of London is exercising his functions in sending these men off without the authority of the minister. My object in speaking to the minister this morning primarily was that he might take some steps so that the men might not leave London until to-morrow. The train leaves in the afternoon in plenty of time for them to reach Niagara in the evening. If the men who are taken must be Conservatives, I take that as a compliment. The great majority of the men in the militia are Conservatives, and when they are selected as instructors I venture to say the great majority will still be Conservatives, because they have always been found to be the most intelligent men in the militia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That seems to be peculiar to the force, not to the rest of the community.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Although I take it as quite a compliment to the force that the Conservatives predominate in it, and are the most intelligent in it when called upon for service, I would like to know the explanation of this case, and what steps the minister has taken in this regard.

I beg to move the adjournment of the House.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it would have been sufficient for my hon. friend simply to have made his inquiry without trying to weave into the discussion a number of things which have no bearing upon it. I do not intend to follow him, but I will give to the House the best explanation I have of the matter to which reference has been made in the papers. I may say that this morning my hon. friend called me up by telephone, not so very early, and asked me if I had read this article or comment in the 'Citizen.' At that time I had not read it, but later on I did, and at about the same time I received a telegram, which was at my office when I arrived there this morning. It was in the following language:

London, Ontario, June 12, 1905.

Sir Frederick Borden,
Minister of Militia, Ottawa.

Reported several men from barracks ordered to Niagara to-day. Tuesday is election day here and I should like it arranged to permit the men to vote before they leave.

(Sgd.) C. S. HYMAN.

So evidently, although the 'Citizen' seems to have absolute knowledge, and my hon. friend also, as to the politics of these non-commissioned officers and men, my friend (Mr. Hyman) seems to have a different view with regard to them.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a state of uncertainty.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. So I think, so far as politics are concerned, we may consider the matter square, and not of very much consequence in the approaching election. Now, as to the military side, I shall read a memorandum which I have received. I may say that when I reached my office I at once asked for an explanation of the item in the 'Citizen.' I had heard nothing of the case, knew nothing of it absolutely, and this is the explanation which has been sent to me by the Adjutant General:

The non-commissioned officers detailed to proceed from London to Niagara, were detailed for the following reasons:

1. The number of infantry to be trained at Niagara being largely in excess of that being trained at London necessitated the employment of a larger number of non-commissioned officers of the permanent infantry for instructional duties than could be furnished from No. 2 regimental depot (Toronto).

2. No. 2 Company, Royal Canadian Regiment (Toronto), is under orders to proceed to Halifax and may have to move at any time on a few hours' notice.

Under these circumstances, it became a matter of urgent necessity to make sure that, as far as possible, a sufficient supply of experienced non-commissioned officers would be available for duty at camp at Niagara.

This is the regimental order, a copy of which was sent to me by the Adjutant General:

Extract from Regimental Order No. 330.
8th June, 1905.

Detailed for duty:

The undermentioned non-commissioned officers will proceed from No. 1 Regimental Depot, Royal Canadian Regiment, to Niagara camp for instructional and other duties in connection with the camp there. They will report to the C. S. O. at Niagara on the 12th instant on arrival. These non-commissioned officers will, at the conclusion of the camp, be taken on the strength at No. 2 Regimental Depot until further orders.

No. 3407 Q.M.S.I. E. H. Price.
No. 3536 Q.M.S.I. A. B. Blake-Forster.
No. 3005 Col. Sergt. D. Cranston.
No. 3095 Sergt. M. O'Connell.
No. 3776 Sergt. W. Beales.
No. 3040 Sergt. G. Evans.

Q.M.S.I.'s Blake-Forster and Price will report to the Adjutant of the Canadian School of Musketry on the morning of the 3rd proximo.

On receiving the telephone message from my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and the telegram, which I have read, from (Mr.

Hyman), I made inquiry as to the whereabouts of the men, and I found they were some two or three hours on their way to Niagara. Consequently I sent this telegram to Mr. Hyman :

Ottawa, 12th June, 1905.

Hon. C. S. Hyman,
London, Ontario.

Am informed by the Adjutant General the order cannot be cancelled as the detachment has already started for Niagara, and services urgently required there.

(Sgd.) F. W. BORDEN.

Now, one word more in conclusion as to the men going on Monday instead of to-morrow : I know enough about the camps to know that it is always important to have a number of non-commissioned officers on hand at the beginning of the camp to assist in laying out the ground and to carry out the instructions of officers in preparing for the large number of troops who are to come in. This is all the explanation I have to give, and it seems to me it ought to be accepted as ample.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. The hon. Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has referred to a telegram sent to him by Hon. Mr. Hyman, also his answer to it. I do not understand from his remarks that he intends to give these men opportunity to vote to-morrow in London. Now, I wish to point out that this is a matter which has been talked of pretty freely in London, and has found its way into the public press in that city. I may say to the Minister of Militia also that the politicians in London are regarded as a 'slick gang,' to use an expression that they themselves would use. This little by-play has been very well arranged, and I have no doubt it has worked out just as the hon. gentleman has stated. And any one who knows the facts knows perfectly well that if these men had been left in the city to vote they would not have voted for Mr. Hyman. So, it is arranged that they are not to be there, and this little by-play is gone through for the benefit of the public. There is the whole case in a nutshell. I am surprised that the Minister of Militia and Defence makes no effort to arrange that these men are to have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be interesting to know the precise time when this matter came to the attention of Mr. Hyman. It has been referred to in the press of London this morning, and it seems a little peculiar that no telegram was received from that gentleman until reference had been made to the matter in the public press both of London and of Ottawa. It seems a little peculiar, to say the least of it, that Mr. Hyman should know nothing of it except from the press. We have had a somewhat higher opinion of his knowledge of what was going on at the present moment in the city of London than to suppose that he needed information on such points as this from the public press. I heard of it before to-day myself. On Saturday night I heard the rumour that these men were to be sent away, and I got a telegram on the subject very early this morning from certain Conservatives in London. It is rather remarkable, certainly and, whether remarkable or not, it is quite timely, that Mr. Hyman should telegraph when he did.

Mr. BARR. After the men had gone.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When they were two or three hours on their journey, Mr. Hyman, because considerable indignation is aroused in London, sends a telegram. And this telegram, the minister produces with a certain smile and a certain look out of the corner of his eye. And he turns to my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and says : 'It does not look as if there was much politics in it ; besides the men are two or three hours on their way and it is impossible that they can be recalled.' It looks like a very well devised piece of play, a very pretty little game. But I do not think that any one's understanding of the real situation will be altered by the fact that Mr. Hyman sent a telegram at nine or ten o'clock this morning after the men had gone and when he, no doubt, thoroughly understood, that the decision of the Department of Militia would be that they should not be recalled. The telegram I received spoke not of six men, but of seven men who are supposed to be Conservatives, and who only on Saturday were ordered to start from London to Niagara this morning. I think it would take a little more than Mr. Hyman's telegram or any such explanation as we have had this afternoon to convince any man in this House, or in this country, that there was not some little design in all this. It was very easy to bring in a pretty little report from some gentleman of the Department of Militia pointing out the necessity—the 'urgent necessity,' for it is stated that this is not only a 'necessity,' but that it is 'urgent'—that these men should start on Monday, the day before election. I think we shall all have our opinion on the subject. While their instruction may be necessary for camp on Wednesday, there is not a word in the communication read by the minister which, to my mind, leads to the conclusion that the men are wanted there before Wednesday. The minister speaks of the necessity of having a number of men on hand to make preparation for the camp. But, surely, with the hundreds of men to be assembled there to-morrow every preparation for the instruction which is only to begin on Wednesday could have been made without bringing these seven men from London. We are not to believe the reverse of that even from the minister's statement. Well, it seems to me this is a pretty small piece of business to come down to after all—on the eve of an

election in London, a by-election, the verdict in which, according to the statements of members of the administration will be significant, it is a pretty small piece of business to send seven men from London to Niagara under circumstances that do not leave much room for doubt in the mind of any man who examines the evidence as to the real motive which led to the making of the order at that particular juncture.

Hon. D. TISDALE. I think a little inquiry in regard to dates may be of interest here. The general order has no date, but it must have been issued some time before the regimental order. The general order is the order changing the usual practice and providing for the sending of non-commissioned officers from London instead of from Toronto. An apparently good reason is given for that by the Minister of Militia—the fact that the permanent corps at Toronto has been ordered to Halifax—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is not going for some time.

Mr. TISDALE. But it has been ordered, and that is the important thing. Now, the regimental order is dated June 8—last Thursday. We have no information here except that these men were ordered away on Saturday. Whether these men were good Tories or Grits, I can well understand that they would make some pretty strong remarks about this order. No good Canadian, no free man could fail to resent such an order. I feel very strongly about this. We know how difficult it is to get good men to join the permanent force on account of the fact that in this country there are better prospects for any young man in any civil employment; and conduct of this kind is not calculated to improve our chances of getting good men. This is the first time such a thing has happened, and no effort therefore could be spared to ascertain whether there was anything intentional in it. One would judge from the circumstances that this step must have been contemplated some time ago because there was a general order to the effect, and there was likewise a knowledge in the department that an election would take place on that day in the city of London. I am not making any charge against the minister because I believe he would be above any trickery of this kind. In my opinion it was the doing of some of the smart Alecks connected with the election contest in London, it was only this morning the news came up in public, but whether there was any design or not the circumstances are very suspicious, and no time should be lost in ordering these men back to London in time to cast their votes. I am no prude but for the sake of decency and honesty and manly conduct the hon. minister should at once see that these men are not debarred from exercising the most sacred right of citizenship. We hear a great deal said about the corporations of this country taking part in elections but what shall we say of a department of the government which would stoop to such a course. We certainly should have from the Minister of Militia an assurance that these men can get back and vote for the candidate they prefer. Nothing short of this will satisfy public opinion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I agree, with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, that this would be a very small piece of business—a conspiracy entered into in order to deprive men who have the right to vote under our law, from casting their ballots. But my hon. friend the leader of the opposition will agree with me that it would be a still smaller piece of business to charge the Department of Militia with having been guilty of an act of this kind, unless there is absolute proof. There is no evidence whatever that the thing which is complained of has been done designedly, and I can understand that it has been done in the ordinary routine of the Militia Department. A camp is opening to-morrow at Niagara, and as I understand from the statement made by the Minister of Militia, corroborated by the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Tisdale), these men, non-commissioned officers, have to be there to discharge their duty on the opening of the camp; and therefore, if there had been no election, they would have had to go just the same; and probably the militia officers who made this order did not think, it did not occur to them at the time, that there was an election in London on Tuesday. They had in mind only their military duties, and they had to provide a certain number of non-commissioned officers to open the camp, to be there, not on the day the camp opens, but on the day before, to prepare the ground and to do whatever was necessary to be done. If that be so, can it be charged that the Department of Militia acted in connivance with the Liberal candidate in order to help his election? I would be sorry for my part to believe it. I do not believe it, and I will not believe it, at all events, until some fact is brought forward to justify the charge. Now it has been said there was a little by-play between Mr. Hyman and the militia officers, because Mr. Hyman only sent his telegram to-day. Well, as I understand it, nobody knew of this order until Saturday, on Saturday there was a rumpus and excitement, and Mr. Hyman, who is a very busy man to-day, might have been there this morning or yesterday, and somebody on the Conservative side came to Mr. Hyman and told him this order would deprive a certain number of his opponents from voting, and Mr. Hyman, with that chivalry which characterizes him, at once telegraphed to the Minister of Militia.

Mr. INGRAM. At the last general election which was held on the 3rd of November, and on the second day before it, the pay of these men was raised 25 cents a day. What was the object?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That addition to the pay was decided on in the previous session of parliament, and that order was only giving effect to it, there was nothing new in that. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that this increase in pay had been decided on by Act of this parliament at the previous session. Therefore, I think that there is no ground for suspicion of any collusion. I have only this to say, that I hope we shall cease to cast aspersions upon one another's good faith unless there is clear evidence.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not wish to animadvert in any way upon hon. gentlemen opposite, but it does seem to me that there is a disposition on the part of some of them always to find fault and to attribute improper motives. Now I take no exception to what my hon. friend from South Norfolk has said, I think his statement on the whole is very fair, and I feel disposed, if it can be done without injury to the public service, to act upon the suggestion he has made. I wish to say, however, that I knew absolutely nothing about the general order, or about the reasons for it, until my attention was called to this matter this morning. There was no collusion or connivance. I do not believe there has been anything improper intended in any quarter. There is something like a hundred men in the depot at London, and this is a proposal to move six selected men, I presume the best men for the purpose, from London, men who are wanted for instructional purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there not a camp held at London?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In telegraphic communications—and several have been passed to me on this subject—emphasis is laid upon the circumstance that there is a camp being held in London at which these men are really wanted. I do not know how correct that may be, but it is a circumstance which lends colour and force to the belief, on the part of the Conservatives of London at least, that the men have been ordered to Niagara for reasons connected with the election contest in London.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I can understand that, but as I have stated already, the whole of the company stationed at Toronto from which the non-commissioned officers would naturally be drawn to take part in the Niagara camp, has been ordered out in readiness to go to Halifax at any moment, and is liable to be ordered to Halifax at any moment.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. No actual date is set?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, but ready and liable to be moved at any moment, and that is the reason, and I believe it is the only reason. But in view of the fact that such improper motives are attributed to the department, and with a desire to prevent the evil effect attendant upon all these accusations which are hurled against the management of the militia, and which are calculated to have a prejudicial effect upon the militia, I am prepared to accede to the suggestion made by my hon. friend from South Norfolk, and I will send at once to the Adjutant General to come here and see whether an arrangement can be made, without the public interest suffering too much, by which these men can be returned to London and sent back on Wednesday or on Tuesday night. If my hon. friends opposite will accept that statement, perhaps the incident may be closed—and I will inform the House later on as to the result of my inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the minister has met the case very fairly indeed, and I hope he will not insist on the conditional words at the end of his promise—'if it can be done without the public interest suffering too much.'

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will put a broad interpretation upon that.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we are all common-sense people. Now that Rojestvensky's fleet is under the sea and various other matters have happened, I do not think that great peril will ensue to this country if these men are allowed to go back and vote on whichever side they please. The right hon. gentleman stated that we had nothing but circumstantial evidence on which to base our suspicions; and then he made an argument on the other side which stood equally on circumstantial evidence. I think the gist of the whole thing lies here: That rightly or wrongly, a large number of people in this country will think that a game is being played with the militia, and I do not think we can afford to have that done. I am quite willing to attribute the most chivalrous feelings to all politicians and all public men, and especially to the present members of the ministry, and prospective members of the ministry; at the same time, I am not disposed to think that the candidate running in London in the ministerial interest is not a very sharp and wide-awake politician, and I think that at the present time in London both candidates will believe that eight votes are worth making a struggle for——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Only six.

Mr. FOSTER.—or six are worth making a struggle for and it is hard work for me to believe that Mr. Hyman was so diligent

in attending to his church duties yesterday, or resting on the Sabbath day, as not to know that from Saturday to Monday morning at nine o'clock something was going on in this direction. I think the hon. minister is well advised and that he meets this side of the House fairly when he virtually says that these men shall go back and be allowed to vote.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am very much pleased that the hon. minister has taken the stand he has in this connection. Now, however, that the matter is up I will just repeat the case. I make the statement without fear of contradiction that that telegram from Mr. Hyman was arranged for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like to know what the hon. gentleman means ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I make the statement that the telegram was arranged for. It is a piece of by-play, as my hon. friend has stated. These men were sent away because they were Conservatives. I would ask the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to follow this matter up. I take his word that he knew nothing about this thing when it was going on, and I am sorry that he allows ministers from various districts around there and in connection with other departments to meddle with his department. We had the instance of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) meddling in his department, and now we have an instance of some one on behalf of the Minister of Public Works meddling in connection with the militia. I want to tell the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence to-day that although these are only six or seven men and although they are only privates they are entitled to their franchise as much as are any voters for Mr. Hyman.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If that little babbling Sbarretti message boy will kindly keep quiet we will get on very nicely. We want these men to have their votes in London. They are entitled to their votes and if we can secure them for them they are going to have them. If they vote for Mr. Hyman all right ; they are exercising their franchise. If they vote for Mr. Gray it is all the same ; they are exercising their franchise and no one has a right to question that. I venture to say that the grounds have already been located and laid out. The hon. minister's argument was that these men were wanted to lay out the camp. I will venture to say that every regiment has sent its men in advance to prepare for the camp. These instructors are not the men who will be employed to lay out the camp. The men who lay out the grounds are not the men who go from London but from Toronto. The grounds are laid out by another set of men altogether.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Under instructions.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all. It is a few hours' job at best. Then it is said that they are there to receive the regiments when they come in. There is a little too much at times of paternally looking after the regiments when they come into camp. I have had a considerable amount of experience in regard to that matter and I have never yet seen the necessity for any non-commissioned officers stepping in to receive a regiment when it comes in. These men are not attached to apron strings, they can look after themselves and not one of these non-commissioned officers will be necessary in the camp at all. I was going to ask the hon. minister to give these men permission to go back, but I want the hon. minister to follow this matter up still further. In connection with Colonel Gregory we have an instance of an officer commanding a district interfering in the most objectionable way—and we will hear more of that, I hope, before the end of the session—to get rid of Colonel Gregory. Some officer has furnished the names here. Some officer has been asked to send these men to Niagara. I want the hon. minister to be good enough to bring down all the correspondence in connection with it. Who demanded the sending of these men to Niagara camp ? Who selected the men who were to go ? Was it by chance that six or seven Conservatives were selected ? Possibly there were none others to go. If that is the explanation, all right. I would like to ask the hon. minister how many non-commissioned officers are there amongst the hundred men at the London camp. I trow he will find that there are very few left in the London camp and he must know that these men are wanted in London for one week more. Do I understand the hon. minister that he is going to furnish these men with transport and sustenance in going from Niagara to London and from London back to Niagara ? I trust the hon. minister will not only give them permission to go but that he will furnish them with transport and sustenance at the cost of the Dominion of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that is against the law.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all ; these men are in the service of the country. I wish the hon. minister to take that into consideration also and see that these men get their transport furnished to them back to London and back to Niagara again.

Motion (Mr. Sam. Hughes) to adjourn, negatived.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RELIEF OF PHILIP VIBERT.

Mr. HALL moved that Bill (No. 172) for the relief of Philip Vibert—Mr. Zimmerman—be read the second time.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I see that my name still appears on that Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, it has been struck out.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 173) respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY BETWEEN MADOC AND ELDORADO.

Mr. NORTHRUP—by Mr. Ingram—asked:

1. What bonus, if any, was paid for the construction of the railway between Madoc and Eldorado, in the county of Hastings ?
2. To what company was it paid ?
3. Why is the road not operated ?

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

1. $21,888 paid January, 1889.
2. To the Belleville and North Hastings Railway Company.
3. Cannot say ; not aware that it is not operated.

BRIDGE OVER LACHINE CANAL—ATWATER STREET, MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. To whom was awarded the contract for the building of the bridge over the Lachine canal at Atwater Street, Montreal ?
2. What was the price fixed in said contract?
3. What was the date fixed in the said contract for the delivery of said bridge ?
4. Why were tenders called for a second time in connection with the said work?
5. Who was the lowest of the first tenderers?
6. Who was the lowest of the tenderers after the second call for tenders ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Does that refer to the substructure or superstructure ?

Mr. MONK. To the bridge.

Mr. EMMERSON. The contract has not been let. I was asking my hon. friend fairly as to whether he referred to the substructure or the superstructure ?

Mr. MONK. I refer, of course, to the work that has been given out.

Mr. EMMERSON. Then, I will have to ask my hon. friend to let it stand. It only came under my notice this morning, and I knew that the superstructure had not been let at all. I will have to make some further inquiry.

Mr. MONK. It refers to the work that has been or is being done.

Mr. EMMERSON. I presume my hon. friend refers to the substructure of the bridge ?

Mr. MONK. Yes.

ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE—SALARIES.

Bill (No. 169) to amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College—Sir Frederick Borden—read a second time and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. TISDALE. You do not seem to have fixed a maximum expenditure here as you promised.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. At the conclusion of the debate on the resolution, I understood my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to state that there was no particular point in filling in the amount, and I rather thought that idea was accepted.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that, but I qualified it by saying it was my individual view. The resolution is wide enough to allow an amount to be fixed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Very well. I move to amend the section by inserting after the word 'council,' the words 'but shall not exceed in all $30,000.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This clause limits the salary of the head of the Royal Military College to $3,200 per annum ; I suppose there are allowances also ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, there is a house and a good many other things besides. The salary was increased to that amount in 1893.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My opinion is that the educationists of this country both civil and military are not paid as they should be. I would be very much pleased if the resolution should read that the salary should be 'not less than $3,200,' instead of, 'not more than $3,200.'

Mr. TISDALE. Including the allowances the salary provided is a very comfortable one and it has enabled us to get a very efficient officer.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would move that the clause should read that : the salary of the commandant shall not exceed $3,200 a year ; the salaries of the staff adjutants and professors, instructors and assistant instructors and staff, shall not exceed a total sum of $30,000 annually.

Section as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

MILITIA ACT AMENDMENT—PERMANENT FORCE.

On the order being called :

Second reading of Bill (No. 170) to amend the Militia Act.—Sir Frederick Borden.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I make a suggestion to the minister before we proceed to consider this order. It will be pretty difficult to go into a full discussion of this Bill unless we have the correspondence that has passed between the imperial government and the Canadian government with reference to taking over the defences at Halifax and Esquimalt, so that we may know what is the position of each government in connection therewith. As a layman I say this is important, because it seems to bring out pretty sharply the line of demarcation between a standing army and the militia of the country ; at least it is showing a decidediy strong tendency towards the establishment of a regular army—not very large, 5,000 men—but still it brings up the whole question as to how far this country should go in that direction and whether it is possible for us to provide sufficient money to have a respectable standing army and at the same time do full justice to our militia, the real arm of our defence. The cost of regulars as high and although you may have only 3,000 in addition to those you now have, the sum total that will be required for the maintenance of these 3,000 men will be pretty large. Then in the second place, if we take over these fortifications, if there is no other way but that we shall do that, we incur an unknown expense of large proportions at the least, which may become very large under circumstances that may occur, it is well for us, I think, to talk over this matter before we have committed ourselves, before the second reading of this Bill, and see whether or not there is not another and a better way by which the same object can be brought about of retaining these defences and retaining them in the only way in which they would be useful, that is as absolutely modern and up-to-date fortifications and defences, therefore, it seems to me to be necessary to have that correspondence, and be able to look over it before the House should be called upon to pledge itself to a policy which is proposed by the government of taking these stations over and of laying the foundation of a regular army. Another point on which I would like information is as to the cost. I find that in this and that newspaper calculations are made as to what the cost will be. These estimates may be near the mark and they may be a long way from it ; we have to rely upon what our department gives us, and I would like the minister to have his Council, those with whom he consults, make very careful estimates as to what will be the added cost. As I understand it, we have now about 1,200 men belonging to the permanent force.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Something over that.

Mr. FOSTER. And provision has been made to increase that to about 2,000. We would like to know what that extra cost will be when our standing force is brought up to 2,000. Then we would like to know, with as much certainty as we can possibly have, what the extra 3,000 men will cost as distributed in the two stations, with all that is necessary to keep them efficient, taking into consideration the difficulty—and I think my hon. friend will find a difficulty—of getting eligible Canadians to go into the permanent force at the very low rate of wages for which the British government has been able to keep regulars in its service. It is becoming more difficult for them to do this, as I find by the conferences and discussions that are taking place in the British parliament. And in the United States they find it difficult to recruit men unless they pay them well. I do not imagine that in the future this item will keep at the figure at which it is to-day in the regular British service. I think we will have to face the idea of having that largely increased instead of remaining at the present rate. Well, then, if you are going to put 3,000 men at Halifax and at Esquimalt, and undertake the care of these fortresses, we do not want to do that simply to have two toys and somewhat expensive toys, one at each end of our country ; we want to have a station at the Pacific and another at the Atlantic which will be absolutely serviceable and up-to-date in every respect. We do not know the conditions upon which we are entering into this. We have to keep up the fortifications, and, that being so, we must face the cost of keeping them up-to-date and of going as far as modern improvements make it necessary to go, discarding one set of arms and taking another and more expensive set as circumstances require. That, of course, is a matter upon which we cannot get estimates, but we can get estimates as to what it will cost for the men themselves and their keep, and what it will cost per year for keeping up the fortifications to the point of proficiency at which, I suppose, we aim to keep them, or we would not undertake them at all. Then, when we get that as a foundation, we will be able to discuss the general principle as to whether Canada should not be dependent almost entirely upon its militia rather than attempt even a small standing army, and so to keep down the permanent force to what is absolutely necessary for instructional and educational purposes, and to go no further than that. I do not know what military men think of the circumstances which have developed in the South African war and the present war, but it does seem to me that things have taken on a very different aspect. I think that num-

bers and shooting power are what should be aimed at by a country that wishes to defend itself, and therefore by Canada, even though we do not now, and I hope never shall, think of undertaking an aggressive war, but still we have a country so vast and so rich that we must make its defence fairly well assured, and it seems to me that the lessons of the wars that have just passed go to show that what you want is men who can handle arms and shoot well and have numbers of such easily available. It is apparently the large numbers that avail, together with proficiency, and it is not so difficult a matter to knock an army into fighting shape now as it seemed to be under the old regime, when it was thought that no one was fit for warfare except the regulars who had been almost born and bred to it. These are the considerations which led me to ask the minister to allow this item to stand until we have obtained the information for which I have asked. Then, too, the House is very thin, and this is a very interesting question to all military men. We shall not lose by having as full a House as possible to discuss the question when once it comes up. So far as I am concerned, I feel very much disinclined to vote money for anything that appears like a standing army. We must have instructors and we must have a nucleus. So far as that goes, we ought to have it efficient, no matter what the cost. If we go beyond that and have even a small force of regulars, very costly and without any power of multiplying itself in case of actual war, I think we would be adopting a policy that would not redound much to the benefit of the country. Of course, I speak with diffidence in this, because I am not a military man.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I must congratulate my hon. friend upon the progress which he is making, and I welcome him very much into the discussion of these important matters. I wish that more hon. gentlemen would take the trouble to read and think about them. But I will say while I entirely acquiesce in his desire to postpone the discussion of this Bill, I think it might be proper that I should say one or two words to set his mind at rest as to one or two points in which I think he misunderstands the position.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not take it amiss, in fact I should prefer to have the minister give as much information as possible, because it will help us in the consideration of this measure.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. What I wish to say at the outset is that there is no intention whatever to take any steps towards the establishment of a standing army; there is no intention to depart in the slightest degree from the policy which was adopted by this country shortly after confederation, and which has been followed ever since, of providing depots of a permanent force for the purpose chiefly of educating the active militia of the country, upon which we would almost exclusively rely for defence.

I am afraid that my hon. friend, in his desire to acquire information, has been looking in the wrong quarter. I myself have seen recently one or two articles which absolutely misrepresent the situation. I do not mean to say that this misrepresentation was intentional, so perhaps it would be more accurate to say that the writers misapprehended the situation. As I have said, there is not the slightest scintilla of evidence to prove the allegation—nor is there the slightest particle of truth in that allegation—that we are going to establish, or have any idea of establishing, a standing army. So far as it goes, the fact that we are going to take over the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt and substitute for the units of the imperial army of these two places Canadian soldiers, might be said to be some excuse for the statement that we are establishing a standing army; but only so far. And, in that connection, let me say that it is the intention of the Militia Council and of the government to utilize these two depots just, as all the other depots are used for instructional purposes of the militia—that at Halifax for the militia of the maritime provinces, and that at Esquimalt for the militia of British Columbia. Now, whether we should or should not take over these two garrisons, whether we should or should not relieve the British taxpayer of the expense of their maintenance, is a question of policy, a question on which we may reasonably differ. But the government has made the offer, the offer has been accepted; and so far as the government is concerned, it is committed to carry that offer into execution. I was under the impression—I am still under the impression—that the House, including my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and the country generally, would approve of this additional step in the direction of assuming responsibility for the defence of Canada upon Canadian soil.

Now, as to the policy outside of these two garrisons, I said a moment ago that we are continuing a system adopted shortly after confederation, the policy of maintaining a permanent militia force—not a standing army, but a number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men, permanently employed, chiefly for instructional purposes but incidentally for the purpose of guarding and taking charge of fortifications at different points. At the outset confederation was limited to four provinces, Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. A little later Prince Edward Island came in. Depots for the permanent force were established at Toronto, London, Kingston, Quebec, St. John's (Quebec) and Fredericton, for the purposes I have just

indicated. They are maintained still, at very much the strength at which they were maintained in the early days of confederation and for the purposes for which they were established. But the country has grown. There is a Northwest. And when the province of Manitoba, became a province a depot was established there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister allow me at this point to ask him how about the Strathcona Horse, of Calgary?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I was coming to that. The province of Manitoba was established, and the idea of an instructional force was carried out there, a depot being established at Winnipeg. In the Northwest Territories, it was not thought wise to establish the militia. Instead of the militia, a force of police, known now as the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, was established in the unorganized section of the country. In the province of British Columbia there was a British garrison. Now, we are about to establish two new provinces. The work of defending and maintaining civil order in these provinces will devolve upon the militia force. It is proposed to continue in these provinces the work begun in the east, of establishing instructional depots, and the depot referred to by my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes), that of the Strathcona Horse will be one.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. minister, but I would be glad if he would explain the reason why we should establish depots in the new provinces when we have still the Northwest Mounted Police? I have not heard that that body is to be abolished. The mere fact of their being autonomous provinces will not change the condition in that respect.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It will, to a very large extent. In addition to what I have said in the early years the question of defending the Northwest was a question that was not seriously considered; the practical question was largely the defence of the eastern and more populous provinces. These Territories are becoming populous and new provinces are being created. The scheme of defence which was begun in the east, is being gradually carried through the west and through British Columbia to the Pacific coast. And the idea is—and I believe it is a sound one—to carry out this policy of organizing a chain of depots of the permanent force from the Atlantic through the older provinces, through the Northwest, through British Columbia, to the Pacific coast—depots which will be in touch with each other and which will form the nucleus of an effective militia which will afford instruction to all the militia.

Now, I have explained very briefly, and perhaps imperfectly, the scheme which we have in mind—which is no new scheme but is simply the amplification of the policy established long ago. Now, to come to the Bill. Last year the policy was to increase the permanent force from 1,000 to 2,000 men. In the early years of confederation, 1,000 men were sufficient for the few depots in the east. But the country has grown and we thought 2,000 would be necessary. Now, it is proposed to add a depot at Montreal, to increase the force by this additional depot and by one in the Northwest. I am now advised that it is desirable to increase the number in the Northwest, not immediately, but eventually, in order to carry out this scheme. And we are now taking over the garrisons at Halifax on the one hand and Esquimalt on the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there at present a depot in Montreal?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No.

Mr. FOSTER. And you propose to put one there? You have one at St. Johns and one at Quebec—pretty close quarters.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The depot at St. Johns is on the frontier and is of special importance for that reason—just as the one at Fredericton which would not have been placed there but for a similar consideration.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand the depot at St. Johns is for cavalry. It would not be quite the same thing as the other.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. Now, I would have said, if I had been anxious to proceed with the Bill to-day, which I am not specially, that we could very well have taken up this Bill and taken the power—because taking of this power is all the Bill amounts to—to increase the permanent force to 5,000 men. Of these, 2,000 or thereabouts will be necessary for the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt, and something less than 2,000 for all the other depots, leaving a margin of perhaps, 1,000 to be filled in later on. I explained the other day that while this number would not be required all at once, there was no doubt that, with the growth of the country, in the near future 5,000 would probably be required, and that I thought we might as well take authority now to raise that number instead of coming back at some later date. But I believe 5,000 is the full number that will be required by Canada for many years.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the number now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. About 1,250, not including those who have been sent to Halifax. But that is not enough, the normal number would be about 1,500 at present, if Montreal were included.

Mr. BERGERON. That is, you are increasing the number to 3,800, as a matter of fact?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. Now with regard to Halifax and Esquimalt, I will not speak at present.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that correspondence nearly ready ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am waiting for the final touches, the final answer, from the war office, certain details which I hope to have at any moment. I do not think I can add any more except to say that the information which my hon. friend has asked for is being prepared. As a matter of fact, when the debate comes on which has been promised upon one of the large items of the militia vote, I expect to lay on the table of the House a memorandum, and to put it in the hands of every member, which will show what the expenditure is, and what is involved in all this scheme.

Mr. BERGERON. Would the hon. gentleman say what will be the number of men in garrison at Halifax when it is full ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The present number is about 1,800 to 2,000 of British troops. I am told by General Lake that he expects to be able to do the same work with from 1,200 to 1,400.

Mr. BERGERON. As a matter of fact, is it not true that it is very hard for my hon. friend to fill up that establishment ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I am glad that question has been asked, because it gives me an opportunity of reading to the House a letter which I received just as I came in, from the Adjutant General. It is as follows :

Dear Sir Frederick,—I desire to call attention to an article in this morning's 'Citizen' on military matters. In this article it is stated that we cannot get sufficient recruits because the pay is too small. This is not the case. The Canadian soldier is the highest paid soldier in the world to-day, receiving as he does $15 per month during the first year of service, with a material increase in the second and third years. As paragraphs of this nature are calculated to hinder recruiting for Halifax and Esquimalt, I trust you will take steps to have this statement in regard to insufficiency of pay publicly contradicted.

As a matter of fact we have had no difficulty whatever in getting all the recruits we wanted. The statement is absolutely without foundation, and calculated, as the Adjutant General says, to cause unnecessary trouble and worry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I understood from the statement that the minister had difficulty in getting recruits, that there were only 900 now, when the statute calls for 1,200.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I know my hon. friend relies upon reports in the papers, and will not accept my official statement. I am sorry, but I cannot help it. I can assure my hon. friend, if he ever gets into office, he will find that these mischievous reports, and intentionally mischievous reports, are very injurious, and will be very injurious to his administration.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the Kingston battery establishment filled up now ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not wish to be cross examined ; but I have stated here, I am told, that the force is practically full.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That letter does not say the force is full, it merely defends the pay, and shows that the reason the men are not enlisting is because of insufficiency.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then I am not able to understand the letter of the Adjutant General. But as I do understand it, it means that we have no difficulty in getting all the permanent troops we require. Now one more word as to this standing army question, as to the allegations that are made, without the slightest foundation, that in order to be able to increase the number of depots and to take over the garrisons of Halifax and Esquimalt, we are cutting down the militia, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul. There is not the slightest foundation of truth in that statement at all. We are taking over Halifax and Esquimalt to relieve the British taxpayer, and not to cut down the militia. There is no intention to reduce the expenditure upon the active militia because of taking over these two forts. It would be what might be called an Indian gift to do anything like that. While we would be relieving the British taxpayer, we would not be strengthening the British Crown and its power in this country if we were to cut down the active militia, while using the money saved in that way to pay for the garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt. No such contemptible idea has entered into my mind, or the mind of any member of this government. I can not understand the motive which anybody would have—I am not addressing anybody in this House, but outside of the House—who may pretend to be a military critic, in putting forward a statement of that kind. On the 31st of May last the correspondent of the London 'Times' in this city cabled to England a statement, which was published in the 'Times,' to the effect that in order to be able to take over the Halifax and Esquimalt garrisons every regiment in Canada had been denuded of one of its companies, and that there had been a general reduction all along the line of the active militia. The statement is absolutely without foundation. If the man who sent that cablegram did not know any better, it was his duty to this country—I believe he is not a native of this country—it was his duty to this country, and his duty to the newspaper to whom he was sending his correspondence, and his duty to this government to come to me or to the department and get proper information before he sent a mischievous cablegram of that kind.

Now as a matter of fact, the active militia is being increased continuously every year ; every year since I came into office there has been an increase. This year there will be 6,000 or 7,000 more men of the active militia trained in camps than ever before in this country, at any rate since 1870 at the time of the Fenian trouble. There is no truth, I repeat it again, in the statement that we have adopted the policy of establishing a standing army here ; and there is no truth in the statement that we are taking over and paying for garrisons at Halifax and Esquimalt at the expense of the active militia, and such a statement is as unfair as it is untrue.

Mr. BERGERON. Accepting the hon. gentleman's explanation that he is not doing this to the detriment of the militia of Canada, as a matter of fact, what will be the cost to the taxpayers of Canada of these two garrisons at Esquimalt and Halifax ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. An estimate made by the War Office places the cost at £200,000 for the present establishment, $1,000,000 a year for the two. Our pay is higher than their's and probably there may be more money required in that respect, but if, as the chief of the general staff thinks, a small garrison will be able to do the work as effectually as it is done now, I think it is probable a million dollars will cover the whole expense, not including, however, the expenditures, referred to by my hon. friend from North Toronto—incidental to armament and so on. I have no doubt that the requirements are very fully provided for at the present time, but of course we all know that the character and types of guns are constantly changing, and in the future there will be some additions and perhaps some considerable additions for that purpose.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that if a discussion is going on there should be a motion for the second reading of the Bill, or a motion to adjourn.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I thought the second reading had been moved. I move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister stated that the establishment was completed. I hold in my hand the minister's own report and I find that the establishment of the permanent corps for 1904 was 1,245. The strength on December 31, 1904, was 959.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I am sure my hon. friend does not wish to draw inferences from that report which are not correct. That may have been the number then, but I stated that at the present time the strength of the corps is nearly 1,300.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is the latest and only information that the public has in the matter. The hon. minister is a little out of place in censuring any one for taking the official figures of the strength of the corps which are given as 959. To know the strength we turn to the report of the minister. The minister must not think that the public can learn these things by intuition.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. But if the public prefers to read the reports of persons who are unable to give the information rather than to read the statement I have made in the House I cannot help it.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like to add a word to what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has said on two lines. The first and most particular information we want is as to the expenditures past and present. I will try to give a little summary so that the minister may have the information prepared as far as he can obtain it : (1) the number of men kept by the British government in these two garrisons ; (2) the number of men the department propose to ask the House to confirm and the number they propose to substitute. In all possibility it may be much less or much more.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As definite as possible.

Mr. TISDALE. I would like a positive statement of the estimate of the number that would be required.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As definite as possible.

Mr. TISDALE. As definite as possible, but in figures ; (3) the estimated expenditures of the war office, if they have it, on these men and all other expenses, if they have it, connected with the maintenance of the establishment and the pay, or in any way connected with the garrison ; (4) the estimated expenditures of the cost of the number of men who are to be substituted and their incidentals ; (5) the estimated expenditures of the fortifications themselves for the year. I think we are entitled to this information and that is all I wish.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will give all I can.

Mr. TISDALE. Not only what you can, because I will explain why I want it as fully as possible. It may be a little trouble but those who with yourself are responsible should figure out what you propose.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We are doing that.

Mr. TISDALE. In other words there may be anticipated a very large expenditure. It will all depend on how these fortifications are manned and armed at the present time.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. My hon. friend will see, if I may interrupt him, that this is something that it is impossible to

give because I do not know and I could not find out, I fancy, without the greatest difficulty, what the nature of the defences of Halifax are. It is known to be one of the most powerful fortresses in the world, but very few people know the number of guns, and it is not desirable that they should know.

Mr. TISDALE. I do not want to know the number of guns. Without the expenditures I am foreshowing it is impossible to determine this important question. This information would have very great weight upon the question of principle which is involved. The hon. minister has assumed that the members on both sides of the House are in favour of this principle, but when the hon. gentleman assumes to believe that the House and the country are in favour of the principle of the government taking over these fortifications and supplying these garrisons I am not prepared at all to agree with him. I am not at all prepared to agree to the principle in my present state of mind and with the information I have. At all events, I know that there are a great many other people in this country, some of them military who have mentioned it to myself, and others who are not military, who are not in favour of the proposition laid down in this House and in the country that the government should take over these garrisons and these fortifications. It depends on circumstances, so far as I am concerned, before I make up my mind. This country and this House are in favour of Canada doing more towards defence, but I am not at all satisfied for myself, and I do not believe the country is, until we know more about it, that I should vote in favour of this proposition. I merely say this now because the hon. gentleman assumes that the House is in favour of the proposition and if later on some hon. gentlemen object to it, I do not wish it to appear as if we have assented to it at one time and objected to it afterwards. The care of fortifications is an entirely new work for the Dominion of Canada. We have no experience in regard to it. The hon. minister has made a very grave admission, a most serious admission and possibly it might be well for me to follow that up a little and call his attention to it. He frankly admits he has no idea of the nature of the magnificent defences, preparations and armaments at Halifax. That is what I complain of and what the people object to, if I do not disagree with him. We have no idea of what it is going to cost or of our capabilities of manning and properly handling these defences. This is practically a matter in which we have no experience because as a rule the militia have nothing to do with fortifications and are not capable of manning them because they are not trained to such work. In these modern days it is believed that forts are no good. It is accepted as a general proposition and it is only in exceptional cases where enormous expenditures are being made and where they are always ready to change the equipment as the evolution of the day indicates the necessity of new styles of arms that a fortress proves effective. It is most important that parliament should know what the government is committing this country to, and that we are capable of maintaining and providing for these defences if the empire is going to rely upon us. The minister has practically admitted to-day that he knows nothing about it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, I said it was impossible for me to tell what type of guns would be used, but I do not think there is much difficulty in getting the expenditure, not perhaps to a dollar but practically.

Mr. TISDALE. Do you know what it means to undertake the defence of two fortifications that ought be second to none in the world so that the fleet of Great Britain may be safe under the guns of these forts. That is a thing that requires serious consideration. I want to know what the cost will be for five or ten years to come. I will go as far as any one else to endorse any reasonable expenditure for the defence of Canada and the empire, but I want to be sure that we know what we are undertaking and I want to be certain also that our maintainance of these fortifications so vital to the empire, will be thorough. I would have a great deal of hesitation about committing myself to this proposition without further information. I agree to a certain extent with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in regard to a standing army. I suppose there is a distinction between a permanent force and a standing army; the difference may be in the name but a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. So far, our permanent force has been confined to schools of instruction, to aiding the civil power so that the volunteers may not be involved, and as forming a nucleus which we may rely on in case we want to call out a large military force. But now you are going to put the permanent force into fortifications, and they must be instructed in the most modern military tactics.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is not that desirable for Canada ?

Mr. TISDALE. Desirable for Canada if we are to defend these outposts of the empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. We will never acquire that military information unless we begin.

Mr. TISDALE. Don't begin too fast, and don't begin unnecessarily, and don't forget that you are now undertaking not only to defend Canadian interests but imperial interests as well. It is one thing to provide

for the defences of Canada alone, and it is another thing to undertake the defence of the empire.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Canada is a part of the empire.

Mr. TISDALE. If these fortifications were only for the defence of Canada it would be an entirely different thing. I do not want to oppose this proposition if I possibly can avoid it, but I certainly must know what we are doing before I support it. Speaking as a Canadian I would be proud to make an expenditure for the joint defence of the empire and of Canada, but it goes past pride and becomes conceit when any one thinks that the defence of Canada is more important than the defence of the empire. I will join with the government in any reasonable expense, but I want first to know what we are about.

Mr. BERGERON. I wish to ask a few questions so that when we come to the discussion of this measure the minister may be prepared to give me the information. The minister told us that the militia has increased since 1896; is that in number or expense ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Both.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the strength of the militia to-day ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 48,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the present cost of the militia as compared with its cost in 1896.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I cannot say exactly but it is very much more than it was in 1896.

Mr. BERGERON. I am putting these questions so that the Minister of Militia will have the information when we come to discuss this Bill.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In 1896 the annual drill cost about $425,000 and for the present year it will cost between $700,000 and $800,000, but a large part of that is due to the increase in pay which has been almost doubled.

Mr. BERGERON. Whatever may have been the cause, the expenditure of the Militia Department to-day is very nearly double what it was in 1896 ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think so.

Mr. BERGERON. When this question comes up again, will my hon. friend be in a position to say what induced the government to replace British soldiers by Canadian soldiers in the garrisons at Esquimalt and Halifax ? Was it the result of correspondence with the imperial government ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The papers will be laid on the table as soon as completed.

Mr. TISDALE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Grant to the imperial government to cover Canada's proportion of probable losses in connection with the operation of the Pacific cable, $125,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By the arrangement contained in the statute the expenditure is to be borne by the four governments in the following proportions : Canada contributes 5-18 ; Australia, 6-18 ; New Zealand, 3-18 ; Great Britain, 5-18. The cost of the cable is about $2,000,000, and the account stands as follows :

Details of receipts.	£	s.	d.	Amount. £	s.	d.
Balance on March 31, 1903.				28,562	15	1
Received from H.M. Treasury out of the parliamentary grant in aid..				75,374	5	4
Traffic receipts...	81,832	15	5			
Less paid out of the Atlantic Co.'s and C.P.R. Co. for the insertion of date and time..	2,008	11	0			
				79,824	5	5
Interest on money placed on deposit..				294	7	10
				184,055	13	8

It is provided in the Act that the capital cost shall be extinguished in fifty, and that is why the annuity is provided, of which first payment is given in details of expenditure I am about to read :

Detals of expenditure.	£	s.	d.
First annuity payment.	77,544	18	0
Head office (salaries and expenses)..	4,568	3	3
Head Office (advertising, canvassing, engineers fees, royalties and cost of remitting money home..	1,259	18	4
Cable stations (salaries and expenses)..	31,763	7	2
Cable ship (salaries and expenses)..	15,933	11	5
Provident fund—contributions to (Statement V)..	1,299	19	6
Transferred to cable repair—reserve and general renewal fund (statement VI)...	35,500	0	0
	167,869	18	8
Balance on March 31, 1904...	16,185	16	0
	184,055	13	8

The revenue is therefore £79,824 sterling plus interest £274 or a total of £80,118 and the expenditure £167,869, leaving a defict of £87,751 sterling.

Mr. BERGERON. Are you co-owners of the cable ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. By what arrangement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contract was made between the imperial government and the colonies I have mentioned in 1899 or thereabouts. There is a trust created by the four governments to manage the cables. The trust is composed of the representatives appointed by the different governments. Our representative is Lord Strathcona and the late manager of the Montreal Bank, Mr. Lang.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this managed as a commercial enterprise ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes ; we have borrowed the cost of construction, two million pounds. It is expected we shall repay the interest and extinguish the capital debt. The deficit is upon the running of the cable.

Mr. HAGGART. The net receipts are £79,000, what is the expenditure ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. £167,000.

Mr. HAGGART. A loss of £80,000 per year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Out of that £77,000 goes to the annuity fund for the extinction of the capital borrowed.

Mr. FOSTER. What has been the income from the traffic receipts for the last five years ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The cable has been only in operation for two years, and I have not the information the hon. gentleman asks. Our expectations have not been realized, which is largely due to the competition of the eastern companies, which have the advantage of a contract made by the South Wales government before the federation of the Australian colonies. The traffic has not been as large as we expected, but it is increasing.

Mr. HAGGART. I understand that New South Wales entered into an arrangement with us which it is not exactly carrying out. Has that question been settled ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No ; we have made representations again and again to the South Wales government, but we have had no satisfaction.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that cable laid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the Pacific coast from the shore of the island of Vancouver to Australia, passing by Fanning island, the British island to the north of Honolulu.

Mr. BERGERON. Are there other cables in that direction or are the others on the Atlantic?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the only cable between Australia and the American continent on the Pacific ocean.

Mr. BERGERON. Then there must be another one on the other side ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is another one on the Atlantic.

Mr. BERGERON. But it has no connection with the one we are talking of.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The object was to have continuous communication over British territory from Australia to British Columbia, then across Canada and then by the Atlantic cables to Great Britain.

Mr. BERGERON. We have nothing to do with the cables on the Atlantic?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the Atlantic cable belongs to the commercial company.

Mr. BERGERON. We are interested in the one on the Pacific ocean.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nothing else.

Mr. BERGERON. We are at the mercy of the one on the Atlantic.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The trouble is not with the Atlantic cables, but at the other end.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand that Australia has defaulted in her payment of five-tenths of the cost, but it has not given good commercial support to the cable, not such support as by the negotiations she would be bound to give. Apart from the New South Wales contract is there amongst the other Australian colonies an indisposition to carry out their arrangements as regards commercial assistance to it? Are they giving commercial support to the proposed eastern extension?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not prepared to answer the hon. gentleman except as regards New South Wales. These negotiations were commenced before confederation in Australia and we made an arrangement which was completed with the Australian government and which was made with the Australian government and not with any other. But before confederation had been completed, New South Wales had made an arrangement with the eastern company and that is what we complain of. We have been protesting against that and asking the Australian government who are a party to that to in some way do away with this monopoly which they have given to the eastern company. Our representations up to the present time have been unavailing. New Zealand has supported us and has protested just as vigorously as we have because New Zealand is equally interested with us, but I am sorry to say that up to the present time the matter is

still where it was and we have received no satisfaction on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the minister would get the information as to the two years' traffic receipts?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall.

Mr. BERGERON. Does anybody control these despatches from the other side that come by cable; I mean principally political despatches from the different countries in Europe ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That has nothing to do with the system.

Mr. BERGERON. It may not have with this one, but I would like some information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This cable is carried on upon commercial principles, the government has nothing to do with it. The trust which sits in London which has built and manages it, carries it on on commercial principles. We have no control over the despatches which are sent over. I dare say in time of war we might exercise the power which all governments possess of seizing the post office and the telegraph, but in time of peace, which I hope we shall always have, although we are annually increasing our militia, there is no more control over this cable than over the cables on the Atlantic.

Mr. BERGERON. Then we are not much interested in this; it is more between Australia and England ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the reason why Canada went into this cable enterprise is that we want to develop the trade between Australia and Great Britain through Canada. First of all we want Australia to do her telegraphic business by this cable over Canada and we want Australia to send her goods to England over Canada. There is no reason in the world why we should not carry the whole of the passenger traffic of Australia through Canada, and I believe the time is not far distant when this will be done as we improve our communications both on the Atlantic and the Pacific. On the contrary there is every reason in the world to think that every passenger who goes from England to Australia or from Australia to England must pass though America for the reason that he would thus avoid the fatigue, annoyance and misery of a trip through the Indian ocean and the Suez canal. If a passenger leaves Australia to go to England all the time he is on or near land he is in the temperate zone, he avoids all discomforts and I have no doubt that all this will tend to the same object.

Mr. BERGERON. It is costly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has been costly.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there was another consideration; Canada was to contribute as the others did in order to have a line which should not pass over foreign territory and so be an all-British line. I shall not borrow any trouble with reference to that cable; I was in favour of it from the first, and I am still; I believe it will work out all right, but my right hon. friend has got to do a little hustling if he expects to see the Australian passengers going across Canada to England in this way. It must take him less than twelve years in the future to get a fast Atlantic service if he expects this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is part of it.

Mr. FOSTER. You will get Australian passengers when you can carry them to London faster than they can be carried in any other way and one means of doing that is to have a fast Atlantic service. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman what particular business carried our Postmaster General to London at the present time. Was it in connection with this ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Have there been developments?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nothing has developed; it is simply that the conditions to which I have alluded are not satisfactory at the present time in Australia. We want if possible to rectify the position which has been created by the contract given by New South Wales to the eastern company. It is partly that and partly to see how far the expenditure can be reduced, to see in what shape the commission is and to look into the matter generally.

Mr. FOSTER. Does Australia meet us in London?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, by specially accredited agents.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see how we can curtail the expenditure; we are in a contract and are bound to carry it out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is our business, we are interested in it and it is part of the business to meet in London and see whether or not the expenses can be curtailed. We want to have the books examined, to see if the expenditure can be curtailed, and if the business of the company can be increased. There is one way in which we know the traffic can be increased; that is if we can get rid of the contract between New South Wales and the eastern company.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we vote any money for the improvement in Ottawa each year or is that statutory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is statutory.

Mr. FOSTER. Do we get any report of the expenditures?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Yearly?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yearly.

Mr. FOSTER. We have none for this year; I have been searching for it but have not been able to find it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am pretty sure there is a report.

Mr. INGRAM. That is in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. FOSTER. The expenses are there, but we want more than the expenses, and I would think that when we give away $60,000 a year for fifteen years we ought to get a report each year of how this money is expended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite satisfied there is a report; whether it has been brought down or not I do not know.

Mr. FOSTER. It does not seem quite right that we should vote this as a statutory matter and get no report as to how the money is expended. Was it a condition that the city should supplement our vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the city does not supplement it.

Mr. FOSTER. But as a matter of fact the city does?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The city is represented on the board.

Mr. FOSTER. But does not supplement the vote?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. Then all the work which has been done by that commission is done on the basis of our 15 years' vote. Another thing that I think we ought to know is whether the commission is mortgaging more than that vote of $60,000 a year for fifteen years. I have heard it mentioned that extensive improvements are projected over and above what has been indicated, and, that in order to meet these, bonds are to be issued based upon the vote that we give. We ought to be very careful to see to it that these securities, issued to get ready money, do not cover more than the fifteen-years' vote that we give. And I think we ought to have, every year, a report from that commission as to the work done. In saying that, I am not raising any objection to the commission's work, so far as I have seen it, or to the vote. I think that the work so far as I have seen it is exceedingly well done. But it would be satisfactory to have a report, so that we might see how our money is expended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is most reasonable. I am sure that there is a report, and if it has not been brought down I will give instructions to have it produced. The statute in this matter was passed when my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was in the House—in 1898 or 1899. At that time we provided for a ten-years' expenditure. We have amended that since, and have provided that the expenditure should be extended for fifteen years. At the same time, we have authorized the commission to issue debentures mortgaging some part of the revenues that they are to receive during these fifteen years, to enable them to purchase land. By the first statute, the commission were restricted to a certain yearly expenditure. But it was urged, and, on reflection, we thought it advisable, that the commissioners should be allowed to make purchase of lands to lay them down for parks. The idea we had in mind at that time was to allow the commission to make a large expenditure on Rockliffe Park. They were authorized to issue debentures, and they have done so. They have purchased about 80 acres of land on the bank of the Ottawa river near Rockliffe Park and have laid it out for a park. In my opinion they should purchase double that quantity. I think all cities make the mistake of not having sufficient parks. As Ottawa will undoubtedly be a large city, a large park should be secured immediately. I shall be surprised if the report is not down, but, if necessary, I will give instructions to have it brought down.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the government takes care that securities are not issued beyond the amount voted; otherwise we may find ourselves, one of these days, with a number of fine improvements, but with a call on parliament for an extension of this vote. The vote amounts to $900,000, which is a munificent donation for the purpose. I wish to say, however, that the city ought not to feel, because of this large prospective expenditure, that it should cease its efforts or should fail to co-operate with the government to make the city what all feel that it should be made. The city ought not to rely on this vote for all its park improvements. Public spirited citizens are doing something for the extension of Ottawa's parks, at Britannia and Aylmer there are beautiful outing places which have been provided by corporations. I do not think the city ought to feel that all such great improvements will hereafter be made by the government or by corporations. I think the donation we have given is a large and generous one, and, with proper co-operation of the city and the corporations, it should do everything that is necessary for the beautification of Ottawa. Ottawa lends itself to beautification. The extension in the direction of the rifle range, in my opinion is a most excellent idea—that is certainly a most beautiful part of the city. When the project is carried out it will make a range of driveway and park the equal of which few cities will be able to show.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I quite share my hon. friend's opinion. The city of Ottawa ought not to rely altogether on the government in these matters. At the same time, the city has a good deal to do in the way of improving such a rapidly growing city—a good deal to do upon the streets, for instance.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and it is doing it very well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commission, so far, has been making the driveway, which is a great addition to the attractions of the city. It is proposed to extend that driveway down to the Ottawa river at the Chaudière.

Mr. FOSTER. What route will that take ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say.

Mr. FOSTER. Will it come from the Experimental Farm down to the river ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the route all within the city limits ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. Talking with one of the commissioners some time ago, I learned that their object is to reach the river, take in some of the islands in the river and make a park there.

Mr. FOSTER. How shall we get across ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By bridges. I think they will not be very expensive. Another, and, in my opinion, more important part of their project is to make a park of that portion near the range. I think it will be one of the finest parks on the continent.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point that is not yet quite clear. Besides what you might call the establishment of the work, there must be maintenance from year to year. I suppose that they have to rely on the $60,000 a year for both construction and maintenance, would they not ? In the issuing of their bonds have they covered the whole of our vote, or have they taken the precaution to allow for the up-keep of the system. Or, who pays for the up-keep—is it the government, the commission, or the city ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that that question has ever been brought to my attention. I always had it in mind that the city would have to provide for the maintenance and I have not heard any opinion to the contrary. As to the reserving a portion not covered by the debentures issued, I may say that I am informed by the Minister of Justice that these are limited to $250,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to provide for maintenance.

Public works—chargeable to income—public buildings—New Brunswick, $108,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it proposed to proceed with the votes for public bridges ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was one item left over.

Mr. FOSTER. I have great faith in the ability of my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur), but I do not think he is quite big enough to undertake the public works with the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) so near the denouement——

Mr. BRODEUR. But perhaps we could deal with some of these items for public works. We might take, for example, those for the province of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. I would much rather take some estimates for which we have the ministers here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, the day after to-morrow we will have the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) here.

Mr. FOSTER. Are all the main estimates passed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I promised that we would give plenty of time to discussing the Intercolonial Railway and we propose to take that up to-morrow. In the meantime, the House is pretty thin and rather demoralized——

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has been in that division for some time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is very hard to please. He insists that we shall elect a Minister of Public Works, and then he does his best to prevent us electing him. And when we propose to go on with the Public Work estimates he objects because there is no minister here.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what an opposition is for.

Mr. BRODEUR. In connection with public works for New Brunswick, there is an item which was allowed to stand—the drill hall at St. John. The Minister of Militia was to give some information with regard to that, but I do not see the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) in his place just now. Perhaps we had better postpone consideration of that item until he gets back. In the meantime we will take Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. I think we shall have to do the same with the Quebec items, because there does not seem to be any Quebec man now in his seat.

Mr. BRODEUR. I told the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) that we would take up the main estimates and public works for Quebec, but he is not present.

Mr. INGRAM. I saw the member for Beauharnois a few moments ago, and he said he could not be in until after six o'clock.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Call it six o'clock.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Harbours and rivers, Quebec—Anse à Beaufils —extension of pier, $1,500.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for the Minister of Public Works). This vote of $1,500 covers the estimated cost of completing the extension of the piers or retaining walls on both sides of the stream. The work was commenced in 1904-5. There was an appropriation in 1904 of $2,000. There has been expended to the 1st January, $1,458.48.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend remember the first work commenced at Anse à Beaufils? I am surprised to hear the hon. minister state that this work was only commenced in 1904.

Mr. BRODEUR. The extension was only commenced in 1904-5, but I understand work has been going on there for some time. I see that the total amount expended has been $9,000. It began in 1887-8.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to create a harbour at the entrance of the cove and this is a kind of protection wall. The object is to enable the fishermen to get into the Anse à Beaufils without any difficulty.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Gaspé ?

Mr. BERGERON. On the St. Lawrence ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Does that finish the whole thing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that completes it.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, we will see next year. I am sure we will see an item for Anse à Beaufils again.

Mr. BRODEUR. There may be some repairs next year.

Anse aux Gris Fonds—improvements at mouth of river, $3,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is of the same character. This $3,500 is for continuing the improvements commenced at the mouth of the river that flows into the Anse aux Gris Fonds.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the Gaspé coast, on the River St. Lawrence. It is not very far from Anse à Beaufils.

Mr. COCHRANE. Is that river navigable ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the Anse à Beaufils is not. This is a work constructed at the mouth of the river in order to form a harbour and provide a shelter for the fishermen.

Mr. BERGERON. When was it commenced ?

Mr. BRODEUR. 1904.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the total estimated cost of the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that given by tender ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, there was only $1,500 voted last year and it was done by day's work. Mr. Morin conducted the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. Why is it that these public undertakings are done by day's work ? There is no excuse for it at all. This was a new undertaking and it should have been let by tender. Was this done about the time you were having an election ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a kind of work that it is difficult to find contractors to undertake. I am informed that the department asked for some tenders at a place called Grands Mechins and that they could not get anybody to tender.

Mr. COCHRANE. It is a very astounding thing that you cannot get contractors to undertake work like that in that section of the country. Is that in the neighbourhood of Seven Islands where work to the extent of $60,000 has been done by day labour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the officials of the department that they called for tenders for work of the same kind but unfortunately they could not get anybody to tender.

Mr. COCHRANE. If you will vote some money for wharfs in Ontario I will venture the assertion that you will find contractors who are willing to build them.

Anse St. Jean—extension of pier, $1,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Chicoutimi and Saguenay, on the Saguenay. This is a vote of $1,000 chiefly for the completion of the work. There was an appropriation last year of $1,200.

Mr. BERGERON. But, that was spent.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How is it that you had an appropriation of $1,200 last year and that it will cost $1,000 more to finish it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because the full amount was not voted last year, and it has been found that this sum is required to complete the work.

Mr. BERGERON. The estimated cost last year was $1,200 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the appropriation was $1,200, but the total estimated cost was $2,200.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this $1,000 finish the whole work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Baie des Peres, Lake Temiskaming—reconstruction of wharf at Ville Marie, including dredging approach, $2,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Why are we called upon to build wharfs there ? This is not on a river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but it is on Lake Temiskaming. As my hon. friend knows there are many places where we have wharfs on Lake Temiskaming. There are many steamboats running on that lake. Baie des Peres is certainly one of the most important places on the lake.

Mr. BERGERON. How large is Lake Temiskaming ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Seventy-five miles long by about four miles wide. As my hon. friend sees it covers a very extensive territory.

Mr. BERGERON. How could you get a dredge there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a dredge belonging to the Public Works Department on the lake.

Mr. BERGERON. She must have been built there.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Barachois de Malbaie—breakwater, $4,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. The total estimated cost is $16,000, and it is intended to call for tenders.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is Gaspé county, on the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a village there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It must be an incorporated village. The work was asked for many years ago ; there is a petition dated 1881 from the Hon. Mr. Fortin asking for a breakwater at that place. It is the centre of a large fishing trade, where sixty or seventy fishing boats are employed in the summer, and the population must be between 1,500 and 2,000.

Mr. AMES. I know the place ; I was there last summer. It is a large shoally bay, with a barachois at the entrance.

Belœil guide piers and booms—to make good damage by ice, $500.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are piers below the Grand Trunk Railway bridge at Belœil to facilitate the passage of steamers and barges through the narrow swing bridge, where the current is very swift. This vote it to repair the piers and booms.

Bic harbour—wharf at Pointe à Coté, $5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Why has nothing been done there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because there was some difficulty with regard to the purchase of a site. No money has been spent.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that work very useful ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand it is ; Bic is used by the pilots.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there not some difficulty about that work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not that I know of.

Mr. BERGERON. I think I have some correspondence about that, and I may have to ask the hon. gentleman to come back to the item again.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand this wharf will be built to Massacre Island ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, from a point eastward.

Mr. AMES. Will you interfere with the present high-tide approach to the existing wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Canton Fabre, Lake Temiskaming—wharf,$2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The item is prepared according to the estimate of the chief engineer for the construction of a wharf on lot 31, township of Fabre.

Mr. AMES. Will this be reached by the new railroad ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; this is on the east side, in the province of Quebec.

Mr. AMES. I understand the Canadian Pacific Railway contemplates building a branch on the east side.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that it is forty-five miles away from the railroad. It is in the county of Pontiac.

Mr. AMES. Would any considerable population be served by that wharf ? It is a long and narrow lake, and the steamers stop practically anywhere and put passengers off on either side of the lake in the ship's jolly-boat. Unless there is some population, there is no use in building this wharf.

Mr. McCOOL. When Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works he visited Lake Temiscamingue, and a large deputation waited on him to represent the need for a wharf at that point, and he promised that it would be built. The shores are very bluff, and in a high wind it is nearly impossible to land with the jolly-boat from the steamer. The only means of access they have in summer is by steamer.

Mr. AMES. What is the population ?

Mr. McCOOL. There must be at least 200 families within reasonable reach of the wharf.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What do you mean by reasonable reach ?

Mr. McCOOL. Within a radius of four or five miles.

Mr. AMES. Is it a farming population ?

Mr. McCOOL. Yes.

Mr. AMES. I suppose the freight will be mostly bulky material, such as hay, which could not be taken in the jolly-boat.

Mr. McCOOL. Yes ; and getting in lumbermen's supplies.

Mr. INGRAM. When did Mr. Tarte promise to build this wharf ?

Mr. McCOOL. It is not in my county ; it is in the county of Pontiac ; but I happened to be present when the deputation waited on Mr. Tarte. It was two or three years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman's memory is not very good when he cannot tell within a year.

Mr. BERGERON. In works like these at Bic harbour and Canton Fabre, it would look as if they were promised on the eve of the election last year ; and now that the election is over, I do not suppose there will be much need for them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that is correct. There was a petition some years ago asking for the wharf, and a vote was put in the estimates last year, but there is a difference of opinion amongst the settlers as to whether it should be at Lavallée bay or Quinn point, and no decision has yet been reached.

Chambord wharf, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete payment on the contract. The conttract was for $9,250. It was given to the lowest tender, Mr. Arthur Tremblay, of Roberval.

Mr. AMES. Why do you want $10,500 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,250 are for superintendence and contingencies.

Mr. AMES. We think an architect's charge of five per cent quite ample for the construction of a house. Why should the charge for building a wharf be greater ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are other things and ten per cent is the amount always allowed.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it not an employee of the government who is in charge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, Mr. Taché, and then there is a lcoal inspector, Mr. A. Lemay, who gets $2.50 a day and the expenses of these gentlemen have to be paid also going from place to place.

Mr. AMES. Why not include the contingencies in the first amount and make one item ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have always thought it better to give the contractor's price in one item and the supplementary expenses in the other.

Champlain, Quebec—wharf repairs and additional, $2,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the wharf at that place. The work is done by day labour. The estimated cost was $8,200. We spent only $6,200 and require $2,000 to spend during the next fiscal year. This is no increase but simply a revote. This work is done by day labour because it is the repairs to an old wharf and is better done in that way than by contract. It was almost impossible to specify what work has to be done. It will be finished by about September.

Chateau Richer—harbour improvements, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the balance required for improvements made by day labour, namely, the removal of rocks on the bar and the construction of a breakwater, the appropriation was $9,000. Château Richer is in Montmorency county.

Mr. MORIN. What kind of boats go there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Vessels carrying firewood, iron and other material and bringing return cargoes of supplies of all kinds. The total number of schooners and bateaux at that place last year was 35 with the total carrying capacity of 3,500 tons.

Mr. MORIN. Will you make the wharf longer than it is now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. MORIN. How does it come that although a wharf was built there years and years ago and the people have always used that wharf, you have this year to spend so much money at that place? I suppose there was no election there?

Mr. BRODEUR. Trade I understand has been increasing and they require some more accommodation. The cargoes carried by these vessels last year were valued at $50,000. My friend will see it is not a useless expenditure.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that on the Island of Orleans?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is on the mainland.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The importance of this place has increased lately because of the valuable stone quarries there. Stone is taken from there for the harbour improvements at Quebec.

Mr. MORIN. Could not the people who have a quarry there build a wharf for themselves? It is easy for them to come to the government and ask them to build a wharf because they want to carry stone from that place. You might just as well give the money to a farmer. If a farmer goes to the west and has to buy a horse or two, a wagon and harness, you might as well rig him out with these things as to rig these fellows out with a wharf. Is that the case or not?

Mr. BRODEUR. This work was constructed many years ago. It was commenced in 1884-5.

Mr. MORIN. And before that too.

Mr. BRODEUR. The note I have here gives that date and it is simply carrying out the same policy as was adopted by the former government. I do not think it would be good policy to let these works fall into decay; I do not suppose my hon. friend would recommend that.

Mr. MORIN. I do not see how that would happen. I have shipped from that wharf, and it must be remembered that the tide has to rise about eight feet before the water reaches the wharf; you cannot load or unload unless the tide is away up and when the tide is down the water is half a mile from the wharf. It is not a great place for business there and I do not see why a wharf is so much required.

Mr. BRODEUR. If my hon. friend has been shipping there himself, he must understand that it is a useful work, and he must admit too that there are in that section of the country wharfs which have been built which cost a great deal more than this work, and I do not think there should be any objection to such a small amount as has been spent there in comparison with the amounts spent in some other places. My friend knows that other places have been asking for wharfs reaching to low tide and we have been spending large sums of money. There is no comparison between the amounts spent in those places and the small amount spent in this place. There is a great deal of trade there, the extensive quarries are being exploited and I think it is a very useful expenditure which has been petitioned for by the inhabitants of the place.

Mr. BERGERON. I would like to have the name of the foreman, the amount that was paid, the rate of wages that was paid to him and to the men, the number of men employed, and where the material was got.

Mr. BRODEUR. The foreman was Ed. Vezina, I shall get the other information.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the work commenced?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year, in July or August.

Mr. BERGERON. It was done during the election time, as a matter of fact.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose so; the appropriation was voted last year and would become available some time in July or August and the work would then be commenced. If the elections happened to take place in that time of course the work must have been going on.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not making any insinuations at all; I am only mentioning the fact that the work was done during the election.

Mr. COCHRANE. I recollect distinctly that on a job of this kind there was a foreman attending to the construction of the work, a gentleman employed in buying the timber, and another gentleman who got so much per cent of the money invested in purchasing the material. The minister would not say I am sure that in a job like this it would be hard to get the material by contract. It becomes serious when you have a lot of officials and hangers-on about election time, when you have a job of this kind going on month after month and year after year with a lot of men employed at big wages.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed this is going to complete the work.

Mr. COCHRANE. I never complain about where money is spent as long as it is properly spent, but I do not think that any minister or any official of the minister can get the work done as well as it can be done by contract. And it is of no use to tell me or to tell this committee that it is impossible, either in Quebec or any other place in Canada, to get the material by contract. Here is a work, that, as I understand it, is on dry land when the tide is out, but is reached by the sea when the tide is high. Are the men able to work when the tide is in? If not, are they paid just the same?

Mr. BRODEUR. The wharf is not submerged at high tide, but at high tide the water reaches the wharf. In many places wharfs are built so that vessels reach them at low water, but this one is built so that it is reached only at high water, and it is so built for the sake of economy. It is one of the least expensive works in that section and for that reason.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that this wharf is being completed by day labour. How does the minister get over the Act of parliament that declares that all works over $5,000 shall be done by contract? Under what authority does the minister presume to do this by day's work. Of course, I do not hold the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) responsible for this, as I suppose that it was not under his

direction that the construction was undertaken. But he is here to defend the action of the Minister of Public Works. This is another of the many cases in which ministers come down and tell us that they are constructing public works by day labour though the Act explicitly says that such works shall be done by contract. What explanation has the minister to give for the conduct of the department on this occasion ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Perhaps I did not make myself very clear in my opening remarks. There are two kinds of work to be paid for under this vote. One is the removal of rocks. My hon. friend knows that such work cannot be very well done by contract, because it is not easy to ascertain how much work will be required. I understand that it is impossible to find contractors who will undertake such work for a fixed amount. Then there is the work on the breakwater pier. This is not all construction, but includes also repairs, and this kind of work it is almost impossible to have done by day's labour. And this is not a violation of the law. The Public Works Act provides that works over $5,000 shall be done under contract. But the same law provides that if the work can be more effectively done by day labour, it shall be done in that way. This is an instance.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister may be right. I have not the statute before me. But I shall be very much surprised if there is a provision in the Act such as he has suggested—that it is left by the minister to have the work done by day's labour if he thinks it is desirable to do so. I certainly have not so understood the law. I have always understood that where the expenditure is over $5,000, the work must be done under contract. I have before me the proposed amendment to the law which provides that the minister shall invite tenders for public works, unless there is an emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or the work can be more efficiently and expeditiously done by the officers of the department, or in case the estimated cost is less than $5,000, or where it appears to the minister that it is not advisable to invite tenders. It may be to this proposed amendment that the minister refers.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that makes the law more stringent than it is.

Mr. HENDERSON. I would like to know how the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) interprets this law? If I am mistaken in what I have always supposed to be the law, then it would appear that parliament has practically no protection. From what the minister (Mr. Brodeur) tells us, if the work involved an expenditure of $100,000, the minister would be as much within the law in doing it by day's work if the amount involved was less than $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is done in some cases——

Mr. HENDERSON. We regret to see that it is so in many cases. I hope the Minister of Justice will have the law amended to make it more stringent ; because the only protection we have is that there should be competition in works of this kind.

Mr. INGRAM. Under this amendment, it would not even be necessary for the minister to go to the Governor in Council for their approval. That simply means that the whole thing is a farce.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are cases in which it is impossible to have work done by contract. There are parts of the country where the contractors will not tender for such work as this, as they cannot estimate the cost. And there are cases where works constructed by day labour have been found cheaper than they could possibly have been had they been done under contract. There is no intention on the part of the department to evade the law. But, where the work cannot be advantageously done by contract, it is done by day labour. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) asked me to quote the law. It is found in the Revised Statutes of 1886, section 13 :

> The minister shall invite tenders, by public advertisement, for the execution of all works, except in cases of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest, or in which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there any evidence that it can be more expeditiously done by officers of the department than by contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a question for the department to decide. This is not a question of construction, it is a question of repairs ; and the hon. member knows that it is almost impossible to make specifications in regard to repairs. You must have some construction first before you can make any repairs to it.

Mr. INGRAM. We are not arguing that all work must be done by contract ; in many cases of repairs it would be impossible to have them done by contract. But this is a new work attached to an old work ; in other words, this is an extension of a pier, it is an entirely new piece of work, and therefore it should be done by contract.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the removal of rocks. I am informed by the officer of the department that it is found much more economical to have that work done by day labour than by contract. It would be impossible, almost, to get anybody to tender.

Mr. MORIN. Are you removing rocks from a hill ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From the bar opposite the village. Vessels were liable to strike the rock, and it was thought advisable to remove that rock in order to give better transportation facilities.

Mr. MORIN. From the wharf out to the channel is about three-quarters of a mile, and you have rocks and boulders all the way across from the wharf to the channel; and then there is a bar above the wharf that extends for miles with nothing but rocks and boulders.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then my hon. friend sees the need of removing these rocks for the protection of the road.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that the only thing you have to do, to remove the rocks and boulders?

Mr. BRODEUR. And repair the breakwater pier.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this harbour owned by the government, or is it private property?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work done so far has been done by the government. This work was begun in 1884.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the property vested in the Crown?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. When was it purchased, and how much was paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not got the information here. The work was begun in 1884, perhaps the records have been destroyed by the fire. All harbours are vested in the Crown.

Mr. BLAIN. This matter was up several times before, and I notice that a considerable amount has been appropriated each year to purchase these properties from private individuals. When this very item was up for discussion last year my hon. friend from Halton asked the question:

> Is this vested in the Crown, or is it private property?
>
> Mr. HYMAN. Probably it will be vested in the Crown. The actual deed has not passed, but an agreement has been made for the purchase from a private individual.

It is fair now that the minister should tell us what amount was paid for this property, and the name of the persons who owned the property.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the officers of the department that an approach has been purchased. That is the reason why that statement was made last year.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask if the agreement referred to last year by the minister has been carried out, has the property been purchased, and is it now vested in the Crown?

Mr. MORIN.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been bought from a man named Guiguère, for $800, and is now vested in the Crown. It was bought about five months ago.

Mr. MORIN. Will the government receive any revenue from that wharf?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the law provides for certain charges to be made at these wharfs.

Mr. MORIN. I like to see a government clever, but there is such a thing as being too clever. Now the government has given subsidies to build a railway from Quebec, and they are giving more money to build wharfs and remove rocks. I may tell the minister that the railway goes right over the wharf twenty feet from the water. There should be an end to these things. I am willing to help people who need to be helped but those people have a railway there and that railway goes right past the quarry. They had even to dig down to the wharf to build this railway because there was a heavy grade there. The railway almost touches the wharf. When these people have a railway for their accommodation what is the use of going to the expense of building a wharf?

Mr. BRODEUR. Is that a steam railway?

Mr. MORIN. It used to be a steam railway. Now they are operating the same road by steam and electricity. They run electric cars every ten minutes in the day in the summer time and in the winter time they run steam cars about every hour in the day.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows the locality very well and he knows that most of the traffic that is carried on there is carried on by means of schooners. It is quite true there is an electric railway built nearby, but most of the traffic is carried on by schooners. Most of the traffic is between Quebec and the south shore of the St. Lawrence. My hon. friend knows that there is no bridge connecting there. My hon. friend who lives on the south shore has told us that he has been shipping from his place to that point.

Mr. MORIN. I said that I shipped to and from there, but not from my own place. I shipped from the north shore.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that there is some traffic on the south shore.

Mr. MORIN. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. And that it is necessary to have a wharf?

Mr. MORIN. That is perfectly right, but I am opposed to giving too much to the same people. Somebody else needs a railway or a wharf or a bridge or the help of the government. I always have objected and I will object as long as I am a member of

this House to favouring one man and crushing another. This money belongs to one man as much as it does to another, and everybody, as far as it is in the power of the government, should be protected. If the government have $100,000 to give let them give it but not give it all to one man. Let everybody have his share. That is nothing more than right.

Mr. BRODEUR. Equal rights.

Mr. MORIN. Yes, Sir. We had the promise from the right hon. leader of the government in 1895 that when he got into power his government would be a government of reform and a government of example. I am looking for the example, but I have not seen it yet, and I hope the government will never display it.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not a fair hope.

Mr. MORIN. Well, it is politics. It is all very well to make promises and then never fulfil them.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the object of purchasing that piece of land my hon. friend spoke of buying a little while ago ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was to get access from the high road. My hon. friend knows the conditions that exist at Chateau Richer. This is a place below Montmorency Falls. The adjoining parish is L'Ange Gardien, the next is Chateau Richer and the next is Ste. Anne de Beaupré. They have a stone quarry on the north side in the main road and in order to get down to this harbour which has been a harbour within my recollection for the last fifty years, they have to cross from the main road through the property of this man Guiguère to get to the wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. How did they get to the wharf before that?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I suppose they trespassed upon this property. The wharf has been extended as a result of these improvements and the improvements in the trade of the place. This particular place is the centre of two great industries. It is a great place for quarries and in addition they export an immense quantity of fire-wood. I suppose that two-thirds of the fire wood, that goes to Quebec comes from Chateau Richer. All that fire wood comes in bateaux from that place. My hon. friends know that the tide rises and falls there for 14 to 18 feet and in order to get that wood out of there it is necessary for the bateaux to go into the wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. When was that land bought ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Within the last four or five months. The deputy minister does not remember at this moment the exact date.

Mr. BERGERON. That would be in December or January ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Can you not tell when the property was bought ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister will find that out for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BERGERON. It seems extraordinary that you cannot tell when the property was bought. There must be a deed. You must find out when that property was bought. If this has been an important harbour for fifty years and it was found necessary five months ago to buy some property it does seem extraordinary, and we are entitled to get that information. I would ask my hon. friend to take a note of it and give us all the information.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Desjardins—Allumette Island—River Ottawa—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete. It is under contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the Ottawa river not very far from Pembroke.

Mr. BERGERON. Which county ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Pontiac.

Mr. BERGERON. If I am not making a mistake this is a revote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The amount of money to be spent on that wharf will be $11,000; $10,000 could only be spent to the first of July and the rest is a revote. That is proof of economy.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we are trying to do what my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin) says.

Mr. MORIN. The hon. member from Dorchester is right.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will not go as far as that.

Doucet's Landing—dredging, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote covers the estimated cost of forming a basin 800 feet long, 450 feet wide and 13 feet deep at low water on the east side of the railway wharf at Doucet's Landing of the Arthabaska and Three Rivers branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, where steamboats calling at this landing can remain safely at anchor during stormy weather.

Mr. BERGERON. We voted some money for this the other day.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was to pay for work done during the current year. This is for next year. Tenders have been called for this work.

Mr. BERGERON. What will be the cost of the whole work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $15,000 will complete it.

Mr. BERGERON. How much was spent before ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The total expenditure for many years back has been $39,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What was spent last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $20,000.

Mr. BERGERON. We voted $8,000 the other day in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was to pay for work done during the current fiscal year.

Mr. BERGERON. Do you mean to say you spent $20,000 in one year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, for dredging.

Mr. BERGERON. And $15,000 more ; that will be $35,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. $35,000. The work is being done by contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is doing that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work has been awarded to Mr. Randolph McDonald.

Mr. AMES. Were there any other tenders ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; and he was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. AMES. Did Mr. Randolph Macdonald have the same advantages that were given to the contractor in the Port Arthur case ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; public tenders were called for, and he was the lowest tenderer and got the work.

Mr. BERGERON. At what price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nine cents per cubic yard.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the material to be dredged ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Gravel and boulders.

Mr. BERGERON. We were told by the Solicitor General the other night that the dredging was to remove sand, and I pointed out that it would be futile to go on dredging sand year after year unless you put in some protection work to prevent the sand from drifting back.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would cost more to do that.

Mr. BERGERON. It might cost more at first, but it would be cheaper in the end. How much money has been spent at this place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The total amount expended was $39,334.62 to the 31st December, 1904.

Mr. BERGERON. And in addition to that we have the $8,000 and the $15,000 now, which makes over $62,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And when you have the work done, what kind of boats can use the wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Boats having a less draught than 13 feet.

Mr. AMES. Why did the government discontinue dredging by the hour and substitute by the cubic yard ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because of a discussion in the House it was thought better to call for public tenders and have the work done in this way.

Mr. AMES. How many tenders were there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Three ; one at 9 cents, one at 15 cents and one at 22 cents.

Mr. AMES. Did the government pay for the towing of the dredge from Cornwall to Doucet's landing ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; Mr. Macdonald had extensive works on the north shore, and the reason his tender is so low is that he will take the material from the south shore and use it for filling on the north shore.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this wharf to be used by a railway company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The wharf there is owned by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the Grand Trunk Railway contribute anything ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; this vote is for dredging, and is not for the wharf.

Mr. MORIN. Some years ago Mr. Tarte told the House that the dredging in the St. Lawrence could be done for three cents per cubic yard, and now you are paying Mr. Macdonald nine cents.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Tarte was referring to a very powerful new dredge called the 'J. I. Tarte,' which works in clay, but this work is in gravel and boulders, and besides we could not expect that a contractor should have such an extraordinary dredge as the one owned by the government.

Mr. MORIN. I understand you very plainly now.

East Templeton wharf, $6,500.

Mr. PERLEY. How much is this wharf going to cost altogether ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $6,500. This is a revote; nothing has been done.

Mr. PERLEY. Is this wharf used very much by the public, and will there be any revenue from it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a wharf there now belonging to the Ottawa Navigation Company, and it is intended to get that wharf for the use of the public.

Mr. PERLEY. Does the government propose to buy this wharf from the Navigation Company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was the intention, in order to make it a public wharf.

Mr. PERLEY. Well——

Mr. BRODEUR. I made a mistake ; I am told that the wharf is to be transferred from the Navigation Company to the government, and the government will make the necessary repairs and have the wharf for public use.

Mr. BERGERON. If it is in the same condition now as it was when I last saw it, it is in a very bad state of repair.

Mr. PERLEY. The result of this would be that the Ottawa Navigation Company would get a new wharf built by the government without any expense to themselves. This wharf has been in existence for a great many years, and it appears to have been satisfactory to the people for what small use they made of it. A certain amount of business has always been done by the public at that wharf.

Mr. BRODEUR. The company wants to have the prior use of the wharf, but the department will not accept it on that condition, and negotiations are pending. Perhaps there will be no final result.

Mr. BERGERON. In what county is it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the county of Wright, a few miles from here.

Mr. PERLEY. It seems to be the policy of the government to build many more wharfs than they formerly did. East Templeton wharf did well enough in the old days. Before undertaking to build new wharfs, does the department have any report to show what use will be made of them by the public and the expected revenue in each case ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, a report is made by the officers of the department in each case before any money is voted.

Mr. PERLEY. On March 6th last, I asked the acting Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) a question with regard to two wharfs on the Ottawa, from neither of which was the revenue sufficient to warrant the expenditure of public money. One was at Greece's point, county of Argenteuil, on which was spent $5,452.19. Last year the gross revenue was $60.93. Then there is the wharf at Hull, across the river, built by the government at a cost of $54,000, which last year was used by only some ten boats, and for the use of which no wharfage is charged. I have passed this wharf a great many times and have never seen it used until a couple of days ago when I saw a small row boat landing at it. While the building of wharfs is very necessary when required for the public convenience, in many cases they are built where they are not needed by the public at all. With regard to the wharf at East Templeton, has the hon. minister any report to show that it will be used by any company other than the Ottawa River Company, which is quite well able to take care of its own wharfs.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief engineer that a report was made in the usual way before the appropriation was asked for last year. With regard to the two wharfs to which the hon. gentleman refers, they are not under the control of the Public Works Department.

Mr. PERLEY. On the 6th March, I asked a question about the wharf at Greece's point, and it was answered by the acting Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer says that this wharf is under the control of the Department of Railways and Canals. The one at Hull was built by the Public Works Department. The other one is in connection with the canal.

Mr. PERLEY. How much revenue does the hon. gentleman expect from this wharf, according to the report, and what use will be made of it by the public outside the Ottawa Navigation Company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The department has no information on that point because the revenue is collected by the Department of Marine and Fisheries ; but I am sure, from the information we have, that the revenue will be sufficient to meet the interest on the expenditure.

Mr. PERLEY. Then it will be very different from these other two wharfs on the Ottawa. The one that cost some $5,000 gives $60 revenue, and the one that cost $54,000, gives no revenue.

Mr. BERGERON. Have the company and the government come to any agreement?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nothing has been decided between the company and the government, the transfer has not been made yet by the Ottawa Navigation Company, and negotiations are going on between the department and the company. The company wants the prior use of that wharf so that they would be entitled to order any boat away which might be there when they wanted to use it, but the department did not consent.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this money be spent if no satisfactory arrangement is come to?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we will not spend anything before the transfer is made to the department.

Mr. AMES. The wharf should certainly not be built if any preference is to be given the company.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is why no money has been spent so far in connection with that wharf.

Mr. PERLEY. How have the public managed at East Templeton up to date?

Mr. BRODEUR. They were using Maclaren's wharf.

Mr. BERGERON. So that this wharf has not been used at all?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, by the Ottawa Navigation Company.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it fit to be used?

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, it is being used by the company.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the government allow steamboats to use a wharf which is dangerous to the public?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no control over that. The company takes all the risk itself, and will be responsible for any accident.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister lay on the table the report under which he proposes to purchase the wharf?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Escoumain wharf, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for building a public pier, which is under contract. The cost altogether will be $11,478, and the usual amount for superintendence and contingencies, $1,522. $10,000 were voted and $5,000 of that is a revote, so we will be spending only $5,000 and $8,000 or $13,000.

Gatineau Point—repairs to wharf and to retaining wall above it, $1,100.

Mr. BRODEUR. This expenditure is to be made on a retaining wall for shore protection built some fifty years ago. It is being done by day labour.

Mr. BERGERON. Do any steamboats stop at the wharf at this place?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for repairs to the retaining wall.

Mr. BERGERON. Are we bound to keep it in repair?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because it is built by ourselves.

Grands Mechins breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. BRODUEUR. This is a work for which tenders have been called but nobody has tendered. It is for the construction of a breakwater here, extending 603 feet from the eastern side of the harbour of Grand Mechins to afford better protection. This is in Rimouski county, fifty-four miles from Little Metis and eighty miles from Rimouski.

Mr. TAYLOR. $5,000 has already been spent.

Mr. BRODEUR. $5,000 was spent during the winter for timber. We called for tenders and nobody would make any tender, but we had to buy the lumber and it has been delivered during the last winter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Are you calling for tenders again?

Mr. BRODEUR. We will call for tenders again.

Mr. AMES. By whom will the harbour that will be formed by this work be used, by the local fishermen and traders or will this accommodate the larger vessels that pass down the northern Gaspé coast such as the 'Campana' and the 'King Edward'?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be for the fishermen and for the general trade. This will provide a depth of 17½ feet and will be sufficient, the chief engineer informs me, to accommodate vessels such as the 'Campana.'

Mr. AMES. If it is purely a local expenditure for the protection of the fishermen it is a large amount, but if it makes a harbour sufficient for the 'Campana' it is a national expenditure and a considerable sum might be permitted.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object is to afford shelter to the fishermen and also landing and shipping accommodation. The only railway connection these people have is the Intercolonial Railway which passes Little Metis fifty-four miles from there, so those people have no accommodation at all.

Mr. AMES. As the minister well knows that coast is not served by railway, but by steamers passing up and down and also by the local trading schooners. There are times frequently, when there is a southeasterly wind, when it is impossible for vessels, even of the size of the 'Campana,' to take on freight from the shore, especially when barrels of cod oil, one of the large exports from that district, are being taken on board. If this affords a protected roadstead in which large vessels of the size of the 'Campana' can enter and load in comparatively still water then it is a worthy expenditure, but if it will not assist in any way the trade of the coast and is only to be used to protect the fishermen or a few vessels loading timber, it is a large expenditure.

Mr. BRODEUR. The object is to afford protection to vessels like the 'Campana.'

Mr. AMES. Then it would be better for the government if necessary to make an expenditure of $5,000 more in order to make an inclosed harbour 17½ feet deep.

Mr. BRODEUR. As a matter of fact the estimated cost is $30,000. We are simply asking $20,000 but shall have to ask a further sum. This is the amount supposed to be spent during the coming year.

Mr. AMES. There is no harbour from Rimouski to Gaspé where vessels the size of the 'Campana' can enter.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is not. And there have been some cases where there has been great danger in storms to steamers passing up and down. If a harbour can be obtained for $25,000 or $30,000 the expenditure is legitimate if it will afford a port with sufficient depth of water to enable vessels to load and unload in safety.

Mr. AMES. How long a roadstead will you have with a depth of 17½ feet? That depth will be all right provided you have it for a length of 500 or 600 feet along the pier, but if you have it only on the face of the breakwater that will not help you very much.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the depth will be from 12 feet to 17½ feet for a length of about 500 feet along the pier.

Grosse Isle quarantine station—extension of landing pier to deep water, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is an amount asked for by the Department of Agriculture in connection with the quarantine. It is to make provision for the extension of the west or landing pier of Grosse Isle to secure a depth of 30 feet at low water, spring tide, along the face. This will allow the largest ships entering the St. Lawrence to reach the wharf at any stage of the tide.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is a revote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, nothing has been spent.

Quebec—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $25,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to cover the cost of repairs to piers, bridges, &c., where they become necessary as well as to provide for the travelling expenses of resident engineers in the province of Quebec during the year. The amount spent last year under this head was $19,477.77.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know whether the Department of Public Works have received a request from the parish of St. Timothée, in the county of Beauharnois. There is a wharf there built by the government many years ago and the keeping of which in repair is also the business of the government. But it has been allowed to fall into very bad condition. I understood that a promise had been made that it would be repaired. The authorities there were to have communicated with the department, but I do not know whether that has been done or not. But I would ask if the repairs of this wharf could not be carried out under this vote. They would not cost very much.

Mr. BRODEUR. How much?

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose $1,000 would put the work in very good shape. At present it is in a dangerous condition.

Mr. BRODEUR. The officers of the department advise me that they have not received any information on the matter. But they will take note of the case and the department will look into it.

Lake St. John—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. AMES. Where is the dredging being done?

Mr. BRODEUR. At the mouth of the river at Roberval and other places on Lake St. John.

Mr. AMES. Can the hon. minister say at what other places?

Mr. BRODEUR. At the mouth of the three different rivers, the Metabetchouan, the Peribonka and the Mistassini.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the dredge belong to the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, and this is to pay the running expenses of the dredge.

Mr. AMES. If I remember well, the dredging is to remove the sandbars at the mouths of these rivers. Is the government able to hold the work that it has done? Having dredged a channel, what steps do the government take to make the work permanent?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the channels are held with difficulty. In the supplementary estimates there will be an item for the construction of retaining piers.

Mr. AMES. The government will have to do that, for it is mere waste of money to dredge without building retaining piers, particularly at the Grand Discharge.

Laprairie—ice piers and protection walls—works of reconstruction and repairs, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the work under contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has this contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. Messrs. Amyot and Lemay of Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. What was the amount of the vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. Their contract was for $29,650.

Lavaltrie—pile wharf and dredging, $5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What depth of water will be had there?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the boats of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company running between Montreal and Cham-

bly. The depth will be from ten to twelve feet.

Le Tableau, Descente des Femmes—wharf on River Saguenay, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This covers works to be executed at Descente des Femmes, the completion of a wharf on the north shore of the Saguenay river. The wharf has to be sheeted with four-inch plank and a portion of the floor is to be completed.

Mr. BERGERON. There are several wharfs on the Saguenay. In which parish is this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is on the north side and about fifty miles below Ha, Ha, bay.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a new wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there a parish there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a village there —a new settlement and a progressive one. They have no other means of communication than by this wharf.

Mr. AMES. Is that to be done by day's work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. AMES. What wages do you pay labourers in the Saguenay district ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $2.50 for foremen, and $1.25 to $1.40 to others.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the $1,000 spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work was begun last year. There is a mistake in this item. Instead of being $6,000 it should be $600. It is an error in the printing.

Little Pabos—harbour improvements, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make further provision for extending 100 feet in a westerly direction the breakwater built in 1889, in order to afford shelter to the fishing boats that frequent the locality. It is at the mouth of the river.

Mr. AMES. That river is subject to great floods in the spring, and a breakwater built there would need to be carefully made.

L'Ile d'Alma—removal point of rock, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to remove by blasting some rocks which obstruct navigation. It is in the county of Chicoutimi, on the river of that name.

Mr. MORIN. It is very strange that the government should spend money at that place. There is a ridge of rocks in the river, and the government proposes to blast the rocks so as to make the river wider. If the government is going to make canals of all the rivers, streams, creeks and brooks in the country, they have a big job before them.

Lower St. Lawrence—removal of rocks, &c., $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the ordinary vote taken every year. It is proposed to spend this money in the counties of Gaspé and Bonaventure.

Magdalen Islands—breakwaters and piers, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision, in accordance with the estimate, for carrying on, during the coming fiscal year, projected works in connection with breakwaters, piers and wharfs in the Magdalen Islands, with a view to affording better shelter and harbour facilities, not only to a large number of fishing vessels, but also to steam sailing vessels and row-boats, and the coasting trade and fishing industry of the lower St. Lawrence.

Mr. BERGERON. You spent $20,000 last year and $20,000 is asked for this year. Does that cover all the work to be done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. The chief part of this work is to be done on the islands of Pointe à Elie, Grindstone, Bassin and Albright. These wharfs are being extended and deepened.

Mr. BERGERON. The other day I understood from the Solicitor General that on account of the sandbar between the island of Amherst there is only one place where vessels of a certain dimension can go. There is enough water on both sides of the island for large steamers.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that they stop at Pointe à Elie, Grindstone and Bassin.

Mr. BERGERON. They generally get a tender to go ashore.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was when there were no wharfs.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of this ? Is it for large navigation or particularly for the fishermen ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is for large navigation. It is in order to connect these islands with the outside world.

Mr. BERGERON. Do large boats ply between the Magdalen Islands and other ports ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a regular ferry from Pictou to these islands. Besides there is provision for sailing boats and large fishing boats.

Mr. BERGERON. How many boats are there plying between the islands and Pictou ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is only one ferry.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that every day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Every week; perhaps twice a week. I am not sure.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there just one vessel?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a direct line between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands.

Mr. BERGERON. What other vessels are there?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are schooners, sailing vessels and large fishing boats. These people are living especially by the fishing industry.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that a number have complained that they have not communication with the outside world.

Mr. BLAIN. There has already been $40,000 expended upon these Magdalen Islands improvements, and we are now asked for $20,000 more. This makes $60,000. May I ask the hon. minister if this will complete the work, or will next year find a similar amount of $20,000 in the estimates?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say that there will be no money expended at any place in the future, but I may say to my hon. friend that this money covers the improvements at the three places I have just mentioned—Pointe à Elie, Grindstone and Bassin. I cannot say that no more improvements will be undertaken elsewhere.

Mr. BLAIN. It is pretty hard to judge whether these amounts should be voted or whether we should ask for a general explanation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have been informed by the officials of the department that the breakwater at Grand Entry has been destroyed, and it will require some work there.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked this question for the reason that I notice that the same explanation is given about this work each year. Last year, when a vote of $20,000 was asked, the minister said that he thought this would complete the work.

Mr. BRODEUR. At these places?

Mr. BLAIN. Then he qualified it by saying that a very small amount might be required for further improvements. This year the hon. minister comes along and asks for $20,000, giving about the same explanation, and saying that possibly further amounts may be required in years to come.

Mr. BRODEUR. In some other parts of the islands. There are several islands.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand that. It is quite a safe ground, but it is rather severe upon the treasury to say that $20,000 each year shall be voted for an expenditure at this one point.

Mille Vaches—landing pier, $5,000.

Mr. MORIN. Who recommended this work to be done at Mille Vaches?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been recommended on the report of the officers of the department. Mr. Taché recommended it.

Mr. BERGERON. Which county is this in?

Mr. BRODEUR. Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mistook (Delisle)—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that?

Mr. BRODEUR. Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

Mr. BERGERON. Why is it called Mistook?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the township of Delisle, and it is called Mistook.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that on Lake St. John?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. How many government wharfs have we on Lake St. John?

Mr. BRODEUR. Six or seven.

Mont Louis—wharf and approach, $6,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is this?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Gaspé. It is to complete the block of cribwork.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will it cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. $8,000.

Mr. BERGERON. We have already voted $9,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The total expenditure from the 31st December last is $8,000.

Mr. AMES. What depth of water will this give?

Mr. BRODEUR. 14 feet.

Mr. AMES. That will let the trading steamers in?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend says we have expended $8,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. And he is asking for $6,500 more. That will be over $14,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Which county is that in?

Mr. BRODEUR. Gaspé; it is on the north shore, and we cannot construct anything at a less cost than that.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it a wharf or a breakwater?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete a block of cribwork 185 feet by 20 feet, reaching to a 14-foot depth at low water. This is being built in Mont St. Louis bay, at the mouth of the river of the same name ; and we also propose to construct an approach to the wharf 365 feet long and 20 feet wide on top.

Mr. BERGERON. Do steamers go there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; the steamers are not going there now, because there is no accommodation.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the 'Campana' be able to stop at that wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Montmagny—wharf on the 'Bassin,' $6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the county of Montmagny.

Mr. BERGERON. I see you have a vote for $6,000. You could not spend all that next year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We would not spend any money during the elections.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that cover the whole work ?

Mr. MORIN. Here is a supplementary vote for $2,500 for that very place.

Mr. BRODEUR. For this year ?

Mr. MORIN. It does not say.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken, I think.

Mr. MORIN. I do not believe he is.

Mr. BERGERON. There is $2,500 in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it not for Montmorency ?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes ; it is for Montmorency.

Montmorency Falls—crib work revetment wall along harbour front, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote of $6,000 is asked to be taken to make further provision for building a cribwork revetment wall 8 feet wide, 8 feet high and 1,200 feet long along the harbour front of the new municipality of Montmorency Falls. This wharfing will afford landing and embarking accommodation to small boats and at the same time prevent the present embankment of stone-filled cribwork, the face timbers of which are decayed and here and there broken, from toppling over on to the beach when the high spring tides would undermine and destroy the harbour. This work is being done according to the report of the engineer.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will it cost?

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BRODEUR. $12,500.

Mr. BERGERON. What was spent before ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $6,000 has already been spent, and this $6,000 is to complete. The contract is $12,000. There was voted last year $4,000, and we voted the other day $2,500 and then there is $6,500 to complete, making $12,500 altogether.

Mr. AMES. When the cribwork is finished will you have a permanent wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. AMES. The old wharf was made almost exclusively of slabs and sawdust and was rotting away all the time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The old wharf was where the old Hall mill used to be and there is a cotton mill there now. This new wharf is immediately east of the old wharf along the shore. The old wharf would cost more than it is worth to repair it.

Mr. AMES. It would be waste of money to try to repair the old wharf. What depth of water will this new wharf give ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Four or five feet at the outside ; it would be more at high tide. It is near the Montmorency Falls and there are a number of industries there. This new wharf could be used by a certain number of light draught vessels, but as a matter of trade and commerce it is not very important.

New Carlisle wharf—extension of pier, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Tenders are being called for the total estimated cost is $25,000.

Mr. AMES. You ought to have no difficulty in getting contractors at New Carlisle. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will complete 200 feet which is estimated at $25,000.

Mr. AMES. Is this the wharf that was injured by the steamship 'Admiral' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. That damage was repaired and this vote is for new construction.

Mr. BLAIN. How much further than 200 feet does the government propose to extend the wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We expect this will give us the necessary depth.

Mr. AMES. The steamship 'Admiral' has been taken off the route this year and a larger and better steamer requiring more wharf room, substituted. The old wharf was big enough for the 'Admiral' but I question if it is big enough for the new steamer.

Mr. BRODEUR. There will be 14 feet at this new wharf.

Nicolet River—dredging, repairs to piers, &c., $6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the estimated cost of this whole work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The total expenditure up to the 31st December, 1904, was $186,000 ; that extends over a great many years.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this vote complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has to be maintained and kept in proper order and repair.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that river navigable?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, for small boats plying on Lake St. Peter.

Mr. BERGERON. How far do they go up the river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no navigation on the Nicolet river except from the St. Lawrence to the town of Nicolet which is situated near the mouth of the river. There are five saw-mills there, and Nicolet is rather an important place. This money has been spent under the previous government and as a matter of fact I do not think the present government has spent much money there except for repairs. This vote is for dredging.

Mr. BERGERON. The chief engineer is now present and I wish to know if some permanent work cannot be done there which would prevent this annual expenditure. If this place is going to fill up all the time we might try and prevent it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief engineer that the filling up will continue and that all we can do is to dredge it out.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not some permanent cribwork be put in ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me that would not meet the difficulty.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does it cost a year to keep that river in order

Mr. BRODEUR. About $6,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Then it is a kind of annual permanent charge

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. AMES. How is this dredging done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Tenders have been called for and the contract awarded to Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. AMES. Not to Mr. Poupore this time?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. AMES. At what price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Twelve and a half cents per cubic yard.

Mr. AMES. What did Mr. Poupore offer to do it for ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know. I only know there were four tenders ranging from 12½ cents to 16 cents.

Notre Dame du Portage—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. AMES. Is that government property at Notre Dame du Portage ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this finish the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. We won't see any vote for it next year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not unless there is a revote.

Peel Head bay, $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Who owns that wharf?

Mr. BRODEUR. The government. It is an old wharf which was purchased on the 5th May from Mr. Ewing for $1,500.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there much navigation from this to Missisquoi bay ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there are a lot of fishermen there, and there was some dispute between the Vermont authorities and the government with regard to fishing.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of navigation is there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Barges and tug boats which come from Lake Champlain.

Portneuf wharf, $4,000.

Mr. MONK. Is that new ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is to be built along the west bank of the river.

Repentigny wharf, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the wharf now under contract. The amount voted was $10,500 and we have added to that $5,000 for a new site and improvements. The estimated cost was $17,500.

Mr. AMES. From whom did you purchase the new site and what was paid for it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I can get that information.

Mr. MONK. Having begun the wharf at Repentigny, it is our duty to complete it, and therefore I do not take exception to the work. In a general way that wharf is of some use. But the point I want to make is this. I think the time has come to restrict our policy of building new wharfs and pay more attention to the completion of our transportation system. When this system was inaugurated of building little wharfs here and there, some of them absolutely useless—some in order to suit the demands of an individual, others merely to give contracts to some friends in the vicinity—the

problem of transportation had not reached the importance it has gained in the last four or five years. On last Saturday the hon. the Minister of Marine courteously invited members of parliament to visit a very important link in the transportation between east and west—the harbour of Montreal and the channel between Montreal and the middle of Lake St. Peter. Upon that trip were a number of members of parliament and some business men whose opinion is of the highest importance—business men who have helped to make Montreal what it is to-day. I was informed by some of them that if we are ever to reach the position we are entitled to in the system of transportation between the east and the west, we should alleviate the burden which at present weighs upon the port of Montreal in the shape of dues and charges. They supplemented that information by telling me that the larger portion of the United States and ports with which we are competing have no such charges at all as weigh upon the harbours of Montreal, Quebec and our ports in the maritime provinces.

Does it not seem to my hon. friend that as men of business who know the conditions of trade, we should direct all our effort not only to improving the channel between Montreal and Quebec and improving the ports of Montreal and Quebec and making them free ports, but also to giving the same advantages to our winter ports in the maritime provinces, that unless we do that we will not attain the position in the transportation trade of this continent to which we are entitled? Does it not seem to the government and to my hon. friend of far greater importance that we should devote our money to not only improving the port of Montreal by sweeping and deepening the channel between Montreal and Quebec, but also to diminishing the burden that weighs upon the port of Montreal. Are the people of Repentigny not much more interested in the carrying out of that improvement in the channel and port of Montreal than in the building of a $17,000 wharf at Repentigny itself? If the port of Montreal acquires the importance which is assigned to it by those who know what is the destiny of that port, if we do what I have just suggested to the minister, will not the people not of Montreal—I do not speak of it at all in a parochial or narrow sense—but the people of the whole province, to go no further than the province of Quebec, be immensely more benefited than if we spent a little money here and there to build wharfs where they are not absolutely necessary. I have seen time and again in our ordinary estimates large quantities of money voted from year to year for wharfs which it has not been deemed necessary to commence. The money has been voted in some cases three and four times. There cannot be any very urgent necessity as the member for Beauharnois pointed out a moment ago, there cannot be any very immediate or pressing need for a wharf, the construction of which is in this way put off from year to year, whereas on the other hand the necessity of immediately perfecting as far as possible and in every imaginable manner our system of transportation in order not only to benefit ourselves but to enable us to compete successfully with the American ports is something urgent, something that is being continually spoken of in the press and impressed upon the government by all who have any interest in it. What I say applies to the whole of these estimates and I think that whatever may be the small, temporary advantage which the government can derive by performing a little work here and a little work there upon these wharfs, the government would have the support of the whole country and in fact of each one of these places for which this money is voted, if it promulgated a policy with reference to our general system of transportation and adhered to that policy by devoting all our money available for the improvement of our harbours and rivers to the immediate improvement of our system of transportation generally. I believe that any improvements made in the direction I have indicated either at Montreal or Quebec or at our winter ports and any effort in the direction of making free national ports of Montreal and of these other ports would be a policy which if adopted by the government and vigorously pursued would have the support of the entire country. It is a question of changing our system, for I do not say that the present system is peculiar to this government. It has been the system for fifteen years past at least. But I say the time has arrived to make that change and the expenditure should be centralized in the direction of perfecting our system of transportation.

Mr. BRODEUR. The two questions which have been raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) are certainly very important questions. First, should we continue to build wharfs in different places? Let us speak for a moment of some cases in Quebec, and secondly, what should become of the port of Montreal. As to the building of wharfs in different parts of the province, I think that this work is perfectly justified and has been carried on for several years. Long before this government came into power, large sums of money were expended for the construction of wharfs in different places and it has been found advisable to keep these wharfs in proper repair and at the same time to build some new ones where it was necessary. It seems to me that the construction of these local wharfs has tended to develop to a large extent the trade which is now carried on in the city and port of Montreal, because those wharfs were for the accom-

modation of boats most of which plied between Montreal and those different places, and instead of being to the detriment of the port of Montreal, I think that these wharfs have tended to develop to a large extent the trade which is now carried on in Montreal. With regard to the port of Montreal itself it is a very broad question whether Montreal should be a free port or whether St. John, Quebec and Halifax should be free ports. Parliament has not had occasion this year to discuss this question but I hope before the end of this session some time may be found to discuss such an important issue. I am not so sure as my hon. friend seems to be that the whole country is asking that Montreal should be made a free port now. I never heard such an expression used by the members representing other parts of the country, but I suppose that if it was the general consensus of opinion in the country that Montreal and those other ports should be free ports, the question should be certainly considered as quickly as possible by the government. I suppose my hon. friend does not expect to-night that the government will make any declaration as to its policy with regard to Montreal or those other ports being free ports. I must add that at the same time we have been spending large sums of money in these different harbours, we have been taking money from the public chest for the construction of wharfs in Montreal. We have used public money for some improvements in Quebec and we have done the same thing in St. John and Halifax when it was necessary. Take the port of Montreal. What would Montreal be without the large expenditure which has been made in it by the central government for the opening of the channel between Quebec and Montreal? Therefore I do not think the port of Montreal has been neglected by this government and in every instance the government has spent money to aid the development of the port as much as possible.

Mr. AMES. Did I understand the minister to say that an opportunity would be given this session for the discussion of this question of making Montreal a free port?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly; any member would be free on a motion for supply to discuss such an important question, and it looks as if the session was to be rather long and so we might have an opportunity of discussing that question.

Mr. AMES. That is not quite what I gathered from the minister's remarks. I gathered that some legislation was in contemplation on the part of the government, the nature of which would afford occasion for considering this whole matter, not that it might be brought up by any private member on going into supply.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think the government has come to any final decision as to that and as to the bringing in of any legislation.

Mr. AMES. As to whether they will or will not bring in any legislation?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MONK. I did not contend that the whole country wanted Montreal to be made a free port, nor did I discuss the question of freeing our great national ports. What I wished to point out was that year after year, ever since I entered this parliament in 1896, and long before, it has been the custom to devote perhaps half a million dollars to the building of wharfs where there is no urgent necessity for them, merely to satisfy some particular individuals who desire the wharf or who desire a contract to build a wharf. That was the system before this government came into power, and it is still continued. I invite the attention of the minister and the government to this point—whether we have enough money to do this in the face of the competition with our great ports and the ports in the United States. The Americans are expending immense sums not only to free their ports—if the information given to me last Saturday is correct, they are free ports at the present moment—but to make them absolutely perfect for the handling of merchandise. I ask is it not advisable, in the face of that rivalry, for the government to adopt a system different from the one that has prevailed for twenty years, to adopt a policy rendered necessary by the present needs of transportation and to spend it according to some well-considered and definite plan? Now, a part of the plan that has always been adopted, if not expressly then impliedly, by the government is to improve the navigation on the St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal—that link of our transportation system which has been brought to our notice by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries lately. Would it not be better for us to perfect that link? We are deepening the channel and we invite vessels drawing thirty feet and more to come up to Montreal. But what is the use of spending these vast sums upon the channel of the St. Lawrence if, when the vessels arrive at our ports, contrary to the plan adopted in the United States, they are oppressed by heavy charges which never diminish? If this system were adopted, we could not have these diversified votes every year.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think they are of great use in developing the country.

Mr. MONK. I do not deny that if we had enough money to build wharfs all over the country, we should do it. I have no doubt also that within very restricted limits, these votes result in enhancing the commerce at Quebec and Montreal. But the question is, what is the most pressing need? My hon.

friend says that we have spent money in the port of Montreal. I do not deny that. He must recognize however, that of the millions expended to improve the port of Montreal, the government has merely guaranteed——

Mr. BRODEUR. We have spent money besides.

Mr. MONK. I will come to that in a moment. But the greater part of that immense sum is only guaranteed by the government, the government has good security and in the payment of interest the harbour of Montreal has never defaulted. The government has built a wharf at the foot of the current, if that is what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) alludes to. That involved an expenditure of some $300,000 or $400,000, I think.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was $700,000, I believe.

Mr. MONK. It was originally stated that it would cost less than $500,000. Perhaps the figure has gone up since then. The debt of the port of Montreal, if I mistake not, is some $8,000,000, for which, as I say, the harbour is responsible, and in the payment of interest on this it has never defaulted. But I say that, so long as that harbour is not on the same footing as Newport News, Baltimore, New York, Boston and Portland we have no right to spend money on wharfs all over the country. If we do so, we shall see our shipping go to the United States.

Mr. AMES. The remarks of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) make it necessary to call the attention of the government to the fact that the wharfs they have built at the lower end of the St. Mary's Current, the Fielding wharf, the Laurier wharf and the Sutherland wharf, are so situated that it is almost impossible for vessels to come in and go out without running aground on the shoal immediately below.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think my hon. friend is mistaken.

Mr. AMES. Only this morning, one of the vessels leaving the Sutherland wharf ran on the shoal immediately below and is stuck there at this moment, with all the tugs they can get, trying to get her off. The government should remove this shoal which is almost opposite and immediately below the Sutherland wharf.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that it is the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to remove that obstruction. But we have no information in the Public Works Department as to that.

Mr. AMES. I sent for the paper containing the item to which I referred and I now have it before me. It speaks of a vessel called the 'Tampican.' The headings says:

(Translation.) The 'Tampican' goes aground on a shoal, at Maisonneuve.—An investigation anticipated.

Then it goes on to speak of the 'Tampican' running on the low ground immediately opposite the Sutherland wharf. The point is that the government have only half done their work, unless they remove this shoal.

Mr. BRODEUR. Did the vessel go outside the channel?

Mr. AMES. (Translation.)

At five o'clock this morning, within a few yards of the wharf, opposite the street Pius the IXth, at Maisonneuve, the Leyland liner 'Tampican' went aground at the foot of Letourneux street, on a shoal. For several hours, three powerful tugs have tugged away and exerted every effort to move the stranded steamer from her awkward position.

The 'Tampician' has on board a full cargo of hay, lumber, &c., and a few hundred head of cattle, bound for London and Leith, and the consensus of opinion is that they will have to lighter part of her cargo, in order to set her afloat again.

In the other papers there is a plan showing where the vessel is aground.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is under the control of the harbour commissioners of Montreal; but the channel within the limits of the harbour is under the control at present of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. All the works which have been done within the limits of the harbour of Montreal are in the upper part of the harbour. which is entirely under the control of the commission, I mean the deepening of the channel at that place. I see by the map published in the papers to-night that the vessel went outside the channel.

Mr. AMES. But the vessel, in getting away from the wharf, found it impossible to get under sufficient headway before the current took her and twisted her round and landed her aground on that shoal. The government should have included in their work the removal of that shoal so as to make the three piers of real value to navigation.

Mr. BRODEUR. According to the map I have seen, I do not think the criticism made by my hon. friend as to the side of the wharf is correct, because I see that near the wharf the depth of water is 32 feet. But this vessel, instead of going near those wharfs, went on the shoal outside the channel entirely.

Rimouski—extension of pier and dredging tidal basin, including repairs, $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for continuing the harbour repairs already commenced, for extending the usefulness of the government pier at Rimouski, and to permit dredging to be proceeded with without harm to the cribwork. The work will cost $50,000.

Mr. AMES. I would like to bring to the attention of the minister the fact that the

conditions which have made the expenditure on this Rimouski pier in the past necessary and valuable, have at the present time almost disappeared. When it was contemplated to build this Rimouski pier it was used as the terminus from which the mails were brought down to the steamer, and the small steamer which acted as a tender used to go along the north side of the pier and get the mails. It was also used for pilot boats to come in and shelter. Now, as the minister knows, steamers do not stop any longer opposite Rimouski, but go on to Father Point, and the mails also are taken on board at Father Point, therefore there is little trade left for Rimouski. Moreover, I think that pier is already half a mile long, and for the first half at least the water is not more than four or five feet deep on either side, and it is only at the end that you can get any depth at all. Now it is proposed to continue spending thousands of dollars to extend that pier further out where it is impossible to get deep water. It seems to me that the usefulness of that pier to-day has to a great extent passed away. It is quite ample as it stands to serve all existing purposes. The need of that pier has practically passed five miles down below to Father Point.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand there are no shipping facilities at Father Point, the shipping facilities are at Rimouski, and all the shipping which is done by the railway is done at Rimouski. Now the work which is proposed does not only cover the repairs which are needed to the wharf now in existence, there is no extension provided ; but the item is to construct at that place a basin. We will build another wharf at the end, and then vessels will come in there and be sheltered, and will be in a proper position to take on cargoes.

Mr. AMES. Only three years ago the entire end of that pier was completely refitted with new timber, and the shed was reconstructed. There should be very little repair required on that wharf at present. You have already a basin on the north side sufficiently large for all the vessels that come in there. I have been down to that pier many times in the summer, and have rarely found more than two or three small schooners there of twenty or thirty tons burden. The extension pier was used as the terminus of the Intercolonial for the transhipment of the mails. So long as tenders came there to receive the mails, just so long that wharf had some usefulness ; but now that all that has been transferred to Father Point, the wharf becomes simply a local wharf.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information I have, on the contrary, is that we have not proper shipping facilities for the local business.

Mr. AMES. None of the lumber is ever loaded on that wharf, it is always lightered out from the mill. The lumber mills are on the other side of the bay.

Mr. BRODEUR. My information is that it is loaded from the wharf.

Mr. AMES. That is a large amount of money to spend for a wharf that has only local use.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will try to make it national.

Mr. AMES. You cannot, with four feet of water.

Rivière Batiscan—dredging channel at mouth, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract, awarded to Mr. Poupore, the lowest tenderer, at 13½ cents per cubic yard.

Rivière Chateauguay—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is proposed to continue dredging operations during the fiscal year in Chateauguay basin, at the mouth of the river.

Mr. BERGERON. In the circumstances that prevail at the mouth of that river, you will have to go on for ever spending thousands of dollars every year for dredging.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to provide the necessary works, and it is not certain that the permanent works suggested by my hon. friend would be sufficient.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this in the river itself ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, at the mouth of the river.

Mr. BERGERON. Near the island ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. There is quicksand at that point. The government that preceded this one worked at this point and the present government are working there now. They have kept on spending so much every year, whereas, if cribwork was constructed, in the long run it would be better.

Rivière Chateauguay—enlargement at discharge into St. John river, $2,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the enlargement of the waterway of the Chateauguay river at the point where a portion of its waters pass into the St. John river at the time of the debacle.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the meaning of that ? Is that our River Chateauguay ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, this is to provide for the enlargement of the St. John river.

Mr. BROWN. The St. John reaches from the River St. Lawrence to the River Chateauguay.

Mr. BERGERON. I never heard this part called the River Chateauguay before. You were working there last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, this is the same vote.

Rivière du Loup (Fraserville)—harbour improvements, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is being done by contract.

Mr. BERGERON. I know that a wharf was built there not long ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision in accordance with the estimate submitted by the chief engineer for the construction of a pier parallel to that now in existence at Rivière du Loup and at a distance of some 800 feet to the north-westward therefrom, the object being to form, by dredging, a spacious protected basin or artificial harbour, with a ruling depth of from 10 to 20 feet at extreme low water, spring tides. This is the same thing as in the case of Rimouski.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Chiarman, upon this vote for the harbour improvements at Rivière du Loup, I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that we are always keeping in mind the scheme of enlarging the harbour, which has been submitted to the government two years ago. The plans and specifications are ready, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the government to begin that work at an early date ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) There is nothing definitely settled upon that point, that is to say, as to inviting tenders. As my hon. friend is aware, that work will require a considerable amount of money ; the cost will exceed $200,000.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) What is the nature of the work projected ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The idea would be to build a new pier or embankment parallel to the one already existing, so as to make between these two piers a basin into which large vessels and trans-Atlantic steamers could take their cargoes from these piers.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) The exports of lumber from Rivière du Loup are presently 40,000,000 feet per year. Unfortunately, the oceanic steamers are unable to come near the present pier, which is used by the boats of the Richelieu Navigation Company, and they are obliged to lay at anchor. Should this new pier be constructed, there would be a depth of 23 feet at low water, and the steamers could then easily get into the basin. As soon as these facilities are afforded, over 1,000,000 feet of lumber may be easily exported from Rivière du Loup every year.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Where will that pier be constructed ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) At a distance of about 800 feet from the one now existing at Pointe des Sauvages.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) On which side ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) The intention would be to build a pier 800 feet long further below the existing wharf, so as to create a basin.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) On the river itself ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Yes ; almost opposite Hotel Bellevue.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) This new pier would then face the road to Fraserville ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) No ; that road is on the hill. The new pier would be at a distance of 800 feet from the one now existing. It would be the second wall of the basin.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Has this matter not been talked over two years ago ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) Yes ; and nothing has been done yet.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I would like to know if plans are really made at the present time for this work ? Has any land been bought ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Yes ; from Mrs. Dansereau.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) What is the area of the land bought ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) I think it is about 70,000 feet from the road down to the river.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) What is the price paid for it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) $9,000.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) Was it valuated ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Yes ; by three valuators.

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) The valuation has been approved by the Deputy Minister of Public Works.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) This work will cost over $200,000 ?

Mr. GAUVREAU. (Translation.) That is the estimate. You must not forget that it will be the finest seaport below Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) First you asked for an appropriation of $20,000, did you not ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) We asked at first a vote of $32,000, upon which we have expended $12,000.

Mr. BERGERON. (Translation.) I suppose these $12,000 include the price of the land, $9,000, and the legal expenses connected therewith for notaries and lawyers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Yes; the price of the land and the incidental expenses, costs of survey, &c. The $20,000 we ask this year is a revote. If we use these $20,000 it will make a total of $32,000.

Rivière du Loup (en haut)—dredging and improvements at mouth, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. By contract with Mr. Randolph McDonald.

Mr. BERGERON. We had an amount of money voted the other day for that in the supplementary estimates.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was for work done in the current fiscal year.

Mr. BERGERON. How much is that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not remember the amount but I suppose it must have been $2,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Oh, more than that. How much money has been spent altogether?

Mr. BRODEUR. So far there has been expended $21,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Now you are asking for $35,000 more.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are asking for $15,000 more.

Rivière du Lievre—reconstruction of dam at Little Rapids, $35,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is called for by the chief engineer to reconstruct works built in 1887 and 1890, in connection with the dam swept away by the destructive land slide, October, 1903.

Mr. BERGERON. How much has been spent to date on account of this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. We spent $20,000 last year; there were $3,800 in the supplementary estimates, and there are $35,000 more to complete the work.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a large amount of money.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was a lot of damage done, and I think the money was well spent.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the work done by contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. It cannot be done by contract, because the department cannot ascertain the nature of the work to make specifications. We expect to complete it next year.

Rivière Maskinongé—dredging, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract is awarded to Davis & Sons, Ottawa, at 15 cents.

Rivière Ouelle—pier, repairs, &c., $5,600.

Mr. BERGERON. We had better stop here now; we have done a very good day's work.

Mr. BRODEUR. Could we not finish the Quebec items?

Mr. BERGERON. Personally, I have no objection, but some of our friends have gone away with the understanding we would stop here. We have done a pretty good day's work.

Mr. BUREAU. Let us take the items for the Rivière St. Maurice.

Rivière St. Maurice—channel between Grande Piles and La Tuque, $12,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What is this expenditure for?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is work that was done by the government dredge. We have a dredge on the Rivière St. Maurice, and this vote is for her maintenance and the payment of wages.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that dredge kept there all the time?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Since when?

Mr. BUREAU. The dredge has been there for several years. This is to improve that part of the St. Maurice river which is navigable for 80 miles, between La Tuque and Grande Piles. There are sandbars which form at different places, and the only way to remove them, in order to enable the logs to come down and the boats to get through and allow the lumbermen to get in their supplies, is by dredging. There is another item in the estimates for the building of a dam, and when this dam is built, it will raise the water and do away with the necessity for the dredging in that part of the St. Maurice river.

Mr. BERGERON. The work at Nicolet and Chateauguay seems to be similar to this. I am not criticising this vote, but I think it would be better to do some permanent work there than to be constantly spending money in dredging, which has to be repeated year after year.

Mr. BUREAU. The other item for the dam will do away with the necessity for this.

Mr. AMES. What depth of water do you get in the St. Maurice river between Grande Piles and La Tuque?

Mr. BUREAU. Five or six feet at the lowest water.

River St. Maurice—dam at Grande Piles, $19,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote will provide for the construction of a dam 940 feet long at the head of the Grande Piles falls, with the object of increasing the boom area in order to afford accommodation for the continually increasing cut of logs on the St. Maurice river and its tributaries.

Mr. BERGERON. Why was this work not commenced last year ?

Mr. BUREAU. They have been taking soundings which is very difficult work at that particular spot, and it took considerable time before a decision could be arrived at as to what kind of a dam would be built. We have the report of the engineers, and soundings have been made in different places during the last two years. This year plans are ready and have been submitted to the department.

Mr. BERGERON. How much will it cost ?

Mr. BUREAU. I believe the estimate is $50,000 or $60,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Will this dam do away with the necessity of constantly dredging the river between Grande Piles and La Tuque ?

Mr. BUREAU. The object of the dam is threefold. In the first place, it will back up the waters for eighteen miles and make the river navigable, in the second place, it will afford accommodation for storing the logs, and I may say that within a few years the capacity of the St. Maurice river has increased from one-half million pieces to six million pieces this year. They have now no place in the river to store these logs, and the further back they have to go in order to get the logs the longer it takes to get them down to the mills. If there is no storage for these logs in the river, then the result will be that the cut of this year could not be got out until next year. Proper storage for the logs would more than double the producing capacity of the St. Maurice river. In the third place, below Grande Piles the water is sometimes too low in summer for the drive, and the mills have to suspend work. The river is shallow and full of rocks in that place. This dam will raise the water and facilitate the driving of the logs. It will also do away with the necessity for dredging, it will increase the capacity of the St. Maurice river and facilitate the driving of logs.

Mr. BERGERON. Who are the lumbermen interested in this?

Mr. BUREAU. There are quite a number of lumber concerns on the river. I cannot tell you all from memory. There is the St. Maurice Lumber Company, the Gres Falls Lumber Company, Alexander Baptist, the Burrill Lumber Company, the Union Bag and Paper Company, the Laurentide Paper Company, the Belgo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Company, the Burgess Sulphite Fibre Company.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand this is to cost $60,000?

Mr. BUREAU. I think it will cost more than that.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me that we are spending this $70,000 to help the lumber companies.

Mr. BUREAU. They are paying for it.

Mr. BERGERON. In what way ?

Mr. BUREAU. In boom and slide dues.

Mr. MONK. We would get that revenue anyway from them.

Mr. BUREAU. I do not think so.

Mr. MONK. I have no doubt that these great lumbermen contribute in a variety of ways to the national revenue; I contribute myself, we all contribute. But, the question is whether it would be proper for the government to contribute to this work, which is for the benefit of private property. It is admitted it will cost $70,000. My hon. friend said it would improve the navigation to the extent of eighteen miles at that point, but navigation there extends over ninety miles. We should certainly obtain some assistance from the lumber company.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought my hon. friend wanted everything free?

Mr. MONK. I never urged that. What I said is that a lot of these expenses should be cut down and the money spent on perfecting our transportation system. It is unfair, when we require to spend so much on that system, that we should sacrifice nearly $100,000 to advance private interests.

Mr. BUREAU. Every log that goes down to the St. Lawrence contributes to the revenue of the government. We had eighty steamers last season which came to Three Rivers to load deals manufactured at our mills, and should this dam be built double this number of steamers could take their cargoes of deals at Three Rivers, but the hon. gentleman thinks they should go to Montreal. He says that this ought to be paid by the lumbermen. Not at all, every log that comes through the slides and is stored on the St. Maurice river, is an addition to the revenue of the country. The lumbermen have agreed that if the cost of this dam is more than represented by the saving in dredging and the increase of revenue, from the greater output, they will contribute.

Mr. MONK. I expressed no such desire as to bring this trade to Montreal, but I do pretend that the money would be expended to much better purpose in improving our transportation system. This expenditure is for the benefit of a lumber company, and when it comes to building a dam which will cost $100,000 and afterwards have to be maintained by the government——

Mr. BRODEUR. We will be getting a revenue.

Mr. MONK. Yes, but we are spending largely already in the interest of that locality. That the lumbermen should contribute to this work made in their interest is only fair.

Mr. BRODEUR. When the hon. gentleman speaks of private interests he should bear in mind that there are very large industries in that section of the country which have become developed to a wonderful extent during the last ten years.

Mr. MONK. I understood that this expenditure was for the purpose of facilitating the bringing down of logs.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the erection of that dam would have the effect of increasing the lumber industry in that vicinity. To-day the situation is not absolutely favourable to the driving of logs in that section of the country. The water is rather shut off and at some seasons of the year it is difficult to drive the logs. It is expected that by the construction of this work, the driving of the logs, will become a certainty and can be made at all seasons of the year and that consequently an increased business will be done in that section of the country. This dam is also going to raise the level of the water in that section. To-day we have to spend $12,000 a year for dredging there. We expect by the construction of this dam that this work will not be necessary. It is a very good piece of work. Besides that my hon. friend says it is going to benefit a private interest. He calls the millions of money invested in those works private interest. Besides that we draw a revenue which is going to increase from year to year. Last year and the year previous we got $29,000.

Mr. MONK. That is less than we expended for ordinary yearly charges and repairs.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is one view of the case where we get some revenue out of the expenditures, and I do not know why my hon. friend should object to expenditures being made in that section of the country when in other places large sums of money are being expended without any revenue at all to the country.

Mr. AMES. There are two issues involved. The first one comes from the fact that we are apparently creating a precedent that at some future date may be dangerous. The conditions of high and low water are the same as exist in all rivers where lumbering is carried on. You find the same difficulty in the St. John river where there is the greatest difficulty in getting logs which are cut in one winter down to St. John to saw them the same year. If you come to the rescue of these lumber people on the St. Maurice, will you not have similar demands from the lumbermen on all of the other important lumbering rivers? They will ask to be enabled to carry on their industry with similarly favourable conditions to those on the St. Maurice.

Mr. BUREAU. Does my hon. friend know that there are only three rivers under the control of the government; the others are all in the hands of private corporations? The River St. John is not under government control.

Mr. AMES. The government have control over the River St. John. You will find that we will be asked to vote sums for other rivers besides this. The minister speaks of the revenue to be derived. There is nothing in that argument as this will simply enable that revenue to be derived more quickly; for the lumbermen must pay the dues sooner or later on every log cut on the head waters of the St. Maurice.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows there are over 60 miles of navigation in this district on the river and I suppose there can be no objection to the general policy of the government in seeing that the proper dredging is made in that section of the river. It costs us to-day more than $12,000 to do that dredging and it is thought that by this dam that will be avoided. This dam will cost us $100,000 and at 4 per cent that is $4,000 a year, which is a great saving.

Mr. AMES. The minister has anticipated what I had intended to say in that particular connection. It does not seem to me that the dredging in the stretch above Grande Piles will be discontinued, and therefore that item of $12,000 will not be expended.

Dredging eastern channel, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract to Mr. Poupore at 12½ cents.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the standard for that price?

Mr. BUREAU. In this case they have to carry the dirt three miles which adds to the expense.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. BRODEUR moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BERGERON. What business is to be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. BRODEUR. I believe that the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated this afternoon that we would take up the Intercolonial discussion to-morrow.

Mr. BERGERON. A statement will be made by the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson)?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. And we hope to go into Committee of Supply taking up the estimates of the Department of Public Works.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 13, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

EMPLOYMENT OF LONDON REGULARS AT NIAGARA.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Minister of Militia whether or not any orders were sent to the men who were mentioned yesterday ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Which would permit them to arrive at London in time to vote to-day ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I shall read what took place. I sent for the Adjutant General as promised, and immediately after the conclusion of the debate yesterday this telegram was sent :

General Otter,
Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario.

If you can spare the services of non-commissioned officers sent from London, and any of them wish to vote, you will return such to London at once with orders to report again at Niagara on Wednesday.

(Sgd.) ADJUTANT GENERAL.

This morning the Adjutant General received the following reply :

Niagara-on-the-Lake, 13th June, 1905.

Adjutant General, Ottawa.

Non-commissioned officers from London have been given opportunity to return to London for purpose of voting, but do not desire to avail themselves of such.

(Sgd.) BRIGADIER GENERAL OTTER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The telegram I received on the subject was that the men received permission, but too late to make London in time to vote.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. They had plenty of time ; I can assure my hon. friend there were two trains available after the telegram was received.

INSTRUCTIONS TO RETURNING OFFICERS IN BY-ELECTIONS.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I wish to draw the attention of the government to what I believe is a serious irregularity in connection with the by-elections which are being carried on in North Oxford and London. The government is aware that clause 65 of the Dominion Elections Act reads as follows :

An elector if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate or by any elector present shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take.

That is part of clause 65. Then when we come to the form of the oath that has been sent out to the deputy returning officers by the returning officer at Woodstock, we find that it does not include the clauses in the Ontario Elections Act or the Dominion Elections Act with reference to bribery. Clauses 8 and 9 of form 18 in the schedule to the Elections Act of the province of Ontario are not included ; all the other clauses with reference to the bribery of voters are included. These clauses read as follows :

8. That you have not received anything, nor has anything been promised you either directly or indirectly, either to induce you to vote at this election or for loss of time, travelling expenses, hire of team, or any other service connected therewith, and (9) that you have not directly or indirectly paid or promised anything to any person either to induce him to vote or to refrain from voting at this elecion.

These clauses have not been placed in the form which has been sent out by this Dominion government. We received notice of this yesterday at Woodstock, and at 2 o'clock we interviewed the returning officer, Sheriff Brady, of Woodstock. I called his attention to the form that he was sending out, a copy of which I received from him and have in my hand, and called his attention to these clauses not being placed in that form. He at once telephoned to Ottawa to the Secretary of State, and after holding considerable consultation with the Secretary of State, he came to the conclusion that the answer was not satisfactory. He then sent a telegram to the office of the Secretary of State, and in the afternoon received a reply stating that the government would do nothing in the matter. I believe that this is a very serious position for any government to be placed in, to send out forms such as I have in my hand, from which the bribery clauses have been entirely omitted.

And I might say further that I urged the returning officer to insist on having these clauses in the form sent to the deputy returning officers throughout the country. He refused to do it, stating that the form the government sent him was the one that would be used and that he had already sent them out to the deputy returning officers. And I certainly believe that this is a matter of vital importance not only to the people in the ridings in which elections are being held to-day, but to the whole country. I understand that in the last Dominion election these were the forms used in many different parts of the country. I certainly believe that if this is the manner in which the people of the province are to be treated, if only part of the oath is to be placed in the form to be used, I cannot help but see that it is a scheme, on the part of the government, might I say, to take advantage of

the honest electors and the honest people of this country ?

I move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I must inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) and the House that this is the first information I have received of anything of the kind suggested by him in his remarks. The Secretary of State has not communicated with me on the subject. Had the hon. gentleman given me notice of his intention to bring the matter forward, I would have informed myself with regard to it. He says—or rather, he insinuates—that there has been a conspiracy on the part of the government to deprive the electors of their rights. I must tell the hon. gentleman that this language is absolutely uncalled for and unwarranted—there has been no conspiracy of the kind. I never heard of the matter until this moment. I can hardly be expected, under the circumstances, to give the hon. gentleman information as to the papers sent by the Secretary of State to the returning officers. But I am sure that nothing unusual has been done, but that the regular course has been followed. Had I been informed by the hon. gentleman that he intended to make such a statement as he has made, I would have made it my duty to call upon the Secretary of State to ascertain what had actually been done. But I am sure that nothing has been done by the Secretary of State that is not according to the law, and I hasten to repel the insinuation of the hon. gentleman that in the election there has been any difference in the form sent out in one county from that sent out in others. All the forms were the same; either all were right or all were wrong. It is not fair to the government, it would not be fair to anybody, that such grave insinuations should be made when the hon. gentleman who makes them had the opportunity at once to call the attention of the government to the matter and receive an explanation. It is not possible now for me to give any answer to the hon. gentleman except to say that my old colleague, my venerable colleague, the Secretary of State is incapable of doing such a thing as has been insinuated against him. Hon. Mr. Scott is an old man, a respectable man if there is one in the country, a man now approaching fourscore years. It is not fair to him to insinuate against him that in his old age he would be guilty of such an act as has been suggested. It is probably like the telegram of Mr. Cousins of Medicine Hat ;—when we have the full information before us, it will probably be found another roorback.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont). The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not seem to feel indignation that the plain provisions of the statute have been violated, not only in the elections now going on, but in the general elections of November last. But, that a matter of this kind should be mentioned even in what seemed to me, the moderate terms used by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) seemed to excite the right hon. gentleman to grave and indignant rebuke. I should have thought that there might be some room for indignation in the mind of my right hon. friend that the statute had been violated, that an act had been committed, which, if committed wilfully, I suppose would render some one liable to indictment under the common laws of England for malfeasance in office. I am not saying that it was done wilfully. But I have heard from a number of my friends on this side that exactly the same thing was perpetrated in the last general election, and with somewhat extraordinary results. I am told that in one riding the oath was taken in the mutilated form for a time, but after the deputy returning officer had been informed that he was to modify the oath sent out by the administration of which the right hon. gentleman is the head, the result was that it was not taken in that form by certain electors. I have before me, handed to me by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), the form of oath which was sent out by this government. I do not care whether the Secretary of State sent it out or what member of the government did so. My right hon. friend is responsible for sending it out, for he is the head of the administration ; and every gentleman who sits on those treasury benches is responsible for this violation of the statute, which I am assuming is not wilful, but which certainly merits investigation and discussion in this parliament and in this country.

Now, what are the circumstances ? By section 65 of the Dominion Elections Act, the oath which is used in the province must be used in Dominion elections. These provisions of the statute are quite distinct, and I will not trouble the House by reading it, for my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) drafted these provisions, and no doubt, has them in mind as well as the debate that took place when this statute was enacted by this parliament. We are referred, therefore, to the oath in use in Ontario, in order to ascertain the proper form of oath to be submitted to electors in these by-elections, for the form of oath in use in the province must be used in Dominion elections with certain modifications which are not material for this purpose.

In Ontario we find this ' Form 16 ' which I exhibit to the House and which bears this title : ' Ontario Form 16. Form of Oath in ordinary cases to be administered at an election to a voter by virtue of manhood suffrage, made applicable to Dominion elections.' Now we come down to the Ontario statute, and we ascertain whether or

not this form corresponds with that known as 'Form 16' in that statute. Perhaps in order to make the matter perfectly plain I had better read the whole document:

Ontario form 16. Form of oath in ordinary cases to be administered at an election to a voter by virtue of manhood suffrage made applicable to Dominion elections.

Ontario Act, section 98. Dominion Elections Act, 1900, sections 21 and 65:

1. You swear (1) that you are the person named or intended to be named by the name of in the list of voters now shown to you in the poll book.

2. That you are a British subject by birth or naturalization.

3. That you have resided within this province for nine months before the (2) day of , being the day fixed by the statute or by by-law authorized by statute for beginning to make the assessment roll in which you were entitled to be entered as a person qualified to vote.

4. That you were at the date aforesaid in good faith a resident of and domiciled in the municipality in the list of which you were entered; that you have resided in this electoral district continuously from the said date (3), and that you are now actually residing and domiciled therein.

Then follow the alternative forms:

(3) That you have resided within this province for twelve months before the (2) day of , being the day up to which complaint could be made to the county judge under the Ontario Voters' Lists Act to insert the name of any person in the list.

(4) That you were at the time aforesaid in good faith a resident of and domiciled in the municipality in the list of which you were entered; that you have resided in this electoral district continuously from the said date (3), and that you are actually residing and domiciled therein.

(5) That you are entitled to vote at this election and in this municipality.

(6) That you are of the full age of 21 years.

(7) That you have not voted before at this election, either at this or any other polling place.

So help you God.

Now, that is the end of the form and up to the words 'so help me God' it corresponds exactly with the form in the Ontario statute, but the Ontario statute which is made applicable by the enactment of this parliament contains two further clauses which I will now read and which are absolutely absent from the form which was sent out not only during the general elections, as I said, but during these two elections that are now proceeding. These clauses are as follows:

(8) That you have not received anything, nor has anything been promised you, either directly or indirectly, either to induce you to vote at this election, or for loss of time, travelling expenses, hire of team, or any other service connected therewith.

(9) And that you have not directly or indirectly, paid or promised anything to any person, either to induce him to vote or to refrain from voting at this election.

So help you God.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

I think this is a subject which has been before the House one way or another during the present session, because my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved for all these forms, and if I am not mistaken some reference was made to this circumstance either by him or by some other hon. gentleman. At all events my hon. friend from Hamilton brought it to the attention of the House by moving for the forms. I think that when two of the most important clauses of the oath are omitted from a document sent out to the returning officers throughout this country only a few days ago, when these two clauses are omitted from a document prepared by this government and for which document my right hon. friend the leader of the government is as much responsible as any one of his colleagues, we require something more than a mere airy rebuke to my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) for mentioning this matter. Does not my right hon. friend think that when a returning officer, at the instance of my hon. friend from Lambton, brings the matter, both by telephone and telegraph, to the attention of this government on the day before the election, some other answer should be given to that returning officer than that this is a matter in which the government cannot interfere and in which nothing will be done. Conservatives not only in these elections, but during the general elections in November last were compelled to go to the trouble themselves, as far as possible, of bringing the provisions of the law to the attention of the deputy returning officers. I am bound to suppose, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that this is a mere oversight, but it is a most remarkable oversight, as I think my right hon. friend himself will admit. For what possible reason, under what possible misapprehension could a department of this government, having a trained and competent staff, venture to prepare a document of that kind leaving out two clauses, the omission of which may be made to answer a certain purpose which would not be a very creditable purpose, I am sure. Under what circumstances could this have arisen? Have the government been in ignorance during the last four or five months of the character of the document which they sent out during the last general election, a document which was used, as I understand it, not only in the province of Ontario, but in the province of Quebec as my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) informs me? It seems to me a most remarkable thing, if the circumstance is as stated by my hon. friend from Beauharnois, that the bribery clauses of the Ontario oath should not only have been omitted, but that the bribery clauses of the oath according to the provincial laws of Quebec should also have been omitted from the form sent into that province. You might understand how one

mistake might be made in regard to a particular province, in regard to the province of Ontario, but will my right hon. friend or any member of his government inform me how it should happen that the bribery clauses of the oath in other provinces have been omitted ? I must confess I cannot understand it for the present and I venture to hope that my right hon. friend will, if he is not able to do so to-day, on some future occasion, give to the House some further explanation than that which he has vouchsafed this afternoon.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, in order to discuss this question intelligently and in such a way as to be of use to the House it seems to me that it would have been proper to have placed those who are standing in defence of the government in possession of the facts. I must confess that I had not heard of this matter until it was mentioned a moment ago by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). Accidentally I happened to see my hon. friend the Secretary of State in the lobby. I put a question to him as to the forms used in the elections in the county of Oxford and he told me that they are the forms which have been used during the last two general elections.

Mr. BARKER. They are not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have the form here which was sent out in the general elections of 1900 and it includes this clause —in the province of Ontario, at least.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I make the statement on the authority of the Secretary of State, with whom I was speaking within the last two minutes. Of course, I am not in a position to verify the accuracy of the statement made by my hon. friend opposite at this moment, because I have not the forms before me. It seems to me that there is only one way to dispose of a matter of this sort. This is a most serious charge ; it is a most important matter and it should be investigated. Now, we have a Committee on Privileges and Elections which has been formed especially for the purpose of looking into matters of this sort and if we had this matter referred to that committee we could thoroughly investigate it, get at the facts, speak from the book and be in a position to make statements and not insinuations. I would welcome a reference of this matter to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I think the sooner we have it the better. I am speaking with the consent of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister when I say that we would welcome an investigation at any time the matter is brought before that committee.

Mr. FOSTER. This is not a matter of insinuation. Why does my hon. friend the Minister of Justice say that it is ? Here are the two documents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not seen them.

Mr. FOSTER. I will let my hon. friend see them in a moment. But had he not better keep his assertion that they are insinuations only when they appear in print over the government's own signature until he has seen them ? Why should he make that assertion before he has the papers before him ? The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) nearly went into hysterics at the wrong that had been done to his venerable and gray haired colleague. If that colleague had the facts of this matter first brought to his attention by telephone, if he were not careful enough or intelligent enough to give an answer, and if given he was appealed to by telegram he gave the decision that it was all right and that the government would not interfere, can the right hon. leader of the government or any member of the government say that they are entirely without blame in this regard and that it was not brought to their attention ? To whose attention should the matter be brought if not to that of the Secretary of State ? What is the Secretary of State there for if he is not there to make wrong things right ? If he does not know enough to do it he should consult with his colleagues and with the Prime Minister and see that it is done right. But, he neither did it himself nor consulted with his colleagues, it seems. With an obstinacy that is characteristic of him he said that nothing would be done, that it was all right. Did he consult the right hon. leader of the government in the matter ? If he did not then he took a great deal of responsibility upon himself and he took a responsibility which the right hon. gentleman cannot disengage himself from but must share equally with him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the matter with hon. gentlemen opposite? Something seems to have struck the risible nerve of my hon. friend there and he cannot contain himself. In 1900, the government of which my right hon. friend is head, and of which the present Minister of Justice was the Minister of Justice then, made this up and in that form which purported to be form 16 of the Ontario Act they gave an exact rescript of that form in which appeared these two sections which were omitted from the next form :

(8) That you have not received anything, nor has anything been promised you, either directly or indirectly in order to induce you to vote at this election or for loss of time, travelling expenses, hire of teams or any other service connected therewith.

(9) And that you have not directly or indirectly paid or promised anything to any person in order to induce him to vote or refrain from voting at the election.

That was the form issued by the government in the year 1900, and under the Secretary of State who is in office to-day. Why the change? Now, when we come to the by-election for 1905—I am not speaking of the general elections now for I have not the form before me—what do you find? There is the same assertion at the top that this is No. 16 of the Ontario Act oath to be administered, and a lie at the bottom of it. Who was it that authorized the lie? Who was it that deceived the people of this country and every deputy returning officer and every voter, by saying to him as he came to vote: this is the oath that the Ontario statute provides for; this is all you need take so far as the Ontario law is concerned; and then excise two principal clauses from that oath in so far as bribery and corruption are concerned. Who did it? It was not my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden); it was not even my bold and audacious friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) so lacking in courtesy as to dare to bring up at this hour in parliament a thing of such a shameless and glaring kind as this. A conspiracy, said my right hon. friend. Who charges a conspiracy? He may talk conspiracy if he likes, but he has got to acknowledge utter and crass neglect or something worse on the part of the department which once knew what was right and did it, and which next election knew what was right and did wrong. That is just as bad as conspiracy. I say that whether there was design or not, there is the plain fact: there are the two instructions, one of 1900 and one of 1905; there is the statute of Ontario which has the oath out of which the principal parts have been excised by the Secretary of State of the government of which my right hon. friend is the head and of which the Minister of Justice is now and was then the Minister of Justice. In the general elections last fall, when hon. gentlemen opposite were using every kind of influence they could; when they exercised their immense influence to draw sums of money from contributors right and left and used it with the most lavish hand that was ever known in this Dominion of Canada, there was a reason why the bribery oath should be left out. To-day there may be the same reason why the bribery oath should be left out. It is left out. It is not our fault it is left out. It was this government that left it out knowing what they should have put in, and doing what they should have done in 1900, but neglecting to do it to-day.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). For a number of years I have taken a very great interest in the election law. On a former occasion I introduced a Bill with the object of amending the Election Act, and as I thought improving that law, and I am happy to say that the suggestions I made then have since been embodied in the statute. This matter which at present is engaging the attention of the House was discussed by many of the newspapers in the province of Ontario on account of what they called the mutilated oath that was used in the Dominion elections. In order to have the subject brought before parliament the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) moved on the 15th of February that all the forms used in the last Dominion election be laid on the table. They were laid on the table of the House, and I took pains to verify the mutilated oath in these papers. The form of oath used in 1900 contained the anti-bribery clauses but at the last general election I was surprised to learn that clauses 8 and 9 were omitted from that oath. I thought it proper to prepare a form of oath and placed it in the hands of the scrutineers in my constituency so that if an elector should be sworn the proper oath should be administered. In some cases the deputy returning officer refused to administer any other oath than that forwarded to him by the government. In one instance, the returning officer persisted in having the oath administered in part, but at the expiration of an hour he concluded to administer the oath the scrutineer handed to him, and he did so for the balance of the day. The Minister of Justice is very careful that we should speak by the book and I shall do so. On the 15th of February, the hon. member for Hamilton moved, for these papers and during the discussion on the Autonomy Bill I informed the Minister of Justice that I intended to bring up a matter in connection with his department. This very matter is the matter I then referred to. I did not expect it would be brought up to-day, but it would have been brought up before this were it not for the discussion on the Autonomy Bill. In order that I may do no injustice to the government, I shall state the absolute facts of the case as they are and I am prepared to stand by these facts as a member of this House. I have committed them to writing and I now give this statement to the House:

For the past thirty years or more, in fact ever since the enactment of anti-bribery legislation, the ordinary form of election oath has always included what may be described as the standard anti-bribery clauses. The substance of these clauses is the sworn statement that the voter has not been bribed and that he has not bribed any one else. Every ordinary oath of qualification used in Ontario, not only in Dominion elections but in provincial and municipal elections as well, during all these years contained these clauses, till the last election when the form of oath printed and distributed for use by the Dominion officials for the first time, and without any change of law or circumstances whatever to justify it, unexpectedly and unaccountably left them out. It is well known that voters are often stopped from voting

by being confronted with the anti-bribery clauses, and scrutineers during all those years had only to ask for the administration of the oath and every one understood that that oath included anti-bribery clauses.

Why then were these clauses that had always heretofore been included, and which Conservative scrutineers and workers expected would still be included, quietly left out in 1904? Such a change, even if proper, should not have been made without special attention being called to it. But no notice whatever was given of it. Not even in the instructions to the returning officers or their deputies was there the slightest reference to it.

Any one familiar with the practical workings of matters at an election booth will understand how this omission of the bribery clauses would operate. It must be remembered that the election oath is not something that every voter has to take. No ordinary voter has to take the oath unless one of the scrutineers demands that he shall take it. The ordinary arrangements at a polling place are that the scrutineers are given a list of voters with certain names marked to be sworn. The scrutineer may or may not know the circumstances or reason why it is thought proper to swear a particular voter. His list is marked by the chairman or committee in charge of the division, usually on private and confidential information. The scrutineer depends on his marked list, and his duties are to watch the proceedings at the poll and swear the persons marked to be sworn. The instructions to the scrutineer always are to insist on the whole oath being put in each case so as to cover all grounds of objection, including bribery. The instructions to Conservative scrutineers last time were the same as usual, no one for a moment suspecting that the bribery clauses would not be included as they had always been in the ordinary form of oath. The government officials and deputy returning officers who had received the forms were the only persons that had a chance to know that these clauses were left out. Whether they discovered the fact before the election or not is a question. Some of them no doubt did but at any rate they kept it a secret from their political opponents. Unfortunately things have reached such a pass in our part of the country at least that the returning officers, deputies and clerks are, with a few exceptions, as much or almost as much partisans as the Liberal scrutineers. In the majority of cases, as things go now-a-days, the person appointed as deputy returning officer in a polling division is one of the most active Liberal workers of the division, often the chairman and nearly always a member of the Liberal committee of workers.

This was the state of affairs on the morning of last 3rd of November when the poll opened. What would happen? A voter would come in whom the Conservative scrutineer had instructions to swear. The scrutineer would ask to have him sworn, supposing as he and all the Conservative workers did that the ordinary oath contained the bribery clauses. The oath would be administered without the bribery clauses. In some cases perhaps no one would notice the omission, every one taking it for granted that the official oath was all right and in the usual form. If the Liberal deputy did notice it there would be slim chances indeed that he would tell the Conservative scrutineer of it. If the Conservative scrutineer noticed it he might perhaps ask to look at the official form to see that it was read correctly, and when he was shown that it had been, unless he was an expert in election law, there was small chance of his having anything more to say. The device of administering two oaths in order to catch the anti-bribery clauses was something he had never before heard of. There is often too a repugnance on the part of scrutineers especially in country places to asking directly or specifically to have the bribery clauses administered to one of his neighbours. If he did speak of the bribery clauses he would be told by the deputy, as I am informed was actually done in a number of cases in Elgin, that that was the oath and all the oath that was supplied. In short the effect of the conduct of the government officials would be that no voter would have to swear either that he had not been bribed or that he had not bribed any one else unless the surreptitious omission of the bribery clauses was discovered and unless the means of remedying it were known to and insisted on by the scrutineer. As a matter of fact there were but very few cases in the province where the bribery clauses were administered.

And let me say in passing that I have inquired from other members from the province of Ontario on this side of the House, and I find that the same thing existed in their parts of the province; and I have no doubt since I examined the official documents laid on the table of the House, that the same form was used all over the province.

As I have said, even if the omission of these clauses from the oath was justified it should not have been done without attention being called to the change. Notice should have been given not only to the officials and deputies but also to the public or at any rate to the candidates on both sides. But, as I have before stated, not a word was said about it. Not even the deputies were notified of it. A perusal of the instructions to the returning officers will show that they were word for word the same in 1904 when the clauses were left out as they were in 1900 when they were in. I have them both here.

But there was no just cause whatever for leaving these anti-bribery clauses out. They were left in in 1900 and the sections of the Act prescribing the oaths (sections 21 and 65) were precisely the same in 1900 as in 1904. Section 65 says 'that an elector if

required shall take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.' We have then to go to the Ontario Election Act (I have it here) and we find that the form there prescribed (see section 98) in Form 16 in schedule 'A' to that Act. This is the oath of qualification required by the provincial law. It contains the anti-bribery clauses (numbers 8 and 9) as all such oaths for more than a quarter of a century back have always contained them. This form 16 then is the oath of qualification which the Dominion Election Act prescribes. Yes, it will be said, but some changes in it are authorized by the above quoted provision of section 65. That is right, but note carefully what changes. Such changes and such only as 'are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.' What then are these changes? Just what were made in 1900 and not one iota more—the omission from the end of the first clause of the oath the words 'in the poll book,' because in the Dominion election the official list is not in the poll book, as it is in the provincial, but is a separate printed list. Not for one single instant can it be contended with the slightest show of reason that it was necessary to omit the anti-bribery clauses in order to make the provincial oath applicable to the Dominion election. These clauses are as strictly and as emphatically applicable as any other clause in the oath. The bribery aimed at by these clauses is forbidden by section 108 of the Dominion Act in the same terms as it is forbidden in the provincial Act. These omitted clauses word for word are in fact contained in Form 'R' of the Dominion Act, showing if further proof were needed that they are not repugnant but are absolutely applicable to the Dominion elections. Moreover the oath of qualification Form S in the old Dominion Act which the present provincial oath takes the place of contained these clauses in the same exact words. Neither in precedent nor in theory was there the slightest ground for leaving these anti-bribery clauses out. Why was it done?

But there is still another and perhaps a more serious aspect of the case yet to be pointed out, and that is that this altered form which was printed and sent forth by the government officials purports to be what it is not. I have here one of the emasculated forms that was actually sent forth and used by the officials. While it omits the anti-bribery clauses it is so headed as to lead one to believe that it contained them. It is headed Form 16. Form 16 is a well known form and well known to contain these anti-bribery clauses. What is sent forth as Form 16 is not the genuine Form 16 at all, but a false, mutilated and misleading form. Just look at it and compare it with the genuine form in the Ontario Election Act or with the form actually used by the government in 1900 (I have them both here) and see what a deception and a fraud it is. Its heading also states that it is the form of oath for use in ordinary cases and this leads to the supposition that it is the only and all the oath applicable to such cases. If it was intended merely to be supplemental to another oath, or another oath to it, why did it not state so on the face of it either in the heading or in a foot note?

From whatever point of view we regard it, this oath matter is utterly indefensible.

The foregoing is the position of the case in brief. It is an absolutely correct and unassailable presentation of the facts and circumstances of the matter. But some excuses are attempted.

It is said that Form 16 is not an oath of qualification, that only part of it, namely the part without the bribery clauses is what is meant in section 65 by 'oath of qualification.' There is nothing in such a contention. For thirty years and more all ordinary oaths of qualification used at elections contained these anti-bribery clauses. Form S and Form X in the old Act (which I have here) which are headed and called oaths of qualification contain these identical clauses. This very Form 16 of the Ontario Election Act, and the whole of it, is described and referred to in the Ontario Election Act itself as 'the oath of qualification.' (See section 94, subsection 5 of Ontario Election Act). It is mere twaddle to pretend that the whole of Form 16 is not what is referred to and intended in section 65 as the oath of qualification. And section 65 justifies no omissions from it whatever. Any changes necessary to make it applicable to Dominion Elections are authorized. That might mean that if the anti-bribery clauses were not properly or appropriately worded for Dominion Elections the wording might be changed, but in no wise could it mean that these clauses were to be wholly left out.

Again it is said that because anti-bribery clauses are contained in Form 'U,' and Form 'U' might be administered, therefore it was right to leave the bribery clauses out of Form 16—in other words that Form 'U' and Form 16 were merely supplemental to each other and that one was not intended to contain anything that the other contained.

Such a contention is altogether wrong, even apart from the fact that the mutilation of Form 16 would, even on such a ground, be a direct violation of the provisions of section 65. Form 'U' has a primary and direct purpose of its own namely to head off persons who are disfranchised by reason of having been found guilty of bribery or corrupt practices at some former election. Peruse section 7 of the Dominion Election Act, and the Act and sections referred to in section 7 and this will be abundantly clear.

Moreover the official who prepared the

mutilated oath did not proceed on the ground that nothing must be duplicated in the two oaths. I want the right hon. gentleman to mark this. If he had he would have left out not only the bribery clauses (8 and 9) but also clause 7 (as to not having voted before) which, unlike the bribery clauses, is retained in the mutilated form though it is also in Form 'U.'

Excuse is also attempted for departure from the course that was followed in 1900 of leaving the bribery clauses in, by pointing out that there had been in 1900 a clerical error in the heading of Form 'U' which was corrected in 1901. That could in no view be any justification for the change, and if the state of the heading furnished any reason at all one way or the other, the condition it was left in in 1904 made it more necessary to have Form 16 complete in itself then than in 1900. For the erroneous heading was corrected before the elections of 1900, by official instructions from the Department of the Secretary of State, dated 12th October, 1900, directing the deputy returning officers to 'absolutely ignore' that erroneous heading as it was inserted by mistake. I have here this official instruction; it is pasted right to this Form 'U.' The heading as it now stands and as it stood in 1904 indicates that the oath Form 'U' is intended for a special class of persons and not for general or ordinary cases, while as it was in 1900 with the official instructions to ignore the heading altogether it might be inferred that it was for general and ordinary use. The fact also that a special instruction was issued in 1900 regarding it would specially draw attention to the fact that there was such an oath and that it was expected it would be used.

Never before was it necessary to administer any additional oath besides the ordinary one in order to catch a voter on bribery.

If the oath Form 'U' had even been printed and distributed like Form 16 it would have made things a little less objectionable.

If the law does not require the anti-bribery clauses to be inserted or rather left in Form 16, and if it was proper to send that mutilated oath forth without them, then there was a time (from 1898 to 1900) when no anti-bribery clauses could be administered to a voter at all. The present section 65 upon which the matter under discussion hangs is, so far as it relates to the oath in question, taken word for word from section 45, subsection 2 of the 1898 Act; and this was the only oath which could under the 1898 Act be administered to a voter. Can it be supposed that it ever was the intention that no voter should be sworn as to bribery?

Wholly unjustified, false, mutilated and misleading is the fitting characterization of the thing that was sent forth and used as the official form of oath at the last Dominion election.

I make this statement to the House, and it is a statement of the facts in connection with this mutilated form of oath. Why that was done, I cannot understand. There was no justification for it. There is no amendment to the Act which necessitated it; and whoever did it, did it with a purpose. Will my right hon. friend pretend to say that all the deputy returning officers throughout Canada, who were furnished the election documents which were laid on the table of this House, were sufficiently well posted in the Election Act of Canada to choose, when a scrutineer asked one of them to swear a voter, from the three separate oaths which one they should administer? Would any hon. gentleman pretend to say that?

Mr. GALLIHER. Pretend to say what.

Mr. INGRAM. That if, an elector going into his polling booth, the scrutineer of either party asking the returning officer to swear him, any deputy returning officer would be sufficiently well posted in the election law to take out of three different oaths make a complete oath to administer to the elector?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not know that our deputy returning officers in British Columbia are any more intelligent than those in other parts of Canada; but I remember being in a polling booth, when the deputy returning officer asked the scrutineer: Which oath do you want administered—the qualification oath or the bribery oath?

Mr. INGRAM. Your election law in British Columbia is different from ours; but speaking for the province of Ontario, I have stated exactly what occurred, and I say there was no justification for amending the oath and making it any different from what it was in 1900. Then it was a correct oath, and any deputy returning officer administering it, would be administering the oath in full. I want to point out in addition that the first oath was a correct and a convenient form, why therefore should it have been mutilated and the bribery clauses struck out? There was no justification for that, nor was there any change in the election Act which required a change in the oath at all. That is where the government made a mistake, or an official of the government mutilated the oath which was required to be administered.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Like my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, I do not wish to imply that this was done in that particular case with design, but the circumstances are rather extraordinary and so is the coincidence; because, as my hon. friend has said, the very same thing was done during the last election in the province of Quebec. I had not examined the papers which were in the polling booth, when my attention was called to the matter in Valleyfield, where there is a very large vote. Let me read to

the House the oath that was there given to the elector. This is the English form of the oath prescribed by section 143 of the Quebec Election Act, 1903, made applicable to Dominion elections pursuant to the provisions of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, in that behalf. This is the oath :

You swear (or affirm, as the case may be), to answer the truth and nothing but the truth to the questions which will be put to you ; so help you God.

1. Are you the person meant or intended to be meant by the name entered as follows (name of the elector entered on the list) on the list of electors for this polling division ?

2. Are you a subject of His Majesty ?

3. Have you been naturalized in any other country or taken thereto the oath of allegiance?

4. Are you of the full age of twenty-one years ?

5. Have you voted before to-day at this election, for this electoral district, at this or any other polling station ?

6. Not being a proprietor and residing out of Canada for over a year, have you returned to this country with your family, at least one month before the election with the intention of remaining therein ?

That is the oath that was administered to the voters in the county of Beauharnois at the last general election.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter is absolutely new to me and I desire information. The hon. member says that this is the form of oath administered in the Beauharnois election. Was there not another oath against bribery ?

Mr. BERGERON. Not at all. When my attention was called to it—we know what is done during elections, we know how fidgety our friends are, and when they came to me and said : 'This is an extraordinary oath ; there is nothing at all in that, and we want to get the oath which should be given to the electors, 'I went to the poll and saw the deputy and asked him if he had not any other form of oath. He said : No. I said : That is nothing. He said : This is the oath I found among my papers, and it is the one I am going to administer. I asked for the Act, and although I had not the local Act in my pocket, I took the Dominion Elections Act and showed him clause 65. I have found that in my province the officials on election day are generally our most bitter opponents. I do not say they are dishonest, but they will not listen to anything, they pretend to stand by their duty, and when a man says : 'This is what I found in the box and I will not use anything else but that,' I cannot tell that man he is dishonest, although I know he is a bitter opponent of mine and has been working against me. I read clause 65 of the Act, which is as follows :

An elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates, or an agent of a candidate or by any elector present shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held, and shall also, if so required, take the oath in the form 'U.'

Now, what is the form of oath used ? It is very much a repetition of this for the first paragraphs, but this is what is essential, and I imagine that is why it was drawn in this form. This is the form :

That you have not received anything, that you do not expect anything, nor has anything been promised you directly or indircetly, to induce you to vote at this election, either for loss of time, travelling expenses, hire of team, or for any other service connected therewith.

That you have not, directly or indirectly, paid or promised anything to any person either to induce him to vote or to refrain from voting at this election.

That you are not otherwise disqualified from voting at this election.

So help you God.

I asked the deputy returning officer in the poll at which I was to add these words to the oath he was taking from the elector. There is not a man in this House who will say it was not the intention of the legislature that the two oaths should be given. The deputy returning officer refused to do so, although I showed him the law. He said: "Mr. Bergeron, I have nothing to do with that ; I have received instructions to put this oath." And he did not do it.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT. Was not the returning officer supplied with a copy of the Election Act in the box ?

Mr. BERGERON. I took the Dominion Electoral Act in the poll and showed it to him, but how could I force him to administer the oath ? The consequence was that in every poll in Valleyfield I could not get any other oath administered but this. I do not say it was done intentionally. I do not want to imply that the government have done that intentionally, but it is a most estraordinary thing that it should be done first in our province and now in the province of Ontario. Would it not be better, and avoid mistakes, if, since we are obliged by law to take the oath of the local Act and apply the federal Act to it, we should have a printed form of the local Act, the whole Act as it is in the local and in the Dominion Acts, and then there would be no mistake ? I only mention this matter, because we have been talking about it in connection with the other case. In my county I found in every poll that I could not obtain from the deputy returning officer what the law required. He had no instructions to that effect, and he would not comply with the law as passed by this parliament.

Mr. SAM. BARKER. The Minister of Justice has complained that this question is sprung upon him without reasonable notice. I wish to confirm what has been

said already from this side, that there was no intention to spring this subject at all. It would not have been brought up for some days to come had it not been for the extraordinary conduct of the government in respect to the pending election in Oxford. I understand that a complaint was made in Woodstock about the form being used, and a telegram was sent to the government asking instructions, and I am told—the right hon. gentleman can tell me whether I am right or wrong—that the government's answer was to stand by the forms sent and no others. Under these circumstances, we on this side thought it our duty immediately to bring these questions up. I personally would have preferred to have the discussion later, because I have not papers here which I intended to use when this subject would come up; but as it is now, we may as well discuss the whole matter. It has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that this is a mistake of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. I contend that it is nothing of the kind. These instructions are the instructions of the government issued by the Clerk of the Crown, but subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and the government is directly responsible for the instructions issued. Section 21 of the Dominion Elections Act provides this:

> Immediately after the issue of the writ of election the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of voters' lists, if there are any, one copy of this Act, and of such instructions approved by the Governor in Council as are required to carry out the election according to the provisions of this Act.

Therefore, Sir, the instructions which we are discussing are not, strictly speaking, instructions of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, but instructions approved and adopted by the government. Same clause goes on:

> The instructions referred to in subsection 1 of this section contain forms of the oaths referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68.

The instructions shall contain the forms of the oaths in sections 65, 66 and 68. Let us see what section 65 says?

> The elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the polling clerk, one of the candidates, or any agent of the candidates, or by any elector present shall, before receiving the ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take.

That form shall be part of the instructions. In November, 1904, or in the present by-elections, what form was given in connection with the provincial law? The statute does not say part of the provincial form, but the whole of the form.

> Take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in a like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.

Of course some of the words have to be changed; the provincial election had to be made the Dominion election, and so on.

> And shall also, if so required, take the oath in the form 'U.'

If so required. If not required to take the form 'U,' is he only to take part of the provincial oath. Surely, if the candidate or an elector did not call upon the form 'U' to be sworn to, the oath called for in section 65 was the whole provincial oath? To say that the provincial oath was to be supplemented by form 'U' is it seems to me, an absurd reading of that section. But if we take the Quebec form read by the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) we will see the utter absurdity of that contention. Take the form issued in November last by the Dominion government for the elections in Quebec together with form 'U' and administer both of them to an elector, and you will not comply with the law. There is more in the province of Quebec affidavit than you will find in the form issued by the government and form 'U' put together. The Quebec Election Act, 1903, chapter 9, section 143, has what may be called the bribery clauses in the form of questions. It is in this form:

> Has any promise been made to you or to your wife or to any of your relations, friends or other persons, to induce you to vote or not to vote at this election?

Neither in the form issued by the government or in form 'U' are the words 'or not to vote.' And who will say that this is not a very material part of the oath? Why, it is a very common practice among certain people who run what is called the machine in the various provinces, to pay a man not to vote. A man does that by perhaps spoiling his ballot or putting in a blank ballot, and in the province of Quebec he can be sworn that he has not received anything not to vote.

> Have you received anything, either personally or through your wife, or through any member of your family, or in any other manner to induce you to vote or not to vote at this election, or in relation to your vote at this election?

There are no such words to be found in the form issued by the government or in the form 'U.'

> Have you been guilty of or participated in any corrupt practice whatever which disqualifies you from taking part in this election?

That goes further than form 'U.' Form 'U' is an affidavit that he has not been convicted, and this not only reaches the man that has been convicted, but the man who has been guilty and not convicted. The Dominion government substituted for this Act in the province of Quebec, two clauses neither of which cover this clause. I take it that that knocks from under the feet of

the government the contention that section 5 allowed 'U' to be substituted for part of the provincial oath and the ground that had covered it for both together cannot cover it in the province of Quebec. Take the form read by my hon. friend from Beauharnois and add to that the form 'U' and you do not get the provincial law. In the law of Nova Scotia there are the same bribery clauses, but of course in different terms, and the same thing applies to the election law of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island which has special forms of bribery clauses. The form of the bribery clauses in each province differs. And yet with regard to the elections in each province the bribery clause is struck out, with one exception and it is rather a curious one. The only form of affidavit in the Dominion in the November elections that had the bribery oath was that used in the Northwest Territories. Why the government thought the Northwest Territories required it I do not know, but that is the fact. Now with regard to what occurred in Hamilton as in other places ; after some hours of polling some of my friends in Hamilton discovered that this mutilated form of affidavit was being used. The gentleman who was acting as returning officer, a lawyer and a very honourable man, the moment his attention was called to it, he issued instructions to all the deputy returning officers to correct the form. He had not the slightest shadow of a doubt what his duty was and he complied with it immediately, and I found by an examination of the polling returns afterwards something which convinced me that the change in the form of the oath had done good. In East Hamilton we had a system of checking by our agents which amounted to the agent keeping a duplicate of the poll clerks' book, so that every agent knew the order in which every man voted, and he had each marked 'sworn' or 'refused' and so on. After the election I took some trouble to go over many of the polling divisions and I found that up to a certain point man after man who had been marked in the canvassing books to be sworn by our side took the oath. But after a certain time we found refusal after refusal by men who were tendered the oath. I cannot say absolutely that the first men knew that they were not to be subjected to the bribery oath, but the result did seem to lead to that conclusion.

I know that throughout the city men who were interested in these things pointed out that they could not control the elections without that bribery oath and they were convinced that it was known broadcast throughout the city that there was no bribery oath in the form. I have no doubt at all that in cities, at all events, where the news would go pretty quickly, it would have a most serious effect upon any man's election to let it go forth that the people could get their votes in without any fear of having the bribery oath administered. There is no doubt about that. Every one knows that is the case in cities where news gets around quickly. Then, what is the case in a county? It is utterly hopeless when a thing of that kind occurs for any man to correct anything wrong in the form if he does find it out. In a county it would be absolutely impossible to send out new forms to all the polling divisions and have the matter corrected. The mischief is done and it cannot be remedied. Fortunately in the city of Hamilton we were able to secure a remedy, because, having a good honest returning officer, he was very prompt in correcting it. But, the extraordinary thing, as has been pointed out here, is this: Having the printed form used in 1900 following strictly the provincial Act to go by, these officers like all other officers, repeat their forms; they do not go through the form of redrawing them. They have printed forms and they use them over again. How was it that clauses 8 and 9 were struck out of that affidavit? What object could there be in striking them out? Surely it must have been plain to any man that the striking of the bribery clauses out of that affidavit was a most serious matter, and I cannot believe that the clerk of the Crown in Chancery or any other official would have dared to have taken out these clauses without authority. I cannot believe that he would have taken these clauses out and then have submitted the form to the Governor in Council without having called attention to the omission, or that experienced politicians like those sitting around the Council Board would not have thought that there was something extraordinary in striking these clauses out of the affidavits in the forms which had been already used.

I want to say one word more on this subject, not quite relating to the forms of the affidavit, but bearing upon the manner in which the government issues its writs to the returning officers conducting these elections. I intended to bring this subject up on a future occasion, but I shall do so now and end the matter. In East Hamilton, the gentleman who was appointed returning officer and who, I repeat, is a most respectable man—I have not a word to say against him, I have no suspicion of his conduct, I believe he is a perfectly honourable and straightforward man and that he did his duty—was a junior partner in the firm of Chisholm and Loggie, the senior partner in which was the president of the Reform Association of the city of Hamilton, one of the most active men at the headquarters of the Liberal Association up to the time of the election and during polling day. Not only that, but the firm of Chisholm & Loggie, carrying on business as lawyers, have, as most lawyers have, a vault common to the firm and open to the clerks in the office. The ballot boxes, after the poll, were returned to that office and kept in the vault of that firm for three or four days. The

keys of this vault were not carried around by the returning officer in his pocket—some thirty keys—but they were in charge of the clerks of the office. For three or four days these ballot boxes were practically under the control of the president of the Reform Association of Hamilton after the election. I am not finding fault with the returning officer. I am quite satisfied that he would do nothing wrong or be a party to anything wrong, but I do say it is an outrage that the government should have appointed a returning officer to carry on an election of that kind knowing, as the government must have known, that the papers and the ballot boxes after the election were under the control of my opponent just as much as they were under the control of the returning officer.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS (St. John and Iberville). Mr. Speaker, I think the argument presented by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) must have convinced the House that there was good reason for the change in the form of the oath which was sent out. As most hon. members know the law is not the same in all the provinces and the laws of the provinces are not the same as the laws of the Dominion. We are by section 65 of the Dominion Act, permitted to use the forms of the provinces. Does that mean that we introduced into our law a provision admitting all the disabilities of the provinces? Not at all. All those which agree with our laws are admitted and that is why, in section 65, we say that it shall be permitted to us to change the provincial form. For what reason do we change the provincial form? I will take the instance which has been given by the hon. member for Hamilton. In the province of Quebec it is settled by law that a man who has been proven guilty of bribery is disqualified from voting. Under our Dominion law it is a doubtful question, if I do not mistake. Then, was there not a good reason for a change in the form of that province? This disqualification, I maintain, which we have put into our provincial law could not be introduced into our Dominion law by a form of oath administered under the provincial law. It was not the intention of this parliament to disqualify electors who were disqualified by the provinces. I do not see anything to laugh at in my argument.

Mr. TISDALE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Demers) thinks I was laughing he is mistaken.

Mr. DEMERS. This is a serious argument. It was not the intention to disqualify electors who are not disqualified under our law. This being the fact it was a sufficient reason for changing the form of oath of the province which change is authorized by section 65. I go further. Hon. gentlemen opposite may make a great noise about this question but if they have the practical side of the question they have not the common sense nor logical sense. According to their contention we should have sworn these people twice for the same thing. It would not have been enough that the oath should have been administered according to our federal law, but we should have been obliged to have come under the local laws and to have sworn them twice. Would it be practicable to have the people sworn twice?

Mr. INGRAM. May I ask the hon. gentleman what oath 'U' is intended to cover?

Mr. DEMERS. It is because oath 'U' is not useless, it is because the government had the right to make changes in the oath of the provinces that we have made the provision of section 65 that any voter, before being allowed to vote, shall be obliged to take the oath in Form 'U.' My hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) says that one officer refused that. His duty was plain. If so that officer was acting in bad faith and the party aggrieved had a right of action against him, but I do not believe that all over his county all of the officers understood their duty in the same way.

Mr. BERGERON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Demers) allow me one question? Why have only half of the provincial oath in this form? Why not have the whole thing there so as to avoid any officer refusing to comply with the Dominion Election Act or refusing to administer the oath according to the Form 'U.' I am reading from the statutes of the province of Quebec, four paragraphs which have been omitted in this form which are nearly identical with the Form 'U' of the Dominion Elections Act. Why was not the whole form put in of oath to be administered to the voters?

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. I say we have a law here which is our law. By section 65 we do not intend to bring up in our elections all the reasons of disqualifications of the provinces, but we only intend to cover those causes of disqualification covered by our law. If you have disqualification for a certain Act under your Quebec law, it does not follow that the man is disqualified from voting under the Dominion law. Of course, he may incur a penalty, but if there is no disqualification under the federal law, do you think it is the intention of section 65 to disqualify him from voting, I say no. I say that section 65 is there for the purpose of permitting us to retain that part of the local laws which is necessary. And it is for this very reason that it has ben put in words so plain, under section 65, that the Form 'U' shall be used.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman means 64.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. No. 65. And section 68 says that no voter can receive a ballot if he refuses to take the oath in the Form 'U.'

Mr. BERGERON. But if the returning officer will not offer it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He will have to do it.

Mr. BERGERON. But he does not.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. I cannot accept the argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron)——

Mr. BERGERON. I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. L. P. Demers) will not take my word for it, because this happened to myself.

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. Then, why did not my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) prosecute the officer ? The case was a clear one. The law declares that no voter may have a ballot who refuses to take the oath according to the Form 'U.'

Mr. BERGERON. But if the form of oath is changed ?

Mr. L. P. DEMERS. It must have been an exception. I cannot believe that that course was followed all over the riding.

Mr. BERGERON. Yes ; and if you will make an investigation I think you will find it in other counties as well.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is contended that the form of oath supplied to the returning officer is not sufficient, that it does not cover the ground. Well, I think there is a good deal of misapprehension of the facts and that there was nothing in the instructions sent to the returning officer to justify the indignation expressed by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). These instructions are to be found in the book which I have in my hand. This book contains the Dominion Election Act. A copy of the book is sent to the returning officer in Oxford in the election that is now in progress. It is stated at page 2 :

> The oaths prescribed under sections 64, 65, 74 and 75, forms 'T,' 'U,' 'V,' 'W,' first schedule, are administered viva voce ; you will instruct your deputies that, when occasion demands it, they will swear the voter direct from the copy of the Dominion Elections Act which is supplied to them.

I think that is very clear. Section 65 of the Dominion Election Act declares that two oaths can be administered under that Act, first the qualification oath under the law of each province. There is an oath which can be administered under the law of the province of Quebec ; there is a different oath with regard to manhood sufferage which is administered in the province of Ontario. There is no form of qualification oath in the section itself other than the form of oath as supplied to the returning officer. That is the form of oath which my hon. friend from East Lambton saw in the hands of the returning officer.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is one of the forms. May I state that the part of the oath with regard to bribery and corruption is omitted. Sections 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 are there, but 8 and 9 are not there.

Mr. BRODEUR. And they should not be there. And for this simple reason ; section 65 says :

> Any elector, when required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates or an agent of a candidate, or by any elector present shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of the oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held, and shall also, if so required, take the oath in the form 'U.'

Mr. BERGERON. And if he refuses.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will come to that. I do not speak of whether the returning officer performs his duties faithfully or not but I am speaking of the law and of the way it is carried out in North Oxford.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where are the words in section 65 on which the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) relies for striking out clauses 8 and 9 of the former oath ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I say the words are to be found in the interpretation of the article itself. There are two forms of oath which are mentioned in this section 65. One is the form of oath which the voter is required to take under the provincial law. In the province of Ontario, by the provincial Act, a man can get a vote under the manhood sufferage provision. Well, he gives his oath as required by this form. This form is not in the statutes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know it is not. I think I did not make myself clear. You leave in seven clauses of the oath provided under the provincial law, and you omit two.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the words in section 65 on which you rely for including the seven clauses and leaving out the two ? I would invite the hon. gentleman's attention to the language, particularly to the words :

> And shall also, if required, take the oath in the form 'U.'

Mr. BRODEUR. It strikes me this way : there are two forms of oath prescribed under section 65 ; one is with regard to the provincial law and the other as to what is called the bribery clauses and which are included in the Form 'U.' As there is not, under our law, any form as to the provincial law the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sends to the returning officer a form which may be different in one province from the other according to the law of each province. Besides that, if the candidate or his agent at the poll wants the elector to be sworn as to bribery, he simply puts to him the different questions which are included in form U,

and which, according to these instructions, he is to administer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite follow the hon. gentleman. The statute says that the instructions referred to in subsection 1 of this section shall contain the forms of oath referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68. Now, you have a bribery oath, under either the province or the Dominion, probably under both. What is the justification for omitting any form of bribery oath from the forms inserted in the instructions ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because I do not see the necessity of inserting it. The first oath is with regard to the qualification—whether the man whose name is on the list is entitled to vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to make my question plain to the hon. gentleman, because I want to appreciate his argument. The instructions contain the forms of oath, but these forms omit any reference to bribery, as set out in either the provincial or the Dominion statute. What is the justification for that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am trying to explain the difference which I find in the two forms of oath described in section 65. The first one is with regard to the qualification of the voter, not with regard to bribery. The second one is whether the voter has committed any acts of bribery ; and the instructions, which are sent to the returning officer, prescribe that he shall instruct his deputies, when the occasion requires it, to swear the voters from the Dominion Elections Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend regard the oath in Form 'U' as a qualification oath ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; I regard it as a different oath. The oath referred to in section 65 is the qualification oath, apart from the question of bribery ; and section 65 says that the elector shall also, if so required, take the oath in Form 'U.' That is the reason the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, who is not an officer of the government or of the House of Commons merely, but an officer of parliament, sent the form of oath as required by the law in each province, and also gave instructions to the returning officers to administer the oath with regard to bribery. That is the situation, and I do not think there was any reason at all for the hon. member for Lambton raising this question. There was certainly no intention on the part of anybody to deprive any elector of his vote or to permit anybody to vote who was not entitled to do so. The returning officers have their instructions ; and if to-day, in the London or Oxford election, somebody shall call upon a deputy returning officer to swear one of the electors because he is suspected of receiving a bride, the deputy returning officer has all the necessary instructions for that purpose. I am sorry, for my part, that the time of this House has been wasted in the discussion of a question which seems to me to be absolutely clear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. gentleman sits down, I would like to ask him one final question, because I have not fully appreciated his argument. The statute prescribes certain forms of oaths. Is his contention that all forms shall be sent forward except the form as to bribery, and that is omitted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; my hon. friend is mistaken. The form as to bribery is sent, like all the others ; but instead of it being sent on a detached form, the returning officer simply receives instructions that if somebody calls on a voter to take the oath, he is to administer it from the book.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I point out to my hon. friend that, not only must the instructions be approved by the Governor in Council and be sent forward, but the forms of oath must also be sent forward with the instructions. All forms of oath have been sent forward except the form with respect to bribery, which has been omitted. The Election Act, the instructions and the forms, these three things have to be sent forward.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. The forms which have been sent to the returning officer in North Oxford are of two kinds. One kind are forms regarding the qualifications under the Ontario Act. The reason they have been sent in detached form is that they are not in our law. But the returning officer also got the form which could be administered under the latter part of section 65.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It does not say the latter part ; it says under the whole section.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the whole section. The first part of section 65 was sent to him, and the second part is in this book ; and it is declared on page 2 of the instructions that if somebody calls upon the voter to take the oath under Form 'U' then the deputy returning officer shall administer it under this Act. So that the two forms were in the hands of the returning officer, the form with regard to qualification and the form with regard to bribes. Consequently, there can be no reason or justification for asserting that there has been any intention on the part of anybody to deprive the electors of their right to vote.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the Dominion Elections Act says that that is the form of oath that shall be given when men are asked to take the oath. The minister refers to a form of oath with reference to the manhood franchise. I admit that that

is sent along ; but not only is that sent, but part of the oath with refernce to bribery and corruption. Of that oath there are only seven clauses included in this form, and I would like the minister to explain why the other two clauses, which are contained in the local Election Act, are omitted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They have no place there at all in law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend regard the oath as an oath of qualification ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I fear I shall be violating somewhat on the rules of the House if I speak again, but I have managed to get hold of the statutes and understand the matter somewhat better than I did a while ago. I am quite prepared to express the opinion now deliberately that, after having considered the matter, the form of oaths supplied is the only one that can be supplied under the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am prepared to state my opinion exactly the reverse of that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then I shall proceed to give reasons in support of my opinion. Section 21 of the Dominion Elections Act provides :

Immediately after the issue of the writ of election, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery shall transmit to the returning officer a sufficient number of copies of the voters' lists, if there are any, one copy of this Act, and of such instructions approved by the Governor in Council as are required to carry out the election according to the provisions of this Act. (With a copious alphabetical index prefixed), for the returning officer himself, one copy for the election clerk and one for each of the deputy returning officers, and also for each deputy returning officer a blank poll book and all the blank forms necessary for the purposes of such election, except Forms 'E,' 'I' and 'P,' which the returning officer shall himself cause to be printed.

2. The instructions referred to in section 1 of this section shall contain forms of the oaths referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68 of this Act, the same having been made applicable to the election being held, and in the case of returning officers in the province of Prince Edward Island they shall be accompanied by the sections of the provincial law relating to the qualifications of voters.

These are all the documents that are to be sent to the returning officers under the law ; and beyond complying with the requirements of the law, the government cannot be held responsible.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is Form 'U' ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will only restrain his ardour for a moment, I shall try to enlighten him. The instructions to the returning officers approved by His Excellency in Council are to be found at the beginning of this book which is sent to each returning officer. These instructions show that copies of the Franchise Act 1898 and copies of the Dominion Elections Act of 1900 are sent them. The copies of the Franchise Act are necessary because there are to be found the qualification of a voter. Copies of the Dominion elections Act are equally necessary because there the returning officer will find what the voter is required to do when he tenders his vote. Section 65 provides that an elector, if required by the deputy returning officer, the poll clerk, one of the candidates or an agent of one of the candidates or by any elector present shall, before receiving is ballot paper—do what ?

Take such oath of qualification as by the laws of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take.

He shall take the oath of qualification—not the oath of disqualification for bribery. He shall take the oath which qualifies him to vote, not the oath regarding something which may debar him from exercising that right, and he shall, take such oath as by the law of the province he may, in like case, at a provincial election, be required to take :

Such changes having been made in the form of the oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held.

He is required to take the oath of qualification with the changes necessary.

Mr. INGRAM. What are they ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I shall point out what they are. In addition he shall take the oath required in respect of bribery. That is the additional oath he is required to take, and that is the oath given him in the Form 'U.' Now let us go back to the instructions. There you will find at page 2 :

Sections 50 to 79, inclusively indicate your duties and those of your deputies and other officers, from the granting of the poll to the close of the proceedings on polling day.

The oaths prescribe under sections 64, 65, 74 and 75, Forms 'I,' 'U,' 'V,' 'W,' first schedules, are administered viva voce ; you will instruct your deputies that when occasion demands it, they will swear the elector direct from a copy of the Dominion Elections Act which is supplied them.

That is to say if the returning officer is called upon to administer the oath in Form 'U', he is instructed to administer it from the form contained in the Dominion Elections Act.

Then with respect to the forms of the other oaths the instructions provide :

Forms of the other oaths prescribed by the provincial law, adapted to the purposes of the present election, are furnished to you herewith.

Mr. BARKER. What do you say they are ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I say they are here.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is speaking of a change in the Ontario oath.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We are speaking of the Dominion Act.

Mr. INGRAM. In the oath administered by the law of the Dominion, the only change is the words in the poll-book. If the instructions that both he and the hon. gentleman beside him quoted to-day govern, will the hon. gentleman point out what are the changes in the instructions given in 1900 as compared with those given in 1904 ? If in the first instructions, the government issued a certain form, what changes are there in the instructions in 1904 to compel the government to change the form ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because the form of oath sent out in 1900 was a form that was improper under the law. That is the reason. The form of oath sent out in 1900 contains provisions with respect to disqualification imported into it from the local law, which had no place in our Dominion law at all.

Mr. INGRAM. Did not the government issue the order——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. INGRAM. Fair-play is a jewel, but evidently that is not the case here.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman desires to ask a question, it is within the right of the gentleman who has the floor to answer it or not.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have not the slightest objection, and I do not think I have ever shown that I am animated by any such spirit as that imputed to me, but I do not think it is in the interest of proper decorum in debate that hon. gentlemen who have not the floor should interject speeches as we go along.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order. If the Minister of Justice will not allow the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Ingram to put a question, I raise the point that the hon. minister has spoken once already.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I cannot be bullied into answering a question or doing anything else, and I want the hon. gentleman to understand it.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not want to make a speech but am eager to get at the facts. The hon. minister has referred to a change made from 1900 to 1904.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I rise to the same point of order that was raised by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes) with regard to the Minister of Justice. If the point of order was good in his case, surely it ought to apply to the hon. minister who is now interrupting him.

Mr. INGRAM. (reading) :

Department of Secretary of State,
Ottawa, 12th October, 1900.

Official Instructions for Deputy Returning Officers.

The heading to Form 'U,' page 59 Dominion Elections Act, is misleading and should be absolutely ignored. It does not in any way represent the provisions contained in the form, and was inserted there by mistake.

So the statement the Minister of Justice makes that this change was made, was absolutely and fully covered in 1900 is incorrect. There has been no change since 1900.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Either my hon. friend argues that the instructions in 1904 differed from those in 1900 or they did not.

Mr. INGRAM. No.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well what is he complaining of ?

Mr. INGRAM. Why was the form changed ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The form is different ?

Mr. INGRAM. The from is different.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then as the form is part of the instructions and is changed, I argue that the instructions are changed.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to know the point of law that was changed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My point was that section 65 requires the two oaths, one the oath of qualifications as required by the law of the province, changes being made in the form of the oath such as are necessary under our Dominion law and in addition to that the oath in the Form 'U.' Now what is the qualification of a voter. The qualification of a voter is prescribed by section 6 of the Franchise Act. Section 6 provides that :

No person possessed of the qualifications generally required by the provincial law to entitle him to vote at a provincial election, shall be disqualified from voting at a Dominion election merely by reason of any provision of the provincial law disqualifying from having his name on the list or from voting——

So that if a man is disqualified under the Provincial Act by reason of some act of bribery, he is not disqualified as a result to vote under the Federal Act, and section 6 is the section which covers the point that a voter is entitled to vote and cannot be deprived of his right to vote because of some disqualification which is peculiar to the provincial Act, and as a result the oath of qualification required by the provincial law must be amended so as to cover the provisions of section 6 of the Franchise Act. But with respect to the bribery clauses this provision is contained in the form which is supplied to the returning officer, which form constitutes part of the Election Act

and which his instructions say he must deliver in that form, assuming as the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers) argued a moment ago, that the provisions of the Dominion Election Act were different with respect to disqualification from the provisions of the provincial Act which should supersede the other, could a voter be called upon to take an oath which would require him to be placed in contradiction under the Dominion Act to what he would swear to under the provincial Act. Is it proper that with respect to disqualification for bribery, two oaths should be put different in words and different in substance ? My argument is that section 65 of the federal Act, properly construed, requires simply that the oath of qualification, which is the oath to be adapted from the provincial Act, should be sent out in a special form and the oath with respect to bribery in the Form 'U' be administered in the form given in the Act.

Mr. FOWLER. I wish to ask the minister whether he considers section 7 of the form sent out in Ontario a qualification or not ? Is that a part of the qualification, paragraph 7 of form 16 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, that is not the qualification.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that not give away the case ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly not, because the same thing is contained in this oath. They ought not to be in it. The same thing is done in this oath ; not in the Form 'U' which is covered by our own Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the form of 1904 right ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The form of 1904 is right and this form here is right. The form of 1900 is the one which I say is in contradiction with the terms of the statute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us see what occurred here in connection with this election. I think I ought to put on 'Hansard' what really occurred so we will have something to go upon. We have the returning officer James Brady, telegraphing to the Secretary of State as follows :

Woodstock, Ontario, 12th June, 1905.

R. W. Scott,
Secretary of State, Ottawa.

Form of oaths numbers sixteen and seventeen supplied does not contain clauses eight and nine, the Conservatives are taking exception to the form, saying it is not a complete oath. Shall we have new forms of oaths printed including clauses eight and nine and have them sent out by special messenger to deputies to-night as to-morrow is election ?

JAMES BRADY,
Returning Officer.

The answer to that telegram is as follows:

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Ottawa, 12th June, 1905.

James Brady,
Returning Officer, Woodstock, Ontario.

Clerk of Crown in Chancery states you have been supplied with all forms supplied to other returning officers in Ontario. If you have any doubts, get legal opinion. Copies of Form 'U' referred to in section sixty-five are not sent out. The oath is read to the elector.

That is the reply that was sent.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER. It seems to me that the refutation of the arguments of the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of Justice is contained in section 7 of form 16. Section 7 says :

That you have not voted before at this election, either at this or any other polling station.

The Minister of Justice contended that the old form sent out in 1900, the form which contained the full oath, was adopted in mistake on the part of the department, under that form when the bribery oath was required to be put to an elector it could be put and there was the form before the returning officer, and there could be no such question as that which arose in Beauharnois. The minister says it was wrong to send that out, because it contained more than the qualification—because it contained all the disqualifications as well—but here we have this oath which is set forth by the Minister of Justice as being the only right and correct thing and it contains the very same objection as that contained in the old instructions of 1900. That is why I asked the Minister of Justice whether he looked upon section 7 as a qualification or a disqualification. If the acceptance of a bribe by an elector is a disqualification, certainly for him to have voted before at that election is a disqualification as well.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In one sense it is but in another it is not.

Mr. FOWLER. I am surprised that the minister would say it is not a disqualification.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I did not say that, I said that in one sense it is a disqualification and not in another. I said to have voted before at an election is a disqualification so far as the elector's right to vote is concerned, but not as to his right to be on the voters' list.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Bribery is not either.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to have the Minister of Justice prove that because a man accepted a bribe that is such a disqualification that he should not be on the list. I think the minister will find some difficulty in finding anything in the law to justify a statement like that. As I have said, that is a refutation of the whole argument. If you have a right to have a portion of the disqualification in an oath you have a right

to have the whole thing in that oath, and I cannot quite agree with the hon. gentlemen who have spoken from this side of the House who have, so far as I have heard, said that they disclaim the idea that the government have wilfully done this thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not know that they have wilfully done this thing, but I say I am prepared to believe and the evidence shows conclusively that they have done this thing. It is done for a purpose I believe as firmly as I believe anything. I have listened to the arguments and I have listened with considerable amusement to the Minister of Inland Revenue floundering in his argument. Usually he is very clear, but he had such a bad case that he floundered badly in this instance. The Minister of Justice stated bad law in order to try and bolster up a bad case, and from all these things I am perfectly convinced that this is done wilfully, done for the purpose of making it difficult for justice to be done and for an honest vote to be cast, because the hon. gentlemen know perfectly that in these two elections to-day, if an honest vote of these two constituencies were cast, the government candidates would certainly be very badly defeated.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh, riding for a fall.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). When I spoke approvingly of the statement of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Fowler) that these forms were sent out with malice aforethought, I heard from the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) a very loud Ha, Ha! as though my approving of that utterance afforded him amusement. Well, we have a right to take that view, considering the telegrams that have been read and that are now on 'Hansard,' from the returning officer—not from the deputy returning officer—in North Oxford, and from the government in reply. The returning officer's telegram sounded much as if he were determined not to use any other forms than those supplied by the government. He telegraphed to the government for information, saying that the Conservatives were claiming that the form of oath should contain sections 8 and 9 of the provincial form and that he should get others printed to replace those that the government had sent him. Then, though he asked for instructions he as good as said these were the only forms he proposed to use. And the government telegraphed him back to engage a lawyer to interpret the instructions given to him. In the general elections of 1904, the same forms were supplied to the deputy returning officers in the province of Ontario. And in my own constituency I know of two cases where the deputy returning officer refused to put any other oath than that furnished in form 16. One was the case of a man working for myself. I found that he was going to drive away out in the country and vote and also that he had been paid by the secretary of the Reform Association; that a horse had been furnished him and a man put in his place to work for him. I telegraphed Mr. John R. Dargavel. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) knows Mr. Dargavel and knows that he is as honest a man as there is in the country. Mr. Dargavel was acting as scrutineer at the poll at which this man proposed to vote. When the man filed an appearance Mr. Dargavel asked to have this man sworn, stating that he had been paid to go out. The deputy stated that there was nothing in the form of oath against bribery. Mr. Dargavel had a copy of the provincial Act and read the clause, and challenged and defied the deputy returning officer to put any other form of oath than the one contained in that statute. The would-be voter said that if there was going to be any row about it, he would not vote, and left the booth. But the fact is that the deputy returning officer refused point blank to submit any other oath than the one supplied by the government. The other case is that of the postmaster who acted as deputy returning officer at Frankville, a case to which I referred the other day. This deputy returning officer refused to administer any other oath than the one supplied. And I am told that the same thing happened in many other cases. And that form of oath was supplied, I have no hesitation in saying, in order that a voter might take a bribe and then swear in his vote. And the same thing is done in Oxford and London. As I have said, the telegram of the returning officer for North Oxford shows clearly that he was of opinion that the forms of oath supplied by the government were the only ones to be used. It must be remembered that, while a copy of the statute is sent to the returning officer, and the deputy returning officers do not look at the provincial Act or any other Act; they regard their instructions and their forms as sufficient. And I feel confident that these were prepared expressly to mislead these officers. It was the opinion throughout my riding, and, I believe, throughout the province, that the object was to omit everything that would prevent a man from being bribed and then swearing in his vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Although I have spoken once already, yet, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has spoken a couple of times I may be allowed to say a word in order to correct myself. At first I said that I did not believe that all this was done on purpose to affect the elections in London and North Oxford, and I gave some explanation of what had happened lately in my own county. But I must say, that after the defence made by the minister,

and after two or three lawyers on that side have exposed their own differences in trying to explain this law, I am beginning to think that perhaps I was wrong. Think of these differences, and then imagine a poor candidate in the province of Quebec having to fight the government in spite of this and every other disability. He has in his county twenty-five or thirty deputy returning officers who are most active partisans and who have been working against him until the very morning of voting day; men who have never gone through the Election Act, never been instructed as to its provisions, but who are there to carry that election by every possible means. With such a law as we now have in force, and in view of what we have heard one would think that the Minister of Justice and several of his colleagues would go around to every poll and tell the deputy returning officer : 'You had better pay attention and do your duty, or there may be an action of damages against you.'

M. O. E. TALBOT. What about the eighteen years before 1896 ?

Mr. BERGERON. I am coming to that. What we have now is all the result of the change in the law. Every Liberal I have heard on the platform has boasted that of all the promises they made they have carried out one—they have made a change in the Franchise Act. But, now that the local governments are becoming Conservative I should not wonder if they would want to change it again. If they did so it would only be another example to prove what we already know, that their principles are not principles at all but a mere matter of opportunities. The law is not carried out at all. Every candidate should be in possession of the names of the deputy returning officers two days before the election, and these deputies should be instructed in the duties of their position. But that is not done. We can hardly even speak to the returning officer—we have to approach him with a great deal of care. And as to the deputies we are not given the names of a single one. And the same is true of the poll clerks. I have known cases where deputy returning officers were changed three times in the night before polling day. This happened in St. James division. But the hon. member for St. John and Iberville (Mr. L. O. Demers) has great consolation for us. He tells us we have a good action for damages against the deputy. That is consolation indeed, particularly when we are in opposition. Why, I caught some of my opponents in St. James division redhanded, putting bogus votes into the ballot boxes. And I had these men put in jail, but the Minister of Justice let them out. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. O. E. Talbot) speaks about the eighteen years before 1896. Before 1896 we had a Franchise Act which, while it may not have been perfect was at least the same for all the provinces. To-day, every farmer carries under his arm to the polling place the form of vote he wants to take. Every provincial law must be consulted before we can know who is entitled to vote for a member of the House of Commons. And this is the reason why I believe that all this was done with a purpose. Unless you have perfectly honest men as deputy returning officers, men who are versed in the duties of their office, it is impossible to obtain justice. The law is not carried out, notwithstanding all the explanation of the Minister of Justice. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery sends a box containing the forms, and those forms must vary according to the province.

We say : Where are the forms ? The deputy returning officer is an ordinary man. If he is a man of intelligence and even if he is a very honest man he is not versed in all the intricacies of what we are discussing here to-day. He says : I have received the forms. That is the answer that my deputy returning officer gave me. He spoke to me in that way. He was an honest man. I do not believe that man wanted to do an injury to me. He said : I have received these forms and it is my duty to administer the oaths which are incorporated in them. I read the law to him but he said : I am very sorry, but I have to follow my instructions. I say that many of them will do the same thing even if they are honest men. Would it be any more costly or any more cumbersome to the government to have all of form 16 under the Ontario Act printed on the paper which is the cause of this discussion ? Why not include these two paragraphs which are the only ones making it necessary to administer the oath to the elector so as to ascertain whether he is worthy of voting, whether he is an honest man, whether he has been bribed, whether he has been bought or whether he has bought anybody ? These are the only two paragraphs of the oath that we look upon as serious. Why do anything that would suggest an error or something that is worse than an error ? Why not have the whole thing printed upon this form here or upon this for the province of Quebec ? Why not mark it or write it and say this form is part of the provincial Act and part of the Dominion Act, but it only makes one form of oath for the elector to take ? I wanted to give some explanation of what I said before. I have done it because I am commencing to be convinced that there is a design in this. It is done in a very clever way. Elections have been going on to-day in two constituencies. All of these deputy returning officers are politicians. They are strong friends of hon. gentlemen opposite and even if they are honest men, if there is any doubt it will be decided in favour of the government candidate. If there is one thing more than another that we are all interested in it is that elections should

be impartially and honestly carried on in this country.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) who has just taken his seat has been referring to the difficulties the poor candidates who are now running in the Conservative interest in the province of Quebec have to face in order to get returned, and he says that the returning officers have been suspected of not being disposed to give them fair-play. I ask him how elections were carried out during the 18 years previous to 1896? I will not make a speech about it, but I will just mention a certain instance and quote the law in order to show the difficulties we also had to meet under the law as it was then in existence. I remember that in 1893, in the parish of Ste. Perpetue, in L'Islet county, 27 voters were disfranchised. Why? They had a form of oath in the law then in existence, Form X, paragraph 2, which read as follows:

> That my application to have my name so registered was refused; that I have duly appealed from such decision of the said revising officer, pursuant to the provisions of the said Act.

It was then understood and agreed that if a man's name was not on the list, if that man took an oath that his name should have been on the list, provided he made his application in time, if his application were not accepted, he had the right to vote, but there was nothing to cover the case of the voter whose name had been placed on the list but which had been stricken off by the paid heelers of the party, and I remember that at this particular poll, 27 good Liberals were disfranchised because there was not an oath which would apply to them. Yet, here is the hon. member for Beauharnois rising in his place as the representative of the party of purity of those days, but forgetting the difficulties against which we had to contend for 18 years. Up to 1896 we had to follow the salaried officers of the former government from parish to parish in order to endeavour to secure fair-play for the people and to see that not only the names of Liberals, but those of Conservatives who were entitled to vote were put on the list. I remember that for three weeks I followed a salaried officer of the government in the province of Quebec to see that the people got fair-play. I spent $350 of my own money to see that fair-play was given to the people, but when the lists were issued we found that the names of 375 voters had been stricken off the list although they had formerly been put on the list. These are the things we had to fight against up to 1896, and I think it is with very bad grace that these hon. gentlemen opposite now find fault with the condition of things prevailing at the present time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I may be permitted to say one or two words in reply to what has fallen from my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) I would like to do so. The object of the Dominion Elections Act, 1900, was obviously to make plain to the returning officers throughout the country what form of oath should be used. It was absolutely necessary that the form should be made plain, because you were using the provincial forms which varied according to the different provinces, and you were also providing for certain purposes a form for use throughout the whole of Canada. You therefore had a form of oath which varied in each province but a portion of which was the same throughout Canada. It would seem obvious that under these circumstances the provisions of section 21 of the statute should be followed strictly, and I do not think my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is able to argue that they have been followed strictly. I will point out why I think that. Section 21 provides that the returning officer—omitting matters that are immaterial—should receive a copy of the Act, the instructions approved by the Governor in Council and the forms of oath referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68. These are the three essentials as to the information which should be given to the returning officer for the purpose of carrying on the election. Now, we come to section 65. Section 65 says that the voter——

> Shall, before receiving his ballot paper, take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held——

My hon. friend the Minister of Justice says that only part of the oath prescribed by the provincial Act is the oath of qualification. The statute speaks of the oath of qualification not such part of the oath as relates to qualification. The statute provides that he shall:

> —take such oath of qualification as by the law of the province he may in the like case at a provincial election be required to take, such changes having been made in the form of oath as are necessary to make it applicable to the election being held, and shall also, if so required, take the oath in Form 'U.'

The elector may be required to take the provincial oath of qualification and also to take the oath in Form 'U'. If the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice were a correct argument he would have to admit that the form sent out in 1904 is an incorrect form, because it contains the provision which is embodied in both the provincial form and the Dominion form; that is to say that the government sent out to the returning officers in the month of November last a form of oath which contains these words:

> That you have not voted before at this election, either at this or any other polling place.

The Minister of Justice seems to think that anything that had been provided for in Form 'U' must be omitted from the provincial form. You have there exactly a provision contained in Form 'U.'

Mr. BRODEUR. In the provincial statutes there is a definition of what bribery is and there is also a definition in the federal statute. Then, if we are going to adopt the oath as it is incorporated in the provincial law, we should have the elector declaring whether he has been guilty of corrupt practices under the provincial laws. That is certainly not the intention of parliament because our law provided for the declaration of the corrupt practice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) has not observed the words I read :

> Such changes having been made in the form of oath to make it applicable to the election being held.

I was dealing with the point on which the Minister of Justice rested his case : that the provincial oath is an oath of qualification, and the oath in Form 'U' is not an oath of qualification. The argument which says that whatever is in one oath should be eliminated from the other, would demonstrate absolutely that the form of oath sent out in 1904 is wrong, because it contains a provision which is also found in Form 'U.' The essential point about the whole matter is this : that you are to send out the forms. The Minister of Justice says they have sent out the forms, and he refers us to the instructions, and the instructions are in these words :

> The oaths prescribed under sections 64, 65, 74 and 75, Forms 'T,' 'U,' 'V,' 'W,' first schedule, are administered viva voce. You will instruct your deputies that, when occasion demands it, they will swear the elector direct from the copy of the Dominion Elections Act which is supplied to them.
>
> Forms of the other oaths prescribed by the provincial law, adapted to the purposes of the present election, are furnished to you herewith.

That is not what the statute says. The statute does not say the forms of the other oaths prescribed by the provincial law are to be sent herewith. The statute says :

> The instructions referred to in subsection 1 of this section shall contain forms of the oath referred to in sections 65, 66 and 68.

And that, for the very reason that because you have adapted to Dominion purposes oaths contained in provincial Acts ; because you are also supplying a certain form applicable to all the provinces under the Dominion Elections Act, the statute makes it absolutely necessary that the exact form for each province should be sent forward to each deputy returning officer. The way the matter has worked out shows the absolute necessity for that. If the statute intended that, it was wise, and in no other way can you work it out satisfactorily, as has been shown by the practical experience of hon. gentlemen in this House.

If you leave the deputy returning officer to work this out for himself under the form of instructions the Minister of Justice has referred to, you will have exactly the same difficulty which prevailed in nearly every electoral district in this country. You have adopted an extraordinary procedure ; you have adopted, not only the provincial voters' lists, but part at least of the provincial form of oath. You have added to that the Dominion form of oath, and it is essential therefore, when you put your instructions in the hands of the returning officer, that you shall make them so absolutely plain to him that any man reading the instructions and reading the forms will know exactly what to do. We complain that you sent a form to the returning officers which some returning officers at least claimed to be an exclusive form. Every line and every word of these instructions will not be present to the mind of a deputy returning officer when he is carrying on an election in the hurry and confusion and controversy that sometimes arise in a polling booth. But if you have a form placed before him which contains everything that any voter can be required to swear to when he comes to vote, then you will not have the difficulty that has occurred. It may be that a very intelligent and studious returning officer, or deputy returning officer, if he cut out from the Dominion statutes what was necessary and added it to the form placed before him, might get along all right ; but this statute was designed to give him a form which, when he had it before him, would guide him exactly in the course which the law intended. Notwithstanding the argument of the Minister of Justice, I venture the statement that the forms which have been sent out are misleading ; that they are not the forms which are contemplated by the statute ; that the intention was that the forms sent forward with the instructions would contain everything that the deputy returning officer would be required to administer to any voter. Whether I am right in that or not, I am sincerely of that opinion, and I venture to think that the Minister of Justice, after what he has heard to-day, will conclude that that would be a wise way to carry out the law. If the law does not mean that at present, then the law should be amended in that direction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think I should make a statement to the House. The impression may have gone abroad that the Secretary of State is responsible for these forms as they went out. I sent for Mr. Fraser, who acted as Deputy Minister of Justice in the absence of Mr. Newcombe, and he tells me that I am responsible. Mr. Fraser prepared a memorandum for me on the 23rd of August, 1903, suggesting this

change, and I approved of it. Therefore, I should take the responsibility for the same.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I may be permitted one more word, I would say that we know a little more of what has taken place in these elections that have just been concluded, and the result of which we shall know presently, than we knew when my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) brought the question to the attention of the House. I concluded from the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) that it would not have been possible for an elector to be sworn to-day as to whether or not he had accepted a bribe in contravention of the law. We now know that such is not the case. It was open to any elector to challenge the vote of any other elector and to put to him the oath as to whether or not he had received a bribe and was disqualified. That is now beyond doubt, because, although the form that was used in 1900 has been amended by striking out paragraphs 8 and 9, which refer to bribery in the province of Ontario, the returning officer was supplied with a form of oath to be administered to the voter, which is contained in Form 'U,' and which is :

You swear or solemnly affirm——

That you have not been disfranchised under the provisions of the Act to disfranchise voters who have taken bribes, or for corrupt practices, under the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.

That you have not voted before at this election, either at this or at any other polling place;

That you have not received anything, that you do not expect anything, nor has anything been promised you directly or indirectly, to induce you to vote at this election, either for loss of time, travelling expenses, hire of team, or for any other services connected therewith ;

That you have not directly or indirectly paid or promised anything to any person either to induce him to vote or to refrain from voting at this election ;

That you are not otherwise disqualified from voting at this election.

This is as broad as the oath under the Ontario law, and therefore no injustice could have been done to any one. I would say further that these very forms were used in the elections in November, 1904, and, although seven months have elapsed since that time, I have not heard that any particular injustice has been done to anybody. My hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) says that he could not have this form with regard to bribery used in his election. That may be, but I do not know of any election in which you do not hear some complaint that there has been an irregularity. Even in the forms used for the ballots irregularities have been committed, and committed most innocently. There is the Wentworth election case, now before the Supreme Court, where forty voters were disfranchised by an act of the returning officer, and, had they not been disfranchised, the Liberal candidate would have been returned. That cannot have been done in bad faith, because if the returning officer in Wentworth was a political partisan, as it is said he was, it was his own party which suffered. I quite agree with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and with everybody else who has spoken on that side, that we should endeavour to make the law as simple as possible ; and if we have printed forms of oaths to distribute, perhaps it would be less confusing to the returning officers if the other forms in this book were included. If that is a proper suggestion, I have no doubt the government would be anxious to have it carried out ; and for my part I shall be glad to bring the matter at once to the attention of the Secretary of State. Because the returning officers are partisans, it does not follow that they are dishonest ; on the contrary, I believe they are honest men, who desire to do justice. But as these laws are only brought into operation once in four or five years, they are liable to be forgotten ; so that the simpler the forms are the better. Certainly the Minister of Justice has no objection to having the matter attended to ; and he has thrown out the excellent suggestion that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, where it can be threshed out, and where members on both sides of the House can give their opinions. For my part, I would be glad to act on this suggestion if it is agreeable to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Justice what is the reason we did not establish a general form of oath when we passed the Act ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because there are different qualifications in the various provinces. After having listened to the discussion, I think myself that the instructions to the returning officers should, in the spirit of the Act, contain every form of oath, instead of referring to an oath in the Franchise Act or in any other Act, as at present. Every form of oath should be embodied in instructions themselves.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister of Justice make that remark. After the discussion which has taken place, I think it must be admitted that the Prime Minister's rebuke to me was quite uncalled for. I can only say that I believe I was doing my duty in bringing this matter before the House and the country. If the form of oath is not satisfactory, is it not wise for us to change it and make it satisfactory ? I might also say, with regard to notifying the government, that I did what I could in that respect. I went to the returning officer and urged upon him the necessity of adding to the form which he had sent out to the deputies, these clauses which we have been discussing this afternoon. In doing that I believe that I was doing what was right ; and I think the argument here

this afternoon proves that it would have been wise had these two sections been added. You cannot expect men throughout the country to pick out of the Acts what is suitable for the occasion. I sincerely hope that before long the Minister of Justice will see that the forms sent out in future shall have these bribery clauses included. When the right hon. Prime Minister says that the government is not responsible, I cannot agree with him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that ; I say we are responsible.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to hear it. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that the government were not responsible for the present situation. However, so far as our judgment goes on this side of the House, this oath, as it has been administered, is to a certain extent a mutilated oath, and I hope the time is not far distant when the government will arrange to have these forms sent out in a proper way.

Motion (Mr. Armstrong) to adjourn, negatived.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Public Works—harbours and rivers—Quebec—River Ouelle—repairs, &c., $5,600.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR—(for Minister of Public Works). This is to continue the heavy repairs which were begun in the spring of 1904. The expenditures from the 1st of July to 31st December, 1904, was $2,985.83. This will complete the work.

Ottawa river—wharf near the mouth of Rivière du Lievre, $4,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make further provision for the construction of a public work at Masson or Buckingham Junction, some 20 miles below Ottawa, so as to give shipping falicilities. It is government property. The total estimate is $8,500 and this $4,500 will complete.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the policy of the government with regard to building wharfs ? They seem to favour some particular places and utterly ignore others. We have never had a wharf built by the government in the riding I represent. Would the minister state what are the conditions which will induce the government to build a wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy is the same as that which was carried on by our predecessors, namely, to construct wharfs for the accommodation of the public where the public interest demands it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. We should have something more definite. Because the Conservative government set the example is no reason why this government should follow it. If wharfs are to be built indiscriminately, without regard to any definite plan or condition or policy, you will have people in every locality asking the government to build their wharfs. Why should not these works be left to private enterprise ? In the part of the country where I come from, the wharfs are built by private individuals, but I do not see why we should not have them built by the government, if the government is to follow the policy of building them wherever the pressure is strong enough to influence it.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the duty of the government to see that shipping facilities are given wherever they are required for the development of trade. There are localities where private enterprise will do the work. On the Ottawa river there are wharfs which have been built by private companies, but these companies will not allow the public to use them and exercise a monopoly over them. It is thus frequently found advisable in the public interest, in order to afford shipping facilities to the whole community, that the government should construct these works.

Mr. BERGERON. I think the first reason the hon. gentleman gave is the best one, and that is that he is following the example of his predecessor. But he evidently forgets that his party, when in opposition, took days and days to criticise these expenditures by the late government. Evidently they were not sincere in their criticisms since they say they are carrying out the same policy.

Rivière Richelieu—dredging at Isle St. Therese, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is being done by a dredge belonging to the government. It is a revote.

Mr. BERGERON. There cannot be much hurry for the work since the money has been voted three times.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it was only voted once, namely, for the year 1904-1905, and this is a revote.

Mr. BERGERON. Has anything been expended yet ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but the dredge is there now.

Mr. BERGERON. Will that be the whole cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have been dredging in this river for some time, but this is the first time at that place.

Mr. BERGERON. At that place ?

Mr. BRODEUR. At this place ; it was the first time the dredging was done. This is on

the Richelieu river between Lake Champlain and Chambly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the depth of water maintained on the Richelieu ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Ten feet. Between St. John's and Lake Champlain there are large boats.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Between Lake Champlain and the River St. Lawrence is there a minimum depth of 10 feet ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is controlled by the depth of the Chambly canal, 7 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that done by contract or how ?

Mr. BRODEUR. By government dredge.

River Saguenay—dredging, $75,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is dredging at Chicoutimi which is being done by our own dredge. It is for the improvement of the navigable channel of the Saguenay, by dredging through shoals below Chicoutimi. The intention is to carry the depth of water there to 23 feet. The dredging is now being done to 17 feet so as to allow temporary relief and it is intended afterwards to continue it to 23 feet so as to allow vessels and steamships to come up the Saguenay river to Chicoutimi.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these vessels that go to the gulf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, trans-Atlantic vessels. There is a large export of pulp from the mills there. I think one of the largest pulp mills in this country is established at Chicoutimi.

Mr. BERGERON. How do they get there to-day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are loaded by lighters.

Mr. BERGERON. How far do they come up the Saguenay ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Within 9 miles of Chicoutimi.

Mr. BERGERON. And this is to bring them to Chicoutimi ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Will the work of one dredge cost $75,000 in a single season there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed it is intended to put two dredges if we can find another one.

Mr. AMES. The average cost of the dredge is less than $100 a day ; that would mean 750 days of dredging. Do you plan to give 750 days of dredging this season ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If we can get two dredges.

Mr. AMES. That would take ten dredges working two and a half months each ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We work seven months.

Mr. AMES. 750 days on one dredge would be equivalent to five dredges working 150 days each. I do not see how you are going to spend that with two dredges ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If we can get the dredges the money can be easily spent. I am informed by the department these dredges are working day and night so that makes two days for each one.

Mr. AMES. Do you mean it costs $200 a day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be $400 if there are two dredges.

Mr. AMES. Does it cost $200 a day to run a dredge day and night ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. AMES. There are a good many fixed charges and it should not cost twice as much to run twenty-four hours as to run twelve hours. I think we should have fuller details as to the number of men engaged, &c.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the number of that dredge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the 'International.'

Mr. BERGERON. How much can she do in a day ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is supposed to do about 1,500 yards in that kind of material.

Mr. AMES. I do not think the minister catches the point I am making. He wants $75,000 for dredging and states it takes $100 a day, for each dredge. That would mean 750 dredging days. It would require five dredges working 150 days each to use up the $75,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief engineer there are 216 working days during the navigation season. These dredges are working day and night, that would make $400 a day, and this for 216 days would make $85,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Are they working there now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'International' is going out there. My hon. friend will see that $75,000 is not too much.

Mr. BERGERON. She will not work five months this year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We will begin on the 1st of July and work until the end of the season and then next spring until the first of July. We are voting money to be expended during the fiscal year 1905-6 which includes from July 1st, 1905 to July 1st, 1906.

Mr. BERGERON. Why is this revote of $25,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because we only spent $30,000 last year.

Mr. BERGERON. When was the work commenced ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Minto' began to work in July, 1904.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did she spend last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was spent for the 'Minto' $11,032.73, for the tug $2,000 and for the 'Champlain' $1,250. And the sum of $15,000 on account of dredging in the upper basin of the River Saguenay was transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to recoup it for disbursements.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much will the whole work cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The whole work of making a twenty-foot channel will cost in the neighbourhood of $300,000. It is to enable transatlantic vessels to reach Chicoutimi.

Mr. BERGERON. What kind of material do they take out there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Sand, boulders and hardpan.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there any danger of the channel filling up again with sand ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that there is not.

Rivière St. Louis—improvements, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This revote of $7,000 is to make improvements in dredging the channel of Rivière St. Louis. The channel is to be six miles long, thirty feet wide and six feet deep at ordinary low water. It is carried on with a view to prevent the overflow of the land adjoining the water-course.

Mr. BERGERON. Can this work be completed for $7,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. I am informed that the money voted last year will have to be revoted.

Mr. BERGERON. There was $15,000 voted last. A dredge was built, costing, I suppose, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the amount spent.

Mr. BERGERON. It has taken all the time to build the dredge, and she has not done any work. If she is not set at work, the money spent in building her will be lost, because she cannot be taken away. But this six miles of dredging cannot be done for $7,000. Unless money is voted, the money already spent will be lost.

Mr. BRODEUR. The total cost will be about $25,000. As my hon. friend (Mr. Bergeron) knows the dredge was completed too late to work last season, and it is only now that she is ready to work.

Mr. BERGERON. But unless money is voted in the supplementary estimates, the dredge cannot go on.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the vote.

Mr. BERGERON. But there is nothing to pay for work done between now and July first.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, $15,000 has been voted.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the dredge at work now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but she is getting ready for work.

Mr. BERGERON. This new dredge was built last year, but, because she was completed too late in the season, or for some other reason, she has not done any work. She should have been ready this spring to earn the money voted last year. And I do not see how she is to go on working through the whole season when only $7,000 is voted.

Mr. BRODEUR. The dredge was not wholly completed last year, and the work necessary for completion has occupied the present season. But I am told she is now ready for work and will soon begin.

Mr. BERGERON. This $7,000 will not go far. Is there to be a vote in the supplementary estimates ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me that $7,000 will cover the work that will be done this season.

Rivière St. Louis—feeders—opening waterways between Ste. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to carry on projected improvements at the head of Rivière St. Louis with a view to securing an outlet for drainage waters and so preventing the rising of Lake St. Francis as a result of the dams built in 1840 by the united provinces of Upper and Lower Canada at the head of the Beauharnois canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that work going on ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No work has been done. That is why we are asking a revote of the whole amount.

Mr. WALSH. Was work done there in the fall of 1904 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was some work done for a few weeks.

Mr. WALSH. About what time of the year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The expenditure was from 1st July to 1st December—I have no more definite date.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a fact that only a few men were on that work about the latter part of October and early in November ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That may be ; I do not know.

Mr. BERGERON. What work is to be done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. As I have explained, the government intend to secure an outlet for the water which, coming from the St. Lawrence now overflows the land in that locality. The people there claim—and it would seem that their contention is correct though I have no information on the subject myself—that this overflow has been caused by the action of the government. So, this money is voted to prevent the repetition of this overflow. I am sure the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Walsh) will not object to the expenditure.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to know where the $5,000 was spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was only $500.

Mr. WALSH. In 1904-5 there was a vote of $15,000, and I see now that there is a revote of only $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimates before us were prepared about the beginning of January, and it was expected that a certain amount of money from the vote of last year would be spent before the expiry of the fiscal year, 1st July next. That is the reason a revote of only $10,000 is asked.

Mr. WALSH. I do not object to the vote but I would like to know whether the work is actually to be proceeded with ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not going on at present.

Mr. WALSH. But we understand that it will be prosecuted.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the government has taken any definite steps as to that, because we must ascertain whether the cost will not be too large.

Mr. WALSH. I believe that a survey and estimate have been made ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there was an estimate that the work would cost $96,000.

Mr. BERGERON. This amount for improvements at St. Louis for which $15,000 was voted last year and this item of——

St. Louis, feeders—opening waterways between St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe, $10,000.

—are as matter of fact the same work. It is a good thing and should be done. Work has been carried on here for many years. A great many works have been carried on in the River St. Louis in the last twenty-five years but they have not all been completed. My hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue understands very well that there is a good deal of politics in this.

Mr. BRODEUR. There was.

Mr. BERGERON. This work lies between Huntingdon and Beauharnois which were before the last election both represented by friends of the government. The government came to the conclusion that it might exercise an influence in favour of their friends to have a certain amount of money voted for this work. Consequently $15,000 was voted for the improvements at St. Louis. The question as to the best method of doing that work was discussed for a long time. The government or the department finally came to the conclusion that it would be done better by a dredge. This is a matter in regard to which there is a difference of opinion. My own impression is that it might be done better in another way. But, it was decided to have the work done by a dredge. Any money which was appropriated for the deepening of the river was expended on the construction of a dredge. The work of constructing the dredge was carried on until a few days before the election. They were paying one superintendent $3 a day to superintend another superintendent and so on. A few days before the election the dredge was working so hard that it broke down. After the election it was so late in the season that it had to stop work. Another $15,000 was voted for opening the waterways between St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe but my hon. friend does not know whether anything is going on or not. The government have not made up their mind how much it will cost. I want to be more just to the government. I have no doubt that before they decided to ask parliament to vote that money they found out how much the work could be done for. I think the estimate of $96,000 is too high. If the officers of the department search the files they will find that there is a report which was made by Mr. Parent, the engineer of the canal some years ago, in which he estimates that the work can be done for a great deal less by doing it in a different way. This is the first time I have seen the item placed in this form 'opening waterways between St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe.' Formerly it was to make a kind of dam to keep the water in Lake St. Louis.

Mr. BRODEUR. Was there not some work done in the old days?

Mr. BERGERON. There was some done but not much. It was a great deal harder to get money from the government then than it is now. This vote will go through but as Huntingdon and Beauharnois are not now represented by the same men the work will no doubt stop.

Mr. BRODEUR. Quite the reverse. We are doing some work on the River St. Louis.

Mr. BERGERON. On the River St. Louis you built a dredge. Unless that dredge is put to work this money will be completely lost because she cannot be taken anywhere else. She has to stay there and unless my hon. friend places some more money in the supplementary estimates to keep that dredge at work until the end of

the season the money already spent will have been spent in an almost useless way. I think it is very important that some work should be done between Anicet and Ste. Barbe. My hon. friend, I am sure, will find that the amount of money which he has mentioned there is necessary, but before the government asked parliament to vote $15,000 for that part of the work they surely must have had an idea of how much it would cost, and they must know that the work there was promised to be done. It was promised by Mr. Loy and his friends and it was promised by the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) very often in my presence. It is a good work, it should be done and I call upon my hon. friend to see that the money which is voted is spent in prosecuting this work to as great an extent as possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know why my hon. friend should complain so much of the action of the government. The money has been voted. He says that he was eighteen years asking for the money to do this work and that he could not get it; yet, because we have begun the work and because we have begun the construction of a dredge which was absolutely necessary, my hon. friend complains. He suggests another way of doing the work. I would like to know what other way—by pick and shovel?

Mr. BERGERON. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it will be much more expensive than to do the work by dredging even if the dredge could be used only in that place. It is a work which will cost some money and I think that if the work were done by pick and shovel it would not be done as satisfactorily as it would be done by a dredge to say nothing of the fact that it would cost a great deal more. My hon. friend should not complain of the fact that the late member succeeded in having money voted for this work after my hon. friend had been unsuccessfully asking for it for eighteen years. If the late member was fortunate enough to have the necessary money voted for that work which he declares himself to be a very necessary work, what has my hon. friend to find fault with? Now, the work is going on. The dredge has been completed and the work will go on. The money which has been voted, I understand, will cover the expenditure on account of that dredge during the year.

Mr. BERGERON. Now that the money is voted it should be expended for the object for which it is voted. I say it is a good object. If Mr. Loy were here he would not thank my hon. friend at all. That money was promised to him about five years ago and it was put in the estimates every year but it never amounted to anything until the election came on and Mr. Loy himself has complained that he has been played upon. He has complained that the work was not done as it should have been done. This was an election promise and if my hon. friend met Mr. Loy I am sure he would tell him so himself. I cannot ask for any favour, as I have no right to ask a favour of my hon. friend.

Mr. BRODEUR. Why not?

Mr. BERGERON. No, no; I would not do it. I give credit to the government that they did vote the money and I take it as an indication that they intend to have the work done although they do it very late. The object is good.

Mr. BRODEUR. We had $15,000 voted last year and more than $8,000 has been already spent.

Mr. BERGERON. But you expended it upon the construction of a dredge. There is no work done yet.

Mr. BRODEUR. But, it is in connection with that work. I do not know why my hon. friend should complain because he admits that the dredge could be used only there. The dredge has been built for that purpose and it is beginning the work about which my hon. friend should not complain at all.

Mr. BERGERON. Why did the dredge not begin to work until May? She is not doing anything now, I understand.

Mr. BRODEUR. Because it was not completed.

Mr. BERGERON. It was completed last fall.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the information I have.

Mr. WALSH. I would like to ask the hon. minister if any work is going on there. The only work which has been done there was done by this pick and shovel brigade which you speak of just before the last election. A few men were set at work before polling day.

Mr. BRODEUR. If there is too much complaint about the pick and shovel brigade I will drop the item pure and simple. Stands.

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not know that we should allow this item to stand. The hon. minister is not running the whole House. There is no use of getting mad because we choose to criticise an item. I think the hon. minister had better keep his temper.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am keeping my temper.

Mr. HENDERSON. Because a member from that section of the country chooses to offer a little fair criticism I think the

hon. minister is not doing justice to his usual reputation in this House by standing up and threatening to drop the item.

Mr. BRODEUR. We will consider it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I will give the Minister of Inland Revenue the credit of being courteous generally, but he made a mistake in attacking my young friend (Mr. Walsh) and threatening to drop this item. The minister can suit himself about dropping the item, but he should not drop it because a member on this side thought it his duty to offer reasonable criticism.

Mr. WALSH. If the minister had allowed me to finish my explanation, he would have understood my position. The work was promised by friends of the government, and I have no criticism as to that, but the men whose property is affected came to the conclusion that the work was not to be prosecuted, and they asked me a great many times to inquire about it. That was my object in mentioning the matter. Personally, I have no interest, but the people there have been promised it for years and they are interested. Nothing has been done to proceed with the work this year, and that is why I asked what was the intention of the government.

Mr. BARKER. I object to this further example of the very improper method in which the government deals with these matters. Last year $15,000 was granted for this work ; apparently a small sum was expended, and the minister tells us that up to the 1st of July next $5,000 will have been expended, and he asks a revote of $10,000. It transpires that the minister has an estimate of what this work is going to cost, which he says amounts to $96,000, but he says that estimate is an exaggeration.

Mr. BRODEUR. I said the estimate was $96,000, but I did not say it was exaggerated. That statement was made by the hon. member for Beauharnois.

Mr. BARKER. I have protested time and again against taking these small votes from year to year for a work that in the end will cost a very large sum of money. I am told by hon. gentlemen on this side that this is a deserving work, but we who do not know the locality are entitled to be told what the entire expenditure will be without being asked to vote blindly. Some of these expenditures would never be endorsed by parliament if we knew what their ultimate cost would be.

Mr. BRODEUR. The excavation is estimated to cost $69,000 ; the improvements at the mouth of the river, $6,000 ; three bridges, $6,000 ; clearing of the River St. Louis, $7,000 ; and $8,000, or 10 per cent, for superintendence and contingencies. The work may be done in a way to cost less than $96,000, but new surveys would have to be made for that.

Mr. BERGERON. Who made that report ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Michaud, the engineer of the district.

Mr. BERGERON. Was there not a report made by Mr. Parent some years ago ; an entirely different report ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me there is no record of it in the Department of Public Works, although it may be in the Department of Railways and Canals. Twenty years ago the government did work in connection with this scheme.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister gravely tell the House that $5,000 has been expended, and that he does not know what this work is going to cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There have been only $500 spent.

Mr. BARKER. The minister said $300 or $400 had been spent and that the balance of the $5,000 would be expended up to the 30th of June.

Mr. BRODEUR. No. There was an expenditure of $548 up to the time these estimates were prepared, and it was then estimated, in January last, that $4,439 would be expended up to the 30th of June, but that money has not been expended.

Mr. TAYLOR. Why does not the minister ask for a revote of the balance of the $15,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because the estimate had been prepared in that way, as I explained.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the $451 spent for ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In pick and shovel work on the land.

Mr. TAYLOR. What work has been done for that expenditure, and why was not the balance of the vote of last year expended ? Is it the intention of the minister to discontinue the work altogether ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will report to the Minister of Public Works what has been said with regard to this work, and I suppose we shall have to examine the question and see whether it is advisable to continue the work or not.

Mr. TAYLOR. The hon. gentleman said he would drop the item.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly, if the member for the county wants to have the item droped.

Mr. TAYLOR. He did not ask to have it dropped. He was giving it fair and honest criticism, and the minister off his own bat suggested that he would drop the item. It looks as if the $15,000 was put in last year for election purposes, and now that the elec-

tion is over the minister is ready to drop the item and not go on with the work.

Mr. BERGERON. This work is not the same as the work I was speaking of. The object of the vote is to prevent the waters of Lake St. Francis flooding the farms of St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe. The report of Mr. Parent, an engineer of the government some years ago, recommended the building of a dam, which seems to be the more natural plan for preventing the waters of Lake St. Francis flooding these farms. The dam was partly built by the government years ago, and if it were continued, there would be no need of having waterways or bridges. That is always the idea I had of that work, and I am convinced that the figures of its cost was a great deal less than the amount mentioned by my hon. friend for the proposed work. This is a very important work, as most of these farms are valuable, and they are covered with water for a long time in the year. I was glad to see the money appropriated for this work, but why was the work not commenced in time? We hear that a few men were there with picks and shovels; but that was not serious work, which is also evident from the fact that my hon. friend is willing to let the item stand. These are two different things, although they may both be connected with the River St. Louis. I want to hear what my hon. friend has to say before I give further criticism of the item.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for Beauharnois evidently thinks that it would be better to proceed in some different way from that suggested in this vote. This vote is for the opening of waterways, but my hon. friend thinks it would be better to extend the dyke which was commenced some years ago, and he says there is a report of Mr. Parent to that effect. There is no such report in the Public Works Department; but in view of the remarks of my hon. friend, I think it is the duty of the Public Works Department to look into the matter and see whether the suggestion he makes is better than what is proposed in this vote. Under the circumstances, I think it is perfectly justifiable to wait until the minister is here and can inquire into the matter and see whether it is better to adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. BERGERON. My hon. friend is not serious. I am not proposing any plan; I am not managing the affairs of the Public Works Department; I take things as I find them. The present engineer of the department has made a report; the department have acted on that report, and have proposed a vote to parliament. I want the department to carry on their own works. I was answering my hon. friend, who said that the report mentioned the sum of $96,000. I am not going to prevent my hon. friend spending that money if he wants to spend it or thinks the expenditure of it is necessary. In answer to that, I said I had seen a report in which the estimate was a great deal less, and according to which the work was to be done in a different way. The report I saw was that of an engineer, but of course I am not competent to judge between the two reports. All I ask my hon. friend is to carry out the work for which the money was voted last year. It will be childish for him to say: we will wait to find out whether you are not right or wrong. If he would agree to take my opinion on everything, of course let him accept this with the rest; but if he wants to leave the item out merely because I have pointed to another report, I am opposed to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked for on the advice of a local engineer. My hon. friend informs me that there is another report, not in the Public Works Department but probably in the Department of Railways and Canals, because the engineer who made it was then the engineer of the latter department.

Mr. BERGERON. It is true that Mr. Parent was the engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, but when I was urging the Department of Public Works to have the work done—because we have been asking to have it done for twenty-five years—that department asked Mr. Parent who was on the spot, to make a report, which he did.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me that he never knew anything about that report of Mr. Parent, and he infers that as Mr. Parent was then the engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals, his report must be in that department. If my hon. friend however says it is in the Department of Public Works, we will look for it there. The object of the government is to drain these lands because it is complained that if they are now covered by water, that is due to some works which the government built in connection with the canal. That is why I think my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that the report must have passed through the Public Works Department.

Mr. BERGERON. At that time the whole thing was in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. BRODEUR. But my hon. friend is referring to a report which was made at a time when the Public Works Department was not included in the Department of Railways and Canals. My hon. friend says that the plan we are proposing is much more expensive than that recommended in the report of Mr. Parent. Does he then think that I would be justified, in the absence of the minister, in committing the department to an expenditure which could be reduced, if my hon. friend's statement be correct. If we can save $20,000 or $25,000 in the drain-

ing of those lands by the adoption of the suggestion of my hon. friend, we ought certainly to adopt it.

Mr. BERGERON. I am not speaking as an engineer, and I would not say that Mr. Parent's report is the better one of the two. My hon. friend should take the report of Mr. Michaud, and ask parliament to vote the money, and there will be nothing to prevent his having the work done for a less amount of money if possible. But he should not try to throw the responsibility on me if nothing should be done.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not doing that, but I say that my hon. friend is making a very valuable suggestion. He says there is a report somewhere, according to which this work may be done for less money. No money has yet been spent, why then should the government go on without looking up this other report ?

Mr. TAYLOR. That will not prevent my hon. friend allowing the item to pass. Then he can consult with the minister, and when we come to concurrence, if the minister thinks we ought to drop the item, let him drop it. But my hon. friend should not get up in a huff and say : Because my hon. friend criticises, we will drop the item.

Mr. BRODEUR. All I said was that the item should stand for the reason given by my hon. friend from Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). But I am quite willing it should pass with the understanding that the minister himself will look into it.

Mr. WALSH. I do not believe that the hon. minister wants to be unfair to me, especially as I am a young member. I certainly was not opposing the vote. On the contrary I wanted to know whether it is going to be expended, because we have been asking a long time to have this work done, and this waterway will have to be built some time or other.

Mr. BRODEUR. What does my hon. friend think about a dyke ?

Mr. WALSH. You will still have to make a waterway as well as a dyke. This land was flooded on account of some works erected at the mouth of the canal by the government, and the government recognized its obligation by paying many years ago the damages caused to some of these lands. In order to drain the lands, there must be a ditch or canal to connect with the St. Lawrence river. A dyke would not be sufficient.

Mr. BRODEUR. Suppose a dyke would be made on the bank which would prevent the water overflowing, and that was found less expensive than a canal, does not my hon. friend think it would be better to adopt that system ?

Mr. WALSH. That is not practicable because there is a river there which flows into the St. Lawrence, and the water is backed up this river and overflows the lands. It is necessary that a waterway be built on that account, because by closing the outlet you are preventing the water from being drained off.

Rivière Verte—improvements at mouth, $5,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to cover the estimated cost of completing the work commenced in 1904-5 near the mouth of the river, together with a widening and deepening of the centre of the channel, and is required to carry away the water of the swollen stream in the spring. The object is to prevent the properties on this side of the river being eroded by ice and currents in the spring.

Sacré Cœur—wharf, $9,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required to complete the wharf, 210 feet long, which is being built on the north side of the Saguenay, at this place, about twelve miles above its mouth. The work is under contract.

St. Alexis, Ha Ha bay pier, $17,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is also under contract. It is to complete the pier 1,448 feet long began in 1899-1900. There will be a depth of 9 to 10 feet at low water spring tide.

St. André de Kamouraska wharf—repairs to earth approach, &c., $6,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the accommodation of another block of cribwork, measuring 100 feet wide, 20 feet in diameter, in order to accommodate the increasing traffic. The present structure is only 24 feet long and altogether too small for that purpose.

Ste. Anne de la Pocatière—reconstruction of pier, $1,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to cover the estimated cost of rebuilding the pier which was destroyed in 1905.

Mr. BERGERON. What county is that in ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Kamouraska.

St. Charles Borromée—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked in order to make further provision towards the construction of a small wharf. It is in the county of Chicoutimi.

Ste. Famille, Island of Orleans—extension of wharf, $700.

Mr. BERGERON. Is that a new wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is an old work.

Mr. BERGERON. When was it built ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About twenty years ago.

Mr. BARKER. Will this complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Ste. Fidèle wharf, $11,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the payments for 1906 in connection with the public works being built at Ste. Fidèle in Charlevois.

Mr. BARKER. Will that complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is expected to complete it.

Mr. BARKER. Is that the estimate given to the department that it will complete ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, according to the estimate of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. $3,000 was voted before which will make $14,000 in all.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

St. Francois, Island of Orleans—approach to isolated block, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the construction of a length of 200 feet of cribwork to the isolated block. It stands at a distance of 650 feet from high water mark. It is proposed to call for tenders. This is in Montmorency county.

Mr. BERGERON. That is a revote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The department had no time to prepare plans last fall. The plans are being prepared now.

St. Francois de Sales—wharf, &c., on River James, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the construction of a block from the river.

Mr. BARKER. Why was that not expended last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the department had no time to prepare the plans.

Mr. BARKER. The department took a grant before the first of July for this money?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it was after July 1st that parliament prorogued.

Mr. BARKER. A month afterwards. Was nothing done last year, was no estimate made ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nothing has been done, no.

Mr. BARKER. Was there any reason for granting it last year when it was known the work could not be done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was expected the work would be done last year, but the plans could not be prepared.

Mr. BARKER. Had the November elections anything to do with it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is true the elections were held then, but we might expect the plans could be prepared ; there were many works to be carried on.

Mr. BARKER. There are four items here, one after the other all in the same position, money granted last year and not a dollar has been spent. These grants were made two or three months before the elections. I think the inference is fair, it was all done in August or July, preparatory to the autumn elections, and not a dollar was spent, and now the government come back this year for renewals of these votes.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is mistaken. For most of the works for which money was voted last year the plans were prepared. Parliament prorogued late and it was not known before the appropriation was voted whether the money would be at the disposal of the department or not. I must mention the fact—I do not know for what reason the criticism is made—but in my district there was a public building in which I was much interested, it was of the greatest importance to me that the work should be done, but I could not get the plans prepared. The officers of the department did their best, they worked day and night upon different works for which money was voted, but the money having been voted so late in some cases the plans could not be prepared.

Mr. BARKER. And the electors were allowed to live in expectation.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think this had anything to do——

Mr. BARKER. No ?

Mr. BRODEUR——with the election. And I am sure the member for Laval (Mr. Leonard) will not say that.

Mr. BERGERON. Are plans prepared during the winter ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are being prepared now.

Mr. BARKER. Are they ready ? You have had a whole year.

Mr. BRODEUR. They are just about ready.

St. Fulgence wharf, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This covers the estimated cost of extending the block and span high water wharf commenced in 1904 on the north side of the River Saguenay, 10 miles below Chicoutimi.

Mr. BARKER. Will this complete that work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. The estimate given to the government shows that this $5,000 will complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

St. Gédéon Islands—wharf, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is under contract, it is to complete.

St. Jean, Island of Orleans—repairs to wharf, $5,000.

Mr. BERGERON. What county is this in ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Montmorency.

Mr. WILMOT. I would like to inquire if the provincial government is called upon to give any share of the expense for the construction of these works ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they are public property. It is repairs made to a wharf which belongs to the government.

Mr. WILMOT. The reason I asked was that in the River St. John, New Brunswick there is an amount here :

To provide for contributions to local government, not to exceed one-half the first cost of wharfs built by them in tidal waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that is in virtue of an understanding between two governments.

Mr. WILMOT. I should think a similar understanding should be made in both cases.

Mr. BRODEUR. These are inland waters, I understand ; but the present work is on the River St. Lawrence.

Mr. WILMOT. The River St. John is a very important river.

Mr. FOWLER. The St. John is a navigable river, as the St. Lawrence is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it of as much importance ?

Mr. FOWLER. No ; but the same principle applies.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work was built many years ago, and the vote is only for repairs.

Mr. WILMOT. I am not complaining of this expenditure, but I think that if the Dominion government build wharfs on the St Lawrence, they ought to build them on other waters.

St. Simeon wharf—extension, $15,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the nature of the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the work in connection with the approach to the isolated pier at St. Simeon, which is being built under contract. The amount of the contract is $19,062.67, and the contractor is Napoleon Trudel.

Mr. INGRAM. How many tenders were there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not that information, but I can get it if the hon. gentleman desires. The tenders were advertised for publicly, and the contract was given to the lowest tenderer.

Terrebonne—wharf with approach, on River Jesus, $7,000.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the plans ready for this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are being made ready. It is just the same case as the other.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Are those works being carried out simultaneously with those that are in process at St. Francis of Sales for which a vote has just been taken ?

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Although the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Walsh) does not seem to take any stock in the statement made by the government when asking a vote from the House in connection with such works, I may tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Léonard) that they will be carried out in the proper time. I am quite sure that the works at St. Francis of Sales will be dealt with in the same way as those at Terrebonne which have just been referred to.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I do not find any fault with the works contemplated here; on the contrary, I believe that they will serve a useful purpose. I entertain no doubt about their being carried out, owing to the fact that both the county of Terrebonne and that of Laval will be benefited by those works.

Mr. DESJARDINS. (Translation.) Those works concern not only the county of Terrebonne, but also two other constituencies. They will prove useful to the three counties of Laval, Terrebonne and L'Assomption.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) As I said a little while ago, I find no fault with the contemplated works ; but I wanted to know whether they were to be carried out this year, and whether the government intended to redeem a promise made long ago.

Yamaska river—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract.

Mr. BERGERON. Who has the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. William Davis & Son, of Ottawa. This is dredging at the mouth of the River Yamaska, which empties into the St. Lawrence. The work has been going on for some time.

Mr. FOWLER. What is the object of this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is at the mouth of the river and allows navigation of the Yamaska, which is navigable for several miles above this place.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it not true that there are certain saw-mills on the Yamaska, and that this work is done to benefit these mills, and should be done by private enterprise rather than at the expense of the country ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; there are no mills there that I know of, and I know the place very well.

Mr. FOWLER. What vessels ply there—ocean steamers ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but market boats running between places on the river and Sorel.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me the same argument that would justify this work would justify work on the St. John. If the Yamaska empties into the St. Lawrence, the St. John empties into the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think that dredging in New Brunswick is done by the government.

Mr. FOWLER. Only in the harbours, not in tributaries of the St. John.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that there were two dredges working on tributaries of the St. John last year.

Mr. BERGERON. Did we not vote some money in the supplementary estimates for this dredging at the mouth of the Yamaska ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; $12,200 has been spent so far. It must have been $2,000 that was voted in the supplementary estimates. I have not the figures before me.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the material that is taken out ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Soft and hard clay and quicksand.

Mr. BERGERON. Does not that quicksand fall back into the channel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not to a very large extent.

Mr. BERGERON. How far is the river navigable from its mouth ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About fifteen miles, I suppose. My hon. friend will remember that some years ago, in order to afford navigation on that river, the government built a lock there, which has cost a large sum of money.

Mr. BERGERON. That lock supports navigation for what distance?

Mr. BRODEUR. For about fifteen miles.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the matter with the lock now?

Mr. BRODEUR. The lock is there.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it in operation ? Was it not carried away by an accident?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is a very useful work.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Apple river wharf, $3,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the hon. minister to make a brief explanation of each one of these items stating the county in which the proposed work is, the purpose for which it is required, the amount that is already expended, the total amount that is estimated for the completion of the work, and the probable date of completion in each instance. If the hon. minister will give us these particulars it would save time.

Mr. BRODEUR. This breakwater and wharf is in Cumberland county. This is a vote which is asked to be taken to make provision according to an estimate submitted by the chief engineer for completing a breakwater and wharf at Apple river during this year. The total cost of the proposed work will be $6,000. The Apple river falls into the Chignecto up at the head of the Bay of Fundy. At its mouth there is a good and well sheltered harbour.

Baddeck—wharf, $5,000.

Mr BRODEUR. This work is in North Victoria. This revote is asked to be taken to make provision towards the construction of a public wharf 40 feet wide at Baddeck, which will reach a depth of 18 feet at low water on Little Bras d'Or lake as requested by the inhabitants of the town. It appears that there is no port on the island of Cape Breton from which there is shipped as much of the soil as from Baddeck, that the imports as well as the number of passengers landed here are large and that all imports to and exports are by water. The appropriation for the current fiscal year was $5,000. No money has been expended. There are three sites which have been offered, but no definite choice has been made as to these sites.

Mr. BARKER. Have the plans not been prepared until now?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the delay is in regard to the site.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. minister has omitted to state the total cost of the work and the date of completion.

Mr. BRODEUR. The maximum estimate of the cost of the site is $5,000. The whole work will cost $15,000.

Barachois—boat harbour, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This revote is to make provision for protecting the anchorage at Barachois in rear of the shingle beach, by constructing a light breastwork that will arrest the heavy surf, also blasting with dynamite a narrow ledge or rock which obstructs the entrance to the boat harbour. There was an appropriation of $1,500 last year but no money was spent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will that complete the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. The cost will be that amount.

Bass river—repairs to wharf, $500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the purpose of completing repairs commenced in 1904 on the Bass river wharf in order to place the structure in a serviceable condition.

Bay St. Lawrence—boat harbour, $5,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is in North Victoria. This revote is asked to make provision towards converting Macdonald's Pond in to a safe boat harbour, and it is to complete the work of opening a channel 30 feet wide across the beach which closes the entrance of this pond at low water. The total cost of the work contemplated will be $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. We had an experience in connection with making a boat harbour in the constituency of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). In that instance they cut a channel through to an inland body of water. After they had got the channel completed the water ran out. Have the minister's engineers looked into this matter carefully to make sure that the same thing will not be repeated?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the chief engineer that they will look into that question.

Bear cove—breakwater, $5,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is in Digby county. This vote of $5,500 is asked to make provision for the construction of a breakwater at Bear Cove between Cape Cove and Meteghan, each four miles distant, that will afford protection to the fishing boats of the locality. The total cost is $4,500.

Beckerton—public wharf, $2,700.

Mr. BRODEUR. This revote is required to complete during the year the block and span wharf which is being built at Beckerton. The total cost will be $4,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is Beckerton ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Guysborough county.

Breton cove—boat landing, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract. This is to complete the wharf which is in course of construction. The amount of the contract is $5,585.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems to be a very large amount for a mere boat landing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Well, this is the report of the engineer.

Mr. FOWLER. What county?

Mr. BRODEUR. North Victoria.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should a boat landing cost so much as that?

Mr. BRODEUR. That was the lowest tender that was received.

Mr. FOWLER. Who has the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Reid & Archibald.

Mr. FOWLER. Has any work been done yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is expected that $2,250 will be expended up to the 30th June.

Bridgewater—dredging, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is in Lunenburg county. This revote is to be applied towards dredging the River La Have and extending the channel as far as the steamboat wharf, five-eighths of a mile below the bridge in the centre of the town of Bridgewater.

Mr. BARKER. Why did you not do the work last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be done by a government dredge, and there was no dredge available.

Broad cove—repairs to wharf, $3,700.

Mr. BRODEUR. In Inverness county. This work is according to the estimate of the chief engineer ; nothing has been spent.

Carlos' breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Guysboro county. This is to make provision for a breakwater 900 feet long which it is believed will afford protection for the boats.

Mr. BARKER. What is the total cost of this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be $29,000.

Clark's harbour—removal of rocks from channel, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Shelbourne county.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any estimate of the total cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There cannot be any definite estimate because they do not know what quantity will have to be removed. The population there is 1,500, and the total expenditure has been $14,000 so far.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You would not go into a work of that kind without some idea of what the total cost will be. It might be reasonable to do it if it would cost $25,000, and not reasonable if it would cost $500,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is expected that this amount will cover the whole expenditure, but that is not certain.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it a river harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Country harbour—removal of obstructions, $2,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimated cost of this is $2,200.

Mr. FOWLER. Is it the intention of the government to make Country harbour the terminus of the Grand Trunk Pacific ? I think a former member for Guysboro' advocated that.

Mr. BRODEUR. It might be a good place for that purpose if there is not too much objection to it.

Mr. OSLER. Nearly the whole of these are revotes. Why do you put them in the estimates from year to year ; there is no election now.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the intention to carry them out this year.

Cow bay (Port Morien)—repairs to breakwater, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for carrying on during the fiscal year repairs and improvements and extensions in order to insure the stability of the breakwater still standing, and restoring it to the original length. The total probable cost is $225,000.

Mr. INGRAM. How much has been spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Over $200,000 was spent some years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. Do you mean that now you intend to spend $225,000 or only $25,000 more ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The cost of restoration and repairs will be $225,000 more.

Mr. OSLER. What business is done there ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Coal mining.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What company ships from there ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The Newcastle Company.

Mr. OSLER. How much coal was shipped last year ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I have not the figures for the output last year but it was about 40,000 tons. They have been developing during the winter and the intended output during the coming season is about 1,000 tons per day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this the place where the Archibald mine was ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That mine was acquired by the Dominion Coal Company ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Dominion Coal Company do not ship from there ; this is a new company ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. This is a new company called the Gowrie Blockhouse Collieries.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Developing a new seam ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do they not ship from the same place as the Dominion Coal Company ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. The Dominion Coal Company have abandoned the piers at Cow bay. This colliery company have no connection with the railway, and are entirely dependent on their own wharf for the shipment of their coal. They have erected a short distance from this breakwater a pier, and this breakwater will protect that pier. They cannot build their pier sufficiently large to accommodate their traffic until the breakwater is restored to its former condition. The work on Cow bay is a very old work on which twenty years ago or more a very large amount of money was expended. Ten or twelve years ago about 200 feet of that breakwater was carried away, and nothing was done to save it. The result has been that during the last eight or nine years a large amount of money has had to be expended to preserve what remained of that work. What did remain has been preserved and is in fairly good condition now ; but in order that the breakwater may become useful to the port, it is necessary that it should be restored. The coal company cannot carry on their work unless the breakwater is restored.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total quantity of coal supposed to be in the seam that is being developed ? Will it continue at the rate of 1,000 tons a day for any great length of time ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes. There are millions and millions of tons of coal in the area held by these people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the seam under the Archibald seam ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Yes, and their property is a submarine area. They have now reached their own property, and last year they drove their levels in order to get a considerable output this season.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It amounts, I suppose, to building a shipping place for this company ? I do not say that may not be justifiable.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I am perfectly willing to admit that it is the most important purpose that this breakwater will serve. At the same time, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that Cow bay is a very important fishing community, and the people who have fishing craft are entirely dependent on the breakwater for the safety of their craft. The present coal company are not using the breakwater for the purposes of their own shipment. They are erecting their own pier

at a very considerable expense; but this breakwater is necessary to protect it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In other words, the breakwater forms a harbour, and it is to be put in the same position for this company that it was for the Archibald company years ago?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Precisely so.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the minister to give us the details of the $225,000 that this work is likely to cost. What are the different portions of the expenditure?

Mr. BRODEUR. To construct and complete the dock removing the ballast deposit along the inner quay face and placing concrete blocks or quarried stone on seaward face and outer end of portion of breakwater still standing, $89,700; restoring the breakwater to its original length by constructing 260 feet of native timber cribwork filled with concrete placed along the continuation of the inner face of the work, and protecting with concrete blocks or quarried stone the seaward side of the proposed extension, $135,800.

Mr. AMES. Is it the intention of the government to do this by day labour, or will they call for tenders?

Mr. BRODEUR. By day's work.

Cow Bay Run—breakwater to protect outlet of harbour, $500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is required for the purpose of completing the breakwater of strong ballast cribwork 125 feet long by 25 feet wide, which is being built outside of Cow bay run at the entrance of Halifax harbour in the county of Halifax.

Culloden breakwater, $2,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision towards the construction of this breakwater for the protection of fishing boats. It is in the county of Digby.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the total cost of this and the previous item?

Mr. BRODEUR. This will cost about $20,000.

Mr. OSLER. What is the size of the place?

Mr. BRODEUR. The population is about 1,000 fishermen.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the work started yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the cause of delay?

Mr. BRODEUR. Plans are now being prepared.

Mr. FOWLER. I might suggest a reason to the minister for all these votes. He will remember that we had an election last year, and previous to that election these promises were of course all made. That is the reason.

Cunningham Point—wharf on Milford Haven river, $2,360.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Guysborough county and is to provide for lock and span work. Total expenditure $2,360.

Mr. INGRAM. This is exactly the same as the other case. Are the plans ready yet?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, nothing is ready yet.

Devil's Island—breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that in North Oxford?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is in Halifax county.

Mr. INGRAM. I thought from the name it was in North Oxford.

Mr. BRODEUR. $5,900 is the amount of the contract.

Digby pier—repairs and renewals, $1,000.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this the contract which was made by the member for Digby with the town of Digby?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know anything about that contract. I think that happened before the election and did not give any bad result.

Mr. INGRAM. Was it not to be $5,000?

Mr. FOWLER. That was what the member for Digby was to get.

East Chezzetcook—breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for extending the breakwater a distance of 400 feet. It will have a total length of about 800 feet and cost $8,000. It is in the county of Halifax.

Freeport—landing pier, $14,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the protection of the landing pier on the east side of Grand Passage. It is to be let by contract this year. The lowest tender is $13,700.

Gabarus—harbour improvement, $20,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for all improvements during the present year and is required to give protection to vessels entering during south-westerly gales. The contract is for $19,000 given to the lowest tenderer. It is in the county of Cape Breton.

Georgeville wharf—extension, $1,300.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Antigonish and is required to add a wing of 400 feet long. The expenditure will be $2,300.

Habitant river—wharf at Canning, $16,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in East King and is to provide for the construction of a wharf on the north side, which will have a river

front of 20 feet, mean depth 129 feet. This is the estimated cost.

Harrigan cove—wharf, $800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the construction of an approach 700 feet long, 20 feet wide. It is in Halifax county and the total cost will be $2,000.

Indian harbour—wharf, $1,400.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is also in Halifax county, and the total cost is $2,000.

Inverness (Broad cove) Mines harbour—repairs to harbour works, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the extension of the harbour works built by the Inverness Coal Company. The total cost will be $10,000. The work will not be started until the property is transferred to the Crown.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How is it that a harbour on which you propose to spend money can be private property ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are having it transferred to the Crown because if it were left in the hands of a private corporation, that company would have the monopoly and could prevent others using it. It belongs now to the Inverness Railway and Coal Company.

Mr. OSLER. This is to provide the coal company with a wharf and get the government to spend $10,000 on it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be transferred to the government.

Mr. OSLER. Why should the government take it over ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In order to give the general public the use of it.

Mr. OSLER. I am interested in some shipping in Lake Ontario in connection with the Niagara Navigation Company. We have had to build our own wharf. We have to keep it in repair. Other people must have a public wharf more or less and if the government are doing this it would be a good thing to transfer the wharf and get the government to keep it up.

Mr. BRODEUR. The company would then be willing to pay wharfage dues ?

Mr. OSLER. Certainly, if the government would take charge of it. On the face of it, this looks like a private wharf, owned by a private company, which is getting the government to relieve them from the responsibility of keeping it up ; and they make it a public wharf, the company getting the full benefit of it as they do now.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have a case in mind where a private company absolutely refused to transfer the wharf unless they got private use of it ; they would not allow the public to use the work as they chose. I do not know whether it would be good policy for the government to take over all the works, but I suppose where it is for the public advantage it should be done.

Mr. OSLER. What other necessity is there for this work ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The Inverness Coal Company agreed with the government to hand them over this harbour in the interests of the public, provided that parliament would make a grant in behalf of that harbour, in order that it would be improved to accommodate the public. There is now a town of about 3,000 inhabitants that has sprung up around that mine and in the vicinity of that harbour. The present company purchased these works from the original company who used them, but the present company have built a railway for their own purposes, and ships their coal at the Strait of Canso ; they have abandoned this harbour and these works altogether, so that it is the public that is now interested in the repair and fixing up of this harbour for public use.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it an artificial harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. It was a large pond—a small lake, in fact—and the original company that owned the mines cut a narrow isthmus that existed between this small lake and the sea and built two piers to protect the entrance to this harbour, and used it in a small way to make small shipments of coal when they were first developing that coal property, but they sold out to the present company, who built their own railway to ship from the Strait of Canso, where they now have one of the finest shipping places perhaps in North America ; it is just as good and extensive a shipping place as that of the Dominion Coal Company in Sydney, and they thus have no use whatever for the Broad Cove harbour, as it was formerly called. I say again it is the public that are interested in opening up this harbour, a considerable business having sprung up around the mines. The public are thus interested in the opening up of this harbour and having it for use, in order that the business interests of the place may be encouraged, particularly that a fair amount of competition may be set up with the company's railway, running sixty miles, over which almost every article of consumption for that town must be carried.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the nature of the work ; completing piers, dredging the harbour, deepening the channel, or what ?

Mr. McLENNAN. There are two piers built for the protection of the entrance to the harbour, in other words, to keep sand from being banked up at the entrance of the harbour. These piers have been wrecked by storms from time to time, and the company at present owning them, having no particular interest in maintaining them, allowed them to go to wreck, and the object of the gov-

ernment now, in the public interest, is to keep the company to the original engagement, that is to hand the harbour and these old works over to the public on condition that the government would rebuild those piers and otherwise render the harbour fit for shipping purposes. There is no doubt the company would use the harbour for local shipping of their coal in a small way to local ports as well as the public, but the government would not make a grant without the company first arranging to hand over the harbour to the public. The company are now hesitating to hand these works over, and until they do so the government refused to go on with the work, and the prospects are that the entrance to that harbour will very likely have to be expropriated by the government in the public interest, in order that this grant may be used for the purpose for which it was voted.

Mr. AMES. When the piers are built, will they be covered by the company with tracks and constructions of various kinds for handling the coal, so that the company would have a practical monopoly of the use of this harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. Oh, no ; they are simply brush and stone for the protection of the entrance to the harbour. The facilities for handling the coal are entirely within the harbour.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total amount ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $10,000.

Mr. FOWLER. It is understood that before the government spends this money they will have handed over this inside harbour that the member for Inverness speaks of ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, as I understand, is a condition precedent to the expenditure of the money.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the reason no expenditure has been made.

Mr TAYLOR. The member for Invesness said the government would have to expropriate it.

Mr. McLENNAN. Unless the company would keep up to their promise.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand the owners have agreed to transfer.

Mr. AMES. The money should be voted provisionally that no share of it would be spent in purchasing property.

Mr. BRODEUR. The committee may be sure that no money will be spent unless a transfer is made to the government.

Mr. BARKER. That is, all the money is to be spent on work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. There are no payments for property ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it is very much like the case of the harbour at Glace Bay last year, where some money was voted on the understanding it was not to be expended until the harbour to be converted into a public harbour should be transferred from the company. In that case, as in this, the harbour had been created, and it was practically an artificial harbour, used entirely for the purposes of a corporation and controlled by that corporation. The promise then made to the committee was, and the one I understand that is being made nows is, that the money will not be expended unless there is such a transfer as will make the harbour available in every way for the public use, so that it will cease to be a private harbour or private work, and will become, to all intents and purposes, a public harbour, just the same as if it had been a public harbour from the commencement. That is what I understand from the minister.

Janvrin's island wharf, $600.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to complete the wharf on the north side of this island. To complete it will cost $600.

Mr. INGRAM. What has been spent so far ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $2,000 has been expended and $600 is required to complete.

Mr. AMES. What county is this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Richmond.

Mr. INGRAM. In the orignal work, was not $2,000 supposed to cover the whole expenditure ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; but the sum of $600 is required to complete.

Mr. INGRAM. But the $2,000 was a vote for the whole thing, and now you ask $600 more.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. We want to know what the additional work that you are to do is ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is because the work cost more than we expected.

Mr. INGRAM. That is the only reason ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the only reason.

Mr. INGRAM. And the first estimate was not a correct estimate ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not absolutely correct ; we have to ask $600 more.

Mr. INGRAM. That estimate is rather wide of the mark—a vote of $2,000, and then you must come and ask for almost one-third more, $600.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a very big difference.

Mr. AMES. How many people live at Janvrin's Island?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 200 people, I am informed.

Mr. AMES. What country is that in?

Mr. BRODEUR. Richmond.

Jersey cove (or Eel cove)—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the construction of a wharf at an estimated cost of $4,300. This is in the county of North Victoria.

Larry's river breakwater—extension, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the completion of a square of cribwork 16 feet wide extending 160 feet long. The total cost will be $4,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it under contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is being done by day's work.

Mr. AMES. In what county is it?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Guysborough.

L'Ardoise—extension of breakwater up to the shore, $7,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Richmond.

Mr. INGRAM. The government let a contract for $24,000 for this work, and now they come down for nearly one-third as much more.

Mr. BRODEUR. The main contract was for $24,880. Inspection and contingencies, $1,470—total, $26,350. There has been expended in 1903-4, $104. Supplementary estimate for 1904-5 to cover the salary of the inspector as above, $750. Appropriation for 1904-5, $18,000—total $18,854.27. And the vote required is $7,500 to complete.

Litchfield breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Annapolis, and it is required for a breakwater the construction of which is expected to be completed in the next fiscal year. The total is estimated at $4,000.

Little Brook—repairs to breakwater, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the work. The total cost is estimated at $5,030. This is in Digby county.

Little Judique—boat harbour, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Inverness, and it is to improve the entrance to the pond at the entrance of the Little Judique river to enable the fishermen to enter with their boats at all stages of the tide.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much will be the total cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. An examination will be made, and if the work can be done for $1,000 it will be done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that supposed to be approximately the cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What county is it in?

Mr. BRODEUR. Inverness.

Lunenburg—dredging harbour, $5,000.

Mr. INGRAM. At last?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a revote and it is to carry out the work of improving Lunenburg harbour in accordance with the estimate, which is $8,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the money be spent this year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we expect that there will be a dredge ready to do the work.

Mabou—bridge, $1,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make a bridge in Inverness harbour. The vote is to make provision for the construction of a pile wharf at Mabou bridge for general shipping and landing purposes. The total estimated cost is $1,800.

Mr. AMES. The county of Inverness is being pretty well treated—Long Point, Little Judique, Mabou, Broad Cove—pretty nearly every port on the western side of Cape Breton has something done for it.

Mr. McLENNAN. That county has a coast line of 150 miles.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman should leave something for next time. The whole thing will be exhausted by 1908.

Mr. McLENNAN. It won't be necessary.

Mahone bay—dredging, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This will be done by the government dredge.

Mr. AMES. What county is it in?

Mr. BRODEUR. In Lunenburg.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. About $25,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it just ordinary dredging.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What depth of water is there now, and what is it proposed to obtain?

Mr. BRODEUR. The present depth is about 9 feet, and it is proposed to obtain a depth of 13 feet. It is being filled up with sawdust from the mills.

Mr. FOWLER. Is there not an Act of parliament against that?

Mr. BRODEUR. I believe there is a law to that effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it due absolutely to the filling up of the stream with sawdust ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That and the ordinary silting of the river.

Mr. FOWLER. It would not be a very expensive work to dredge out saw-dust.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is not only sawdust in the river. I am informed by the chief engineer that it is very expensive to dredge sawdust.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you dredge it with ?

Mr. BRODEUR. With a hydraulic dredge. That is really why the work has not been done.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is a hydraulic dredge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A suction dredge.

Main à Dieu—breakwater on west side of harbour, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required for completing the breakwater which is being built. This is a payment on the contract. The contract was for $8,925.

Mr. INGRAM. What county ?

Mr. BRODEUR. South Cape Breton.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there another work of that kind in Inverness county ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We will see later on.

Mr. INGRAM. I mean Margaree.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is further on.

Malignant cove—close piling end and sides of channel piers with creosoted piles, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Antigonish and is required to cover the cost in connection with close piling of the outer ends and 30 feet in length of the sides of the entrance piers of Malignant Cove harbour which has been undertaken to make good in a permanent manner the damage done by the teredo. The total cost is $1,000.

Margaree harbour—improvements, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Inverness county. This vote is required to cover the estimated cost of completing the following works in process at Margaree : (1) Rock excavation to secure a clear depth of 8 feet at low water along the channel face of the pier on the west side of the entrance to Margaree harbour over a distance of some 200 feet from a point 200 feet from the inner end outwards. (2) Urgent repairs to the outer end of this pier commenced in November 1904 to make good damage done by a storm. The total cost will be $1,500.

Mr. INGRAM. This is not the total cost of the works there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the total cost of the work contemplated here.

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, but it is not the total cost of the works constructed by the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been expended in late years up to the 31st of December, $28,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I want to know why the local government, having expended money on this wharf we should refund it to them ?

Mr. McLENNAN. The local government of Nova Scotia had all these wharfs and smaller harbours in charge before confederation. It was only after confederation that they were handed over to this government and paid for. That harbour has been under improvement for the last 35 or 36 years and this amount is simply to complete the work of blasting rocks from the entrance to this harbour. It is rather a commodious harbour and as the hon. minister stated an expenditure of something like $25,000 or $30,000 has been made by the government in the past thirty years in its repair. I may say in regard to this small appropriation that the lateness of the session last year prevented this money from being expended for the simple reason that the coast there is facing the north and as the prevailing winds are north, these appropriations could not be expended. Hence, it is that the appropriations of two years are mixed up in this list.

Mr. INGRAM. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure that the money refunded to the provincial government was money expend ed by themselves on this harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I know it from personal knowledge.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the general policy been pursued that moneys expended by the government of Nova Scotia previous to confederation, 38 years ago shall be refunded by this government ?

Mr. McLENNAN. It certainly was the policy of this government to take over all the works that were considered of Dominion importance and refund whatever money was expended upon them by the government of the province.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to find out whether this has been the policy of the Dominion government since 1867.

Mr. McLENNAN. The hon .gentleman's friends were good enough to take these works over and pay for them.

Mr. BARKER. Is the Dominion government returning to the province of Nova Scotia moneys expended for the maintenance and repair of these works 38 or 40 years ago ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I cannot say in regard to repairs, but I do say that the Dominion government took over all these works, breakwaters and harbours of Dominion importance, and they refunded whatever expenditure had been made on these works by the provincial government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I never knew that before.

Mr. McLENNAN. Well, it is a fact all the same.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did it take place? I am asking for information.

Mr. McLENNAN. I cannot say really what year, but I know it was done. By reference to the records it will be shown that it has been done. I do not know whether it has been done in the case of other provinces, but I am sure it has been done in the case of Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is to say that money expended on public harbours and breakwaters by the provinces before confederation has been refunded by the Dominion government?

Mr. McLENNAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. That has not been general.

Mr. McLENNAN. There was a wharf at Port Hastings in the Gut of Canso, and there was a wharf at Point Hood in Inverness, built by Nova Scotia before confederation, and these wharfs were taken over by the Dominion government.

Mr. TAYLOR. At the time of confederation?

Mr. McLENNAN. I cannot say it was done just exactly at confederation, but I do say that the Dominion government took over all these works of Dominion importance and whatever outlay was made by the government of Nova Scotia was refunded.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if moneys expended by the province in the maintenance of breakwaters or harbours before 1867 are being refunded to the province by the Dominion government?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have absolutely no information as to that. I was reading over the notes while the discussion was going on, but I do not see anything that covers the point mentioned by my hon. friend. I do not know whether that statement is correct or not. I have nothing in my notes about that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister's answer about not having it in his notes reminds me that when Sam. Weller was asked if he saw his father, he looked into the ventilator and said he did not. We would not expect to find much in the minister's notes about the subject introduced by the member for Inverness.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You would have as good a chance to find it there as anywhere else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the Minister of Justice would give his views on the subject.

Mr. HENDERSON. The British North America Act, 1867, provides that the public works and property of each province enumerated in schedule 3, shall be the property of Canada. Schedule 3 specifies these works to be: Canals, and waterpowers connected therewith, lighthouses and piers and Sable Island, and public harbours. Public harbours are specially mentioned as being the property of Canada and there is nothing in the British North America Act about the province being indemnified for any expenditure on them.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have been informed that in 1884 some public works were bought in this way from the provincial governments of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the money has been paid to the provinces I do not think you could recover it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The government in power in 1884 was, my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) will say a very good government, and I am surprised they would have done anything unconstitutional.

Mr. BARKER. That was probably a refund of expenditure made by the provinces after 1867.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like the minister to give us the date of the payment of this money to the local government. If it was before 1867, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McLennan) is correct, but if it is since 1867 we ought to know it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will ask the officers of the department to get the information and I will give it to the House on concurrence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There may have been in the early history of confederation some moneys expended by provincial governments after the date of confederation on works which became the property of Canada. The payment would likely be to recoup the provinces for that expenditure.

Mr. McLENNAN. I presume that was why it was done, but I know the fact that it was done.

Mr. INGRAM. If that is the case it will make a difference.

Margaretville—general repairs to and extension of breakwater, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Inverness county?

Mr. McLENNAN. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; it is in Annapolis county. The total expenditure is estimated to be $4,100.

Meteghan cove—restoration of breakwater, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Digby county; the total expenditure will be $4,000.

Mr. AMES. There was work done there in 1903-4 to the extent of $2,500. Has that work been washed away?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. This vote is for the completion of that restoration work. The damage was raised by the teredo worm.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the expenditure?

Mr. BRODEUR. The restoration has cost $10,000, but there has been spent altogether at that place $38,802.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will this finish it?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is expected to.

Mill cove—breakwater, $13,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Lunenburg. The total cost will be $13,500, and we will call for tenders.

New Campbellton—ballast wharf in Kelly's cove, $12,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in North Victoria. The total cost will be $12,000; tenders have been received but the contract has not been awarded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What has given occasion for this work?

Mr. BRODEUR. Development of coal mines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have heard something of mines at Kelly's Cove and I would like to know what development there is.

Mr. BRODEUR. Coal was struck in the neighbourhood of Kelly's Cove and it proving valuable the mines were opened up. The mines are owned and managed by the Cape Breton Coal Company, and since they came under the new management, they have been more extensively worked, and the output has been largely increased.

Newport landing—wharf, $5,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Hants. This vote is for completing the work, the total cost of which is placed at $6,200.

Noel wharf—repairs, $1,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the same county. The total cost of the repairs will be $1,200.

Ogden's pond—to complete protection works, $800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is Antigonish county. It is to cover the expense of protection works on both sides of the channel.

Pembroke breakwater, $800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract. The amount of the contract is $7,970. This is to complete. It is in the county of Hants.

Pleasant bay—wharf, $6,700.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the formation of a small harbour which will afford landing facilities and shelter to small vessels and fishing boats by constructing a cribwork and pier extending to 5 feet depth at low water. The total cost will be $8,000. This is in Inverness county.

Plympton—repairs to breakwater, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for completing the repairs commenced on the breakwater in order to place the structure, which has been badly damaged, in a thoroughly sound condition. The total cost will be $2,500. It is in the county of Digby.

Port Greville—extension of breakwater and repairs, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Cumberland. The total cost will be $12,000. It is under contract to Mr. Thomas B. Charlton.

Port Hastings—wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the construction of a wharf at Port Hastings in the county of Inverness.

Port Hood harbour—closing northern entrance with brush and stone work, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for closing the northern entrance of the harbour of Port Hood by a dam 3,860 feet long. The total cost will be $60,000. It is done by day labour. $20,000 was spent last year. It is in the county of Inverness.

Mr. INGRAM. The total expenditure to June 30, 1904, was $61,592.20, besides $2,708 for dredging, and now you are asking for more money.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the same work.

Mr. McLENNAN. That is not the same work at all. The work to which my hon. friend refers is the old wharf which is built inside the harbour. The work to which this vote refers is a breastwork of brush and stone built across the northern entrance to the harbour in order to prevent the harbour filling up with sand, which is washed in by the northerly winds and the seas, thus rendering the harbour next to useless.

Mr. AMES. Have previous appropriations been made to open the northern entrance to the harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. No, not at all. Unfortunately the elements opened it.

Mr. INGRAM. So that this harbour, instead of costing $60,000 will cost something like $125,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am only speaking of this work, not of the other improvements made in the same harbour.

Port La Tour—extension of breakwater, $11,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the completion of the breakwater at that place. It will cost $24,000. It is in the county of Shelburne and Queen's.

Scott's bay—extension of breakwater, &c., $2,100.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the extension of the north breakwater, a distance of 75 feet, which will necessitate the construction of cribwork. The total cost will be $3,100.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot let that last statement about Port Hood go. I have made another discovery, and my friends must be fully aware of it, or they would not allow that statement to go unchallenged. I showed an expenditure in one case of $60,000 and in another of $63,000, making a total of $123,000, and I am surprised at gentlemen nodding assent to an incorrect statement which they must have known was not correct. We are not supposed to be acquainted with every detail of the public expenditures. Here is an item of $482,000 and another of $191,000, and I think that a statement assented to in that way is not a proper thing for the officers to do. I find on pages 53 and 52 of part IV of the Report of the Public Works Department a statement which shows that there are $61,500 and $2,000 in one instance. Let me read from the report to show how careful we have to be to get the correct information :

The harbour of Port Hood is on the west coast of Cape Breton island, about twenty miles to the northward of the northern entrance to the Strait of Canso.

The harbour was formerly a secure one, Smith island, which forms its west side, having been connected with the mainland by a range of sand hills. In 1893 the sea made a breach through this protection ; the opening, at first narrow, was enlarged by the tidal currents with increasing rapidity until it was entirely swept away. The harbour is now unsafe during northerly gales, except in a small cove on the east side of Smith island.

In March, 1902, a report was submitted on the closing of the northern entrance in which the estimated cost of work suggested varied from $482,000 to $291,000, according to design and location.

During the fiscal year 1903-4, the sum of $2,968.85 was expended in constructing a length of 330 feet, 28 feet wide on top, of a proposed breakwater, and in procuring materials for its construction.

This would appear to involve the idea that the department intended spending a very large sum at this point, an expenditure something like $482,000, and the information the hon. gentleman is giving is misleading.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think that the criticism of my hon. friend with regard to the officers of the department is justified. It is true that the statement he read has been made, and that it was estimated that this work would cost a much larger sum than I have mentioned. It is true that the officers reported at first that it would cost a much larger sum, but the chief engineer, with his usual ability, went to work and found out some other means of doing the same work and getting the same results. Instead of spending the larger sum, we are simply providing for an expenditure of $60,000, and we expect with that to reach the same conclusion. So that my hon. friend was entirely mistaken in trying to infer that we are not giving proper information.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. minister had given at first the information he is now giving us, that would have been perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was asked what would be the probable cost, and I said $60,000. I am not saying that my hon. friend was unfair, but he thought he had a point against us when he was simply relying on the first report, which has since been abandoned.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the hon. member for Elgin was perfectly justified in the statement he made. He read from the report of the Department of Public Works. Why was that statement put in that report unless it was intended to be information for the public, and surely we had a perfect right to accept that information ? I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to cast any reflection on the hon. member for Elgin when that hon. member read from the minister's own report.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think he might have asked the question how such a statement came to be made, without reflecting on the officers of the department. In this instance, instead of being open to censure for what they have done, we ought to declare that they done their duty most admirably.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The fault is not with the officers, but with the minister, in not making that explanation in the first instance.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am taking the responsibility.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend will understand perfectly that when I allude to him I am alluding to a gentleman who is not very familiar with the department, and am simply doing so as an illustration for the time being. Where there has been a departure from the course intended to be followed, and a departure which makes the information before the House absolutely inaccurate, it is only right that the min-

ister should make that explanation in the first instance. I realize perfectly that in this case the minister is not very familiar with these estimates, and we must make some allowance for him. That explanation should have been given in the first instance. Why are you closing the harbour ?

Mr. McLENNAN. I think I gave the reason a minute ago. The sand along the coast is getting washed into the harbour and destroying the anchorage there entirely. Just as has been read from the report of the Department of Public Works, the harbour had been closed at the northern entrance, and about sixty or seventy years ago it was an excellent harbour with excellent anchorage—not only serving the purposes of a local harbour, but those of a regular harbour of refuge along that western coast. The object now is to bring back, as it were, the old order of things, and form a beach or a protection breast-work across the northern entrance, which has been broken into by the elements. It is quite true that the resident engineer reported that the closing of the northern entrance to Port Hood harbour would cost the amount which the hon. member for Elgin has stated, but the present chief engineer devised a plan by which the object in view could be secured for the amount of money stated by the minister. This will be done by substituting brush and stone, built after a particular plan, and so compactly put together that to-day there are 950 feet or so of this breast-work completed, the result being, as the chief engineer predicted, that the sand, which used to be washed into the harbour, is washed up against this breast-work, and a regular mound of sand is thus forming along that work, so that one-third across the entrance to that harbour is now shut across by means of a mound of sand which this breast-work has served to form. So far as regards the 930 feet of breast-work already constructed, it is an entire success ; and every person who knows anything about public works of that character has no hestitation in saying that the plan is most successful.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not going to let this go for a moment or two. We have been very liberal in allowing items to slip through very easily, but it is not to be expected that we on this side can follow each item carefully and peruse the reports of the department minutely in the few minutes we have at our disposal. The generous offer made by the leader of the opposition with respect to the Nova Scotia items was with a view of getting all this information without having to ask questions. In reading this report, I was surprised to find this in two different places. That is why I referred to the $482,000 and the $291,000. Now, the minister says he proposes to expend about $60,000 upon this work, but the other statements are contained in the report. Apparently they are going to abandon the report, although this is the report which was brought down for the year ending June 30, 1904, and laid on the table of the House this session.

Mr. BRODEUR. When I explained the item, I was asked what would be the total probable cost and said it would cost $60,000. That is the work that is contemplated and is going to be done according to the late report of the chief engineer, but in the first instance the chief engineer reported that the cost would be as stated by my friend and as he says in the report, but it was found it would be more expensive and the chief engineer reported on another plan which has proved to be as effective and would cost less.

Mr. INGRAM. And that as we understand now would cost about $60,000.

Shelburne harbour—dredging, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for dredging to remove a strip 150 feet wide and 300 feet long to 8 feet depth at low water ordinary spring tides, from the eastern part of a shoal in Shelburne harbour running practically northeast and southwest which is a hinderance to most of the shipping business done along the water front of that town. It is in the county of Shelburne and Queen's.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the depth of the water now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a shoal there ; it is from 4 to 5 feet.

Skinner's cove—boat channel and protection works, $8,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Pictou. It is to complete the excavation of the projected channel into Skinner's pond where fishermen's boats can be taken for safety and the protection of this passage on both sides with walls of cribwork. The total cost will be $10,500.

Summerville wharf, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Hants, and is to complete the block or ordinary round log well fendered and fully ballasted cribwork about 80 feet long, 26 feet wide and 24 feet high, at the outer end of Summerville wharf. The total cost will be about $3,500.

Three Fathom harbour—restoration of beach protection works, $1,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Halifax county and is for continuing the restoration of the beach protection works commenced in 1901-2. The total cost will be $1,200.

Victoria beach—wharf, $58,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Annapolis county on the north side of Annapolis basin, two miles from the Pictou landing pier.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think this was supposed to be constructed in connection with a railway that was projected. What is the position of that railway.

Mr. BRODEUR. In connection with the railway from Victoria bridge to Middleton which is now nearly completed.

Mr. PICKUP. It is owned by Mackenzie & Mann and is run in connection with the Halifax and Northwestern.

Wallace harbour, $12,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for carrying out works which are recommended to be undertaken in connection with the ferry slips on both sides of Wallace harbour.

West Arichat—landing pier, $7,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Richmond and is to provide for the construction of a landing pier to extend to 15 feet depth at low water spring tides off Bosdet point. The total cost will be $7,200.

Mr. AMES. What was the estimate last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The same estimate. We are going to call for tenders and expect to do the whole work during this fiscal year.

White Head wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in Guysborough. It is to provide for the construction of a block and span wharf 175 feet long at White Head which will reach a depth of 16 feet at low water. The total cost will be $4,000.

Wolfville wharf, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in King's county. It is to replace the present pile work structure at Wolfville by a wharf of solid cribwork strong enough to withstand moving ice fields and heavy seas. This is expected to be the total cost.

Yarmouth harbour—retaining walls, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for building levees and bulkheads to retain dredged materials preparatory to season's work of new suction dredge.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. BRODEUR moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business will be taken up to-morrow.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Two Bills of Mr. Préfontaine's will be taken up and then I will make a statement in connection with the Kentville rifle range. After that Supply, either of the Railway Department or a continuation of Public Works, probably railways.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.25 p.m.

Mr. BRODEUR

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 14, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PACIFIC BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. W. A. GALLIHER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 175) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada. He said : The reason why this legislation has not been presented to the House before this session is that it was thought we would be able to make arrangements so that it would not be necessary to secure the passage of the Bill. We find, however, at the last moment that we cannot do so, and I therefore ask leave to introduce the Bill.

Mr. D. HENDERSON. When are we going to cease introducing Bills ? How long does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Galliher) expect this session is going to last ? If we continue as we have been doing we may be here until next winter. There is certainly no necessity for this Bill at the present time, because nobody claims there is any need for new banks. This charter might just as well lie over until another year, and we would be saved the necessity of passing Bills out of order continuously, practically violating a well established rule of the House. I only rise to protest against this, and I hope that those in charge of the legislation of the House will take note of it, and that no further legislation will be introduced this session, with the view of concluding the session as soon as possible.

Mr. GALLIHER. If I were making this request in connection with a Bill that had not already been before the Standing Orders Committee this year and passed by that committee, and if the rule in connection with the introduction of Bills had not been suspended, there might be some justification for the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson). But for that I would not be making this motion to-day. All this has been done, and, as a matter of fact, I think I am quite within my rights in presenting the Bill even now, because once the motion is passed for the suspension of the rule there is nothing to prevent me from introducing the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 174) to amend the Grain Inspection Act as regards the selection of commercial grades and samples.—Mr. Fisher.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Louis Auguste Carrièr, Esquire, member for the electoral district of Lévis, introduced by the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Wm. Paterson.

INLAND REVENUE ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Inland Revenue) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 176) to amend the Inland Revenue Act. He said: The main object of the Bill is to harmonize the different sections of the Inland Revenue Act. Several amendments have been passed since the consolidation of the statutes in 1886, and in some cases we have still in the law clauses, which are not in harmony with the principle adopted when these amendments were made. The main object of the Bill is to incorporate these changes in the Act in order to harmonize the law, and in order that these amendments may be incorporated in the new revision of the statutes. There are, however, some other amendments of greater importance. We provide in the Bill, for example, that the bonds which are to be given by licensees shall be given by guarantee companies instead of being given by individuals. We also provide that distillers who are using malt in their distilleries, instead of being bound to manufacture the malt themselves, may get it in bond from the malting houses. We provide that malting process, instead of being carried on from eight in the morning until six in the afternoon, may begin at seven in the morning. It is also provided that spirits may be denaturized, not only with wood naphtha, but also with all other material that could produce the same result. We provide that snuff may be sold in packages of one-twelfth of a pound.

Mr. BERGERON. Are these changes all going into the proposed Bill?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE AT HAMILTON COVE, QUEBEC.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. When was the post office established at Hamilton Cove, Ashuanipi, Saguenay County, Quebec?
2. How often do mails arrive and depart, from what point are they forwarded, and in what manner?
3. What other post offices have been established in Ashuanipi, Mistassini and Abitibi, of the province of Quebec?
4. How many letters were received and despatched from Hamilton Cove during the last four years?
5. What was the revenue collected and the expense incurred in connection with the Hamilton Cove post office?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (for the Postmaster General):

1. The Hamilton Cove post office, which is in the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and not in the Ashuanipi district, was established on the 1st June, 1883.

2. Hamilton Cove is served tri-weekly from Les Escoumains by horse and vehicle.

3. There are no post offices in any of the districts mentioned.

4. As no record is kept of the mail matter received and despatched, the information asked for cannot be furnished.

5. The revenue of the post office at Hamilton Cove and the salary of the postmaster during the past four years are as follows:

	Revenue.	Salary.
1901	$ 51 92	$ 34 00
1902	50 00	34 00
1903	63 16	42 00
1904	103 54	64 00

The service between Hamilton Cove and Les Escoumains, including three other post offices, costs $356 per annum.

ELECTORAL LISTS IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. AMES asked:

How many names of qualified electors appear upon each of the lists used on November 3rd, 1904, for the electoral districts of Alberta, Calgary, Strathcona and Edmonton?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister):

Electoral district.	Number of electors on lists.
Alberta	3,473
Calgary	7,951
Strathcona	8,786
Edmonton	6,477

CONTRACT, LACHINE CANAL, MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. To whom was awarded the contract for the building of the bridge over the Lachine canal at Atwater street, Montreal?
2. What was the price fixed in said contract?
3. What was the date fixed in the said contract for the delivery of said bridge?
4. Why were tenders called for a second time in connection with the said work?
5. Who was the lowest of the first tenderers?
6. Who was the lowest of the tenderers after the second call for tenders?

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

1. Messrs, Rogers & Taylor are the contractors for the substructure.

2. It is a schedule price contract, which monied out on approximate estimate to $35,495.

3. The date fixed in the contract for completion of the work is August 1, 1905.

4. Because the first tenders were not acted on, on account of insufficient notice.

5. Mr. W. H. Davis, $38,244.

6. Messrs. Rogers & Taylor

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. Before the orders of the Day are called I would like to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior, who is back from his wanderings, battered and torn, but still looking in his

right mind, to the fact that we have been waiting anxiously for those papers from his department with reference to scrip. I hope my hon. friend has not forgotten all about it. I would like him also to bear in mind that the session is so far advanced that it would be well if we could get these as quickly as possible. I hope my hon. friend will have them for us certainly this week.

Mr OLIVER. The papers asked for are in course of preparation, some of them could be presented now. They cover so large an amount of ground that the work of preparation is very great. But they will be presented as fast as they are prepared, some of them I will present to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope we will get them in a day or two.

THE BY-ELECTIONS.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to congratulate the hon. members for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who are back from their wanderings. May I congratulate also the hon. member for South York that he did not fulfil his boast of resigning his seat to contest the election for Edmonton, and later on to contest the elections in London or North Oxford. Now I think it is up to him to resign his seat for South York and try to get elected in his own constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. There is nothing before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I want to know if he has tendered his resignation.

VACANCIES IN THE JUDICIARY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to inform my hon. friend the Minister of Justice that I have observed some intimation in the public press, and I have had some private advice, that there are two vacancies, one on the judicial bench of Ontario and one on the judicial bench of Manitoba, one of which has been vacant for some time, I refer to that one in the province of Ontario, the chief justice of the Exchequer Court division of the High Court of Justice. I was not aware there was any vacancy in the Supreme Court of Manitoba, the Court of King's Bench, but I observe a reference to it in the press. Would the Minister of Justice be good enough on some future occasion to inform the House how long these vacancies have been existing; and would he be good enough at the same time to give a statement as to the vacancies that exist on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia since the resignation of Chief Justice McDonald, in the month of January, 1904? I have intimated my intention of discussing the vacancies in the Supreme Court in Nova Scotia, but since that time I understand the only vacancy on the bench of that court has been filled. At the same time I would like to have information of this precise character; I would like to know, from the commencement of 1904 up to the present time, during what periods any vacancies have existed, and what they have been; and the same with regard to the courts of Ontario and Manitoba. I am not aware of any other vacancies in the superior courts of justice in this country at the present time; but if there are any others, perhaps the Minister of Justice would also intimate what they are.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The vacancy in Manitoba has been caused by the death of Mr. Justice Bain. The judge died a few weeks ago. As to the vacancy in Ontario, I think it could hardly be called a vacancy, because there has never been provision made for the appointment. The position has never been filled.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would rather call that an accentuated vacancy.

IMMIGRATION OF SKILLED LABOUR.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to give notice to the Acting Minister of the Post Office Department that to-morrow I propose to bring up a question which has been placed in my hands by the Toronto District Labour Council. It has to do with certain allegations that have been brought to the attention of the government with reference to the close connection between a gentleman by the name of Leopold, and W. T. R. Preston, Dominion Government Agent, by means of which connection, as the allegation states, mechanics and skilled workmen are sent out to this country under a promise of employment which has not been fulfilled, and that great injustice is done to these men and great suffering is incurred by them; and also that the proceeding is not in the true interest of labour.

CORRESPONDENCE RE ROYAL MINT.

Mr. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to remind my right hon. friend that it is now some time since the correspondence with the imperial government was called for in regard to the establishment of a branch of the Royal Mint in Canada. I think we will require it in a few days.

SEAMENS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 147) to amend the Seamen's Act —Mr. Prefontaine—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister say on what date this measure was discussed before?

Hon. RAYMOND PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). This Bill is

to replace Bill (No. 38), which has been withdrawn. The first Bill contained only one clause, and met with a good deal of objection, as it did not provide for certain eventualities. This Bill covers entirely the ground for which the measure was asked by the shipping interests of British Columbia. I could not explain the Bill better than it explains itself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the real difference between this Bill and the Bill that was introduced before ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The first Bill meant simply that the dispositions of the Seamen's Act did not apply to the province of British Columbia, without giving further explanations. This Bill gives all the explanations and the way in which the measure will be acted upon.

Mr. INGRAM. Does it refer to employing British subjects ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No, the Act does not mention anything about that. It provides that the shipping master, instead of being obliged to do this work, may appoint another person to make these arrangements with the seamen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the Minister of Justice took some part in the discussion of this Bill when it was previously before the House. If he has drafted it, I have no doubt he could explain to us precisely what its effect is.

Mr. AMES. In looking at the Seamen's Act, chapter 74 of the Revised Statutes, to ascertain the full meanings of the three sections which it is proposed to make not applicable to British Columbia, I find that section 7 reads as follows :

> No person who sells any spirituous liquors, and no tavern keeper or boarding-house keeper, shall be eligible for the situation of shipping master or deputy shipping master.

If this section does not apply to British Columbia, it would appear that any saloon keeper or seller of liquor may be a shipping master or a deputy shipping master. It has hitherto always been considered inadvisable to have that class of persons acting in this capacity. What special reason has induced the minister to make them eligible in British Columbia for this important position ? Then, under clauses 16 and 18, the fees established elsewhere are 50 cents on engagement and 30 cents on discharge ; but in British Columbia these limits, which protect both the seamen and the captain, are to be abolished, and hereafter any fee may be charged which may be considered mutually satisfactory, subject to the Governor in Council, replacing that of the schedule. There must be some reason for making these important changes.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The reasons I gave when the Bill was last before the House. As regards section 7 not affecting British Columbia, if power is given to a shipping master or deputy shipping master to appoint any one to act as an intermediary to hire seamen, it makes no difference who makes the engagement. At present in British Columbia the shipping master gets only 50 cents, which is not a large enough remuneration to induce the proper men to make up crews, and the result is that the masters are obliged to go to Seattle or some other part of the United States to secure crews. They have to pay $25 or $30 to American agents to get the proper crew, because under our law they can get nobody to engage seamen. It is necessary to make the provision as broad as possible, so that anybody can do this kind of work. It is provided in section 2 that the Governor in Council shall establish a rate of fees. Of course, the Governor in Council will be guided by the recommendations of the boards of trade. It is at the request of the board of trade and the shipping interests of British Columbia that this is done. I understand perfectly well that the first Bill did not go far enough, and would probably have been ineffective, while this one, after being considered by the Department of Justice, has been found to meet the case.

Mr. AMES. While I can see that there may be conditions in British Columbia which may make it necessary to pay more than the stipulated price for the engagement of seamen, I have not as yet heard any reason advanced which, to my mind at least, is sufficient why a certain class of persons who for good and obvious reasons have been considered in other provinces ineligible to act as shipping masters, should be permitted to act in British Columbia. There are reasons all over the world why it is inadvisable that men who engage sailors shall be saloon keepers. Is there any special reason why in British Columbia it is necessary that this class should be considered eligible ? The dangers are considered that a man who runs a boarding-house or a saloon or an hotel, should be the person who would supply sailors for an outgoing vessel. For my part, unless there be some very strong reason to the contrary, I should have to record my vote against section 7.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It has been represented by the shipping interests and the board of trade of Vancouver and Victoria, that under the present law seamen cannot be engaged in British Columbia ports because the shipping masters will not accept the legal fee of 50 cents per head. Ships are now obliged to go to United States ports and pay very large sums to secure crews. It is asked that under certain conditions the shipping master shall have authority to appoint any one to act in his stead and receive whatever remuneration may be fixed by the Governor General in Council. There may be objections elsewhere, but under existing conditions in British Columbia there would appear to be

no objection to the boarding-house keeper acting as an agent to hire sailors. I understand why the law was made so strict a few years ago when it applied to the province of Quebec, but the conditions are not the same in British Columbia as they were then in Quebec, and in my opinion this Bill is in the public interest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As it stands at present the remuneration is unlimited until the Governor in Council fixes the fee.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That will be done at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why should you depart from the usual form which says that the person who is to receive the fees shall be entitled to such fees as are appointed by the Governor General in Council? We all know that eventually the remuneration to the shipping master is deducted from the wages of the sailors, and although the Bill is an improvement on the one originally introduced, it could be still further improved by simply providing that such fees should be paid as would be appointed by the Governor General in Council.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I do not think there would be any objection to that amendment.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The leader of the opposition suggests that in the end these fees are taken out of the pockets of the sailors, but as a matter of fact on the Pacific coast these fees are paid by the ship-owner or the shipping company which owns the vessels. Ships sailing from Vancouver or any other Pacific port cannot at the present time get a crew in our province, because nobody will act as a boarding-house keeper, it being forbidden to keep sailors and ship them under the existing law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the fee does not eventually come out of the pockets of the sailor?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It does not. Suppose a man is running a boarding-house and keeps five sailors for six weeks, their indebtedness to him would come out of their wages, but the fact is that the fees to-day paid by ship-owners on the Pacific coast for shipping crews, is much in excess of what the seaman's wages would be. I know some instances in which ships have paid as high as $50 per man for a crew, and my hon. friend can easily realize that the seaman's wages would not stand a charge like that. I know one instance where $100 per man was asked in the city of Portland, but that was an excessive charge and it of course drove the ships from that port. To-day, in Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo, Westminster, or wherever a ship may come, she will load her cargo of lumber or fish, and then, having enough men on board to take her to Port Townsend, she will go there to ship her crew and buy her provisions. It thus happens that every ship that leaves Vancouver without purchasing supplies will spend anywhere from $10,000 to $15,000 (according to the length of the voyage) at an American port. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will easily see that under the present law nobody will take any particular interest in getting crews for the shipping masters at 50 cents per head. It is quite true that danger might occur by allowing indiscriminate rates to be charged, but that it is not at all likely because there is more or less competition with the American side. In the meantime the present law works to deprive British Columbia ports of quite a considerable amount of trade in supplying outgoing ships. If this Bill is passed it will remove the grievance in so far as British Columbia is concerned, and no bad results will follow even if ships have to pay $10 or $12 per man, because they would not go to the American side and pay sometimes five times as much. At all events it would preserve to the British Columbia ports the trade of supplying ships.

Mr. FOSTER. At first sight this legislation seems objectionable because it is removing one part of the country from the operation of the general law, and you need a very strong argument to justify that. I do not see how this Bill is going to better the thing unless it betters it at the expense of the sailor.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Not at the expense of the sailor.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us analyse the thing. A ship-owner is willing to pay almost anything for seamen; my hon. friend (Mr. Macpherson) has known of a bonus of from $50 to $100 per man. That is a very great inducement. Suppose the ship-owner applies that bonus in the way of wages, if men are to be got by any fair means such a bonus or any considerable bonus added to the sailor's current wages should certainly bring the employee to the employer. Suppose the ship-owner is willing to pay a bonus of $25 per man, and that he advertises that he will pay that to the sailor in addition to his regular wages it ought to get him men if they are to be obtained by any fair means.

If men are not to be got by any fair means, we do not believe in getting them by any unfair means. All that the shipping master gets in this instance is the opportunity to appoint a man to act in his place. But it is virtually the same thing. He does not do it himself but appoints a deputy to do it for him. In what will the success of the deputy consist? It will consist, not in

the amount of extra wage that he offers the sailor, because the sailor will not get that. The extra inducement will go to the deputy as the middle man ; and consequently he will have to get the sailor into the ship by some other method. What will be that method ? It will not be, as a rule, the bounty given by the shipping agent to induce an honest and sober sailor to take employment with a certain shipmaster. The deputy shipping master will rely on other inducements. You place in conjunction the greed—I am not speaking in an offensive sense—of the boarding-house people and that of the shipping owner. To do what ? To overcome the disinclination of men to take service on a ship. Then the only way in which this boarding-house keeper can get his aim accomplished and his men shipped will be by bringing to bear some influence other then betterment in wages. I take the same exception that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) takes. I think that to leave out section 7 would be ill-judged and ought not to be done. If you had the best class of people to keep boarding-houses and hotels to cater for that trade, you might have the respectability of the person to vouch for the absence of unfair means ; but if you have no such guarantee, you know exactly what will be the result. The best class of hotel and saloon keepers will not bother with that business. It will fall into the hands of keepers of cheap sailors' boarding-houses, whose aim will be to have as many boarders as long as possible, get them into their debt for rum or food or other things, and then put the spur of necessity on them. The boarding-house keeper would say to the sailor who is sufficiently in his debt : You have to ship now ; here is a chance for you. He will get out of that sailor his own profits as well as what he gets from the ship-owner himself. That is the alliance which there will be between the boarding-house keeper and the ship-owner, and it is one the law should not sanction. It may be made outside the law, and often is but we ought not to make the law so wide open that it will allow this kind of thing to be done. Why can ship-owners get sailors in Seattle and not in Vancouver ? It must be either because of the lack of men or because of the lesser wages offered. If it is due to the lack of men, you will not get them by honest means by these inducements, and I do not think we ought to make it proper to get them by dishonest means. If there are more men willing to take that kind of life for a fair wage in Seattle, the law of demand and supply will have to take its regular course, even though it operates against the supply consideration which my hon. friend speaks of. With reference to the other, I cannot think that in the end it will not be the sailor who will pay for it. He will pay at both ends. Take the boarding-house end where he has a bill run up for food and drink, and he will pay the ship-owner, who will recoup himself by a deduction from the sailors' wages in some way or other. There may be some ship-owners who will be generous enough not to do that ; but in the majority of cases, they will pay themselves out of the sailors' wages. So that the poor sailor will be fleeced by the boarding-house keeper and the pay of the go-between will also come out of him. I should be glad if there was some way of doing this without going into this kind of business, but if it must be done I protest most strongly against section 7 being taken out of this Act.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman asks why men can be got in Seattle or Port Townsend or Tacoma and not in Vancouver. The reason is that under our Act no boarding-house keeper is allowed to ship crews, whereas on the American side they can do so. Any man on the American side can enter into the business of boarding-house master or keeper of a sailors home, as it is there called. When a man leaves a ship he does not like or on which his time is up, he goes to one of these sailors' homes and puts his name on the list. He will say : I want to go out on the first or second boat or I want to stay here three or four weeks. We all know that when a sailor gets his money in his pocket, he thinks he cannot spend it too quickly. In three or four days he is dead broke and has to trust himself to the tender mercies of a boarding-house keeper. The latter will keep him three or four weeks, and he may be a very respectable and honourable citizen because he is doing a perfectly legitimate business. That is the case on the American side.

Mr. FOSTER. It is possible.

Mr. MACPHERSON. And probable as well. But under our law, if a boarding-house keeper keeps a man for say four weeks and has a Bill against him at the rate of $3 or $4 per week for board and lodging, he cannot go to a ship captain and say : I have a man here whom you may have, but I want $16 to pay for his board. If he were to do that, he would make himself immediately liable to the penalty and could be fined $500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. Because under the Act he cannot take remuneration as shipping master.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not remuneration as shipping master.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Of course not, but he dare not do it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you are going to pass a statute which is to be used for a purpose that is not apparent on the face of it, that is the strongest objection for passing it. We are dealing with the question

of the remuneration of a shipping-master. If we mean something else, let us say it. If we mean that the boarding-master may deduct the sailor's wages, let us say so; but not let us lend ourselves to the project of deducting from the sailor's wages the amount which he owes for boarding and doing that under the guise of paying the shipping-master.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is not what I said. According to the Bill introduced, a shipping-master will have the power of saying to the boarding house keeper : I appoint you my deputy. Then the captain may come along and get his crew.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You mean that he will be taking his pay for board under the guise of remuneration as deputy shipping master.

Mr. MACPHERSON. He would deduct his board. At present he can deduct his board any way if the captain will pay him ; but he cannot enter into the business of boarding-house keeper, because, according to section 7, he cannot ship anybody. According to the Bill that we desire to have passed now it will be possible for a man to go into the boarding-house business and ship men without incurring any penalty. I recognize the fact that a danger may underlie any act that allows the shipping of men to go into the hands of irresponsible people, but I do not think there is any crime in the passing of a Bill like this. The American boarding-houses are carrying on their business within sixty miles of our ports. They are doing a large and remunerative business. Shippers want crews and they want to buy their supplies. We are obliged to tell them in British Columbia that they can load our timber, our fish, our coal, or any of our products, but we cannot supply them with anything else. They have to go to the American side to get their men and provisions. There is an obvious necessity for the boat leaving our harbour, being towed down and paying double towage at the same time although that does not enter into the spirit of the affair at all. If we are discriminated against it is because the present Act is applied so strictly to us in British Columbia. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) can see that quite easily. He, being a lawyer, can foresee all kinds of trouble that may result from the passing of the Bill, and he can anticipate all kinds of subterfuges that may be raised. He says that the law may bear heavily upon some people. It is bearing heavily on some people to-day if his argument is correct ; it is bearing heavily upon the shipper and the sailor and there is no Act that we can pass that will relieve the shipper or the sailor. But, we can drive away from our shores the legitimate trade we have to-day by continuing the Act which is at present in force.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. COCHRANE. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman how it is that if they have to go to the United States to get their crews, they are driven over there by the same Act to get their provisions ? If you sold your commodities as cheaply as they do on the other side they would get their supplies where they loaded their freight.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I would like to tell my hon. friend that when the captain has got his boat loaded that boat is worth $300 or $400 a day and the boarding-house master in the port at once says : I will ship your crew, but I will only do it under certain conditions. The conditions are that you shall get your crew from me, that you will pay me so much and that you shall buy your supplies from people I name.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. If the members of the committee will allow me to read the representation which has been made by the Board of Trade of Victoria, British Columbia, I think we will probably understand the question better. Here is a communication that I received in May, 1904.

May 2nd, 1904.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—This board has had under consideration the disadvantage under which vessels loading in British Columbia are operated in consequence of it being necessary to go to United States ports in order to secure crews.

A committee has reported upon the matter, and I am instructed to transmit the accompanying copy of their report and on behalf of the board to ask your good offices in securing the desired relief.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) F. ELWORTHY,
Secretary.

You have in this letter a declaration under the authority of a responsible officer of the Victoria Board of Trade which affirms that at the present moment the masters of ships are obliged to go to the United States to secure their crews. A report made to the board of trade by a certain number of members appointed to look into this question reads as follows :

To the president and members, Victoria, British Columbia, Board of Trade :

Gentlemen,—Your committee appointed to report upon the conditions under which crews are at present shipped on foreign-going merchant vessels in British Columbia ports beg to report as follows :

The regulations now being enforced in regard to the shipping of crews on foreign-going vessels are prejudicial to the interests of Canadian trade on this coast and must inevitably work in favour of United States ports.

The shipping masters will not undertake the responsibility of finding crews for outgoing vessels and captains are not permitted to employ any other person to assist them in securing crews.

In a recent case in Vancouver, that of the ship 'Linlithgowshire,' five men had been shipped by a boarding-house master, and a prosecution

was instituted, fines being imposed amounting to $500.

Since this case has been before the courts of British Columbia, all the boarding-house masters have ceased entirely to procure crews.

It was disclosed that this prosecution was instigated by the Puget Sound boarding-house masters for the purpose of preventing crews being obtained in British Columbia ports, and with this object in view it is understood that agents from Puget Sound frequent the British Columbia ports for the purpose of compelling the authorities to enforce the regulations to the utmost to the serious injury of Canadian shipping interests.

Vessels arriving here from long voyages invariably lose a portion of their crews by desertion, and often a whole crew of seamen has to be replaced by the time the vessel has completely loaded.

The Canadian regulations have always made it difficult to secure crews with facility, whereas the boarding-house masters in the United States ports on Puget Sound are always ready to supply crews, and in many cases have yearly contracts with the ship-owners.

Although the charges made by these men are often extortionate, owners of vessels would sooner pay these excessive charges than have their vessels delayed after loading, and it has been not unusual to tow vessels, after loading, to Puget Sound ports to pick up their crews.

The extra cost involved by this course has caused a discrimination in freight rates against British Columbia, and it has also resulted in vessels obtaining their sea stores in the United States port instead of at the British Columbia loading port. Recently the authorities at Vancouver have refused to give clearance to a loaded vessel unless the full crew was first shipped, the captain desiring to proceed to Puget Sound to procure a crew.

The postion therefore is that the captain is unable to secure a crew at Vancouver because no one is permitted to give him the necessary assistance, unless gratuitously, that he cannot legally bring in a crew from Puget Sound, and that he cannot get a clearance, even for Puget Sound, without a crew.

Nothing but harm is done to Canadian interests by the creation of such a dead-lock, and it is evident that the present regulations should be modified without any delay.

Owing to the proximity of American ports to Canadian on this coast, the conditions are quite different to those on the Atlantic coast, and if the ship-owners find themselves under a disadvantage in British Columbia ports, the injury to trade is immediate and direct, owners protecting themselves by raising freight rates. At the present time the shipments from British Columbia ports by cargo vessels consist of lumber, coal, salmon, ore and general produce, and it is vital to all these trades that shipments should be made at as low freight rates as are current elsewhere on this coast, and especially on Puget Sound.

It has not been easy to keep a supply of seamen for foreign-going vessels in British Columbia ports owing to the inducements held out by the agents of the Puget Sound boarding-masters.

The shipping-masters have never made any effort to provide crews for vessels, and the only assistance to the shipping interest in this essential matter has been given by boarding-house masters.

The majority of unemployed seamen in Pacific coast ports, having left their previous ship without being paid off, the only remuneration which the boarding-house master can receive must be out of the seamen's advanced note, and any sum paid by captains for procuring crews.

In the past in British Columbia ports, under, perhaps a not too strict interpretation of the law, certain boarding-house masters have undertaken to provide crews with results satisfactory to both captains and seamen.

Your committee is informed that the fee charged here has been $10 per head, and on Puget Sound from $35 to $80 per head.

On the other hand the wages paid to seamen here have usually been 25 per cent higher than on Puget Sound where the seamen are made to accept lower wages to compensate for the extra amount charged to captains by the boarding-house master.

Your committee is of the opinion that a continuance of the practice of boarding-house masters charging a moderate fee for securing crews in British Columbia ports will be to the advantage of seamen and all other parties concerned, and your committee would recommend such an amendment of the regulations as will permit this.

It seems to your committee that under subsection 'c' of clause 11 of the Shipping of Seamen Act, shipping masters should be allowed to license not more than two reputable persons in each port who would be authorized to assist captains in securing crews, and that for such services a fee of not more than $10 per head should be paid.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

(Sgd.) J. J. SHALLCROSS,
JOHN G. COX,
HARRY F. BULLEN.

These are prominent members of the Board of Trade of Victoria, whom I know personally, and who not only made these representations in writing in May, 1904, but made further representations to a special meeting of the Board of Trade of Victoria last September. I think the law proposed will afford them relief and will secure what they require.

Mr. BARKER. Is it contemplated, that, under section 2 of this Bill, the Governor in Council may establish a tariff of fees, and that that tariff shall supersede the right to contract for any sum ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It is intended to establish a rate of fees approved by the Governor in Council which shall not be exceeded. Except for that, of course, a man will be free to make his own agreement.

Mr. BARKER. I would point out that the Bill repeals, as regards British Columbia, section 18, which is the only clause in the statute that protects the parties in respect of fees. That section provides that the shipping master or deputy shipping master who has charged more than the established fee shall be liable to a penalty and to dismissal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. More than that, for my part, I cannot see why section 7 should be repealed. But sailors are notoriously improvident; they are notoriously

liable, as the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) has stated, to spend their wages foolishly. And, if you provide that the deputies of the shipping master may be persons who are engaged in the business of selling spirituous liquors, you are passing legislation that in my opinion is unwise. These men have been referred to as wards of the nation because of their improvidence when ashore. They should be wards of parliament, and parliament should not pass legislation that would be likely to increase their tendency to improvidence.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Then we have no wards of parliament in our part of the country—we have no sailors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is to be regretted. But there may be some worse things than having no sailors. I am anxious to further the commerce and shipping of Vancouver; but I am not anxious to place on the statute-book of Canada legislation of this character even for the object stated here to-day. You may appoint as deputies of the shiping master, not only men who are keepers of boarding-houses, but men who engage in the sale of spirituous liquors.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It does not say so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It suspends section 7, and the effect of that is what I have stated. If that is not the object, then remove this repeal of section 7, and you will remove one very grave objection to the Bill so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Well, allow the prohibition of liquor sellers to stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We want to have that feature of this Bill eliminated at least. So far as the other part of it is concerned, it seems to me that we are going at this in a wrong way. The hon. member for Vancouver has some personal knowledge of the circumstances. As I understand, the difficulty is due to the fact that there is no means of recovering in British Columbia the moneys due to the boarding-house keeper. From what the hon. gentleman says, as I understand him, a boarding-house keeper will keep a sailor for three or four weeks; and, even when he does procure a berth for him on an outgoing ship—because we know boarding-house keepers, even if they are not deputy shipping masters, do this work by interviewing masters and so on—he has no means of reimbursing himself for what the seaman owes him.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It goes a little further than that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well that is part of it at least. If this is the principal part of it, it does not seem to me that we are going at the matter exactly in the right way by this legislation.

Mr. MACPHERSON. This is not drawn for the benefit of boarding-house masters, but for the benefit of the shipping of the ports of British Columbia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that; but the means taken is to provide a way by which boarding-house keepers may recover money owing to them by sailors.

Mr. MACPHERSON. That is an incident.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the main incident, because it is contended that boarding-house keepers, unless they have this power, will not engage in this business. That is the whole argument, is it not?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what I understood.

Mr. MACPHERSON. While the boarding-house master may not have means of reimbursing himself, this legislation was not suggested by that class of people, nor, in my opinion, is it drawn up with the object of advancing their interest. It is to enable us in British Columbia to get seamen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, but by this means.

Mr. MACPHERSON. How are you going to do it otherwise? Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows that these sailors are in boarding-houses. But while we are splitting hairs over this thing, our trade is going by the board. We in British Columbia are convinced that, if this Bill passes it will be one of the best things of recent years for the benefit of our shipping. After all, sentiment does not figure very much when the interest of a whole trade is at issue.

Mr. FOSTER. But there must be some limit;—you must not push that too far.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Of course.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It seems to me that in drafting legislation, the first thing required is to understand what you want. Our legislation on this subject, as found in the revised statutes is wise legislation, passed because of abuses of a most serious character that had grown up in our Canadian ports. It was intended to suppress an evil in the maritime ports known as the evil of crimping, as a result of which more crimes were committed, I believe, than through any other cause in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. You had an experience of it in Quebec.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. A terrible experience. At last public attention was aroused by the murder of a man—I have forgotten his name—by Captain Pelletier; and the result was the passing of the statute from which this chapter of the revised statutes was taken. The law now provides that a sea captain must hire his men by the assistance of what is known as a shipping master. A shipping master in each port has

the power to appoint a deputy shipping master.

The intention of section 7 was to prevent boarding-house keepers and saloon keepers from being deputy shipping masters. That was the intention, and that is the intention to which we must give effect now, otherwise it is likely to lead to most serious results, with regard to saloon-keepers especially. Now what are the conditions prevailing on the Pacific coast which make a change desirable at the present time? In British Columbia ports as in other ports, where vessels go to discharge their cargoes or take on their cargoes, as we know perfectly well, when a seaman reaches his port of destination and is entitled to his discharge, he almost invariably leaves the ship. I do not suppose that of the seamen on board ships generally, there are 5 per cent who remain beyond a voyage. When he reaches his port of destination the seaman obtains his discharge, if he is entitled to it; if he is not entitled to it, and he can get out of the vessel in any way, as a majority of the men can, he goes to the boarding-house keeper who takes hold of him and keeps him away. So that either the seaman leaves the ship because he is entitled to a discharge, or he is induced to leave by the boarding-master, but the result is that the vessel is without a crew. As a consequence of existing legislation, it is represented that in British Columbia, the captains there cannot get their crews, and as a consequence they are obliged to go over to the United States ports in Puget Sound where this law does not apply, and where they secure their crew through the aid of the shipping master who happens to be a boarding-house keeper or a saloon keeper. The reason, I think, of that is that the ship captain who wants to get his crew knows a boarding-house keeper who has probably at his place four or five men, and the latter knows that in the adjoining boarding-house there may be four or five more. So he goes to this man and says to him: Pick me up a crew of fifteen or twenty men and I will give you so much per head for them. The result is that that this boarding-house keeper is interested in securing a crew, and he goes about it deliberately and gets the crew. The law as we have it would prevent the captain from charging to the seamen the honorarium he is obliged to pay to the boarding-house keeper. He could charge to him what would be the amount of his board, but unless that honorarium is included in the board, the captain cannot charge it to the seaman, and very properly so. But the question is how are we to meet that difficulty which obliges the vessel owners to go to these Puget Sound ports for the purpose of getting their crews, and when they get their crews they also take supplies, and we lose thereby a considerable amount of trade. What are we to do to remedy that difficulty? That is to say, what ought we to do to enable a captain to go to an agent—and I say that agent should not be a deputy shipping master, it is improper he should be a deputy shipping master—but what we can we do to enable the captain to go to an agent and get that agent to pick up these men and to bring them before the deputy shipping master and make them sign a contract in the ordinary way. All that is required to be done, if it is found desirable, is to amend the law so as to increase the fees that are paid to deputy shipping master in order that he may procure these sailors without the intervention of an agent. If it is desirable we should do it, let us increase the fees paid to the deputy shipping master—if my recollection of the statute is correct only one-half of these fees would be charged to the seamen. Why can't we proceed in that way? Why can't we make provision to increase the fees of the deputy shipping master in such a way as to offer him an additional inducement to get a crew, instead of the captain being obliged to go to the boarding-house keeper and directing him to do all these things for the purpose of getting a crew? It seems to me we ought to be able to secure our object in that way, by giving the deputy shipping master that inducement which is necessary to enable him to go to the boarding-house masters and get from them the crew that he requires. It seems to me that is a solution of the difficulty, because there is a difficulty for which we ought to find some solution. But I do not think we will solve that difficulty by making the boarding-house keepers deputy shipping masters.

Mr. FOSTER. With that state of things, it does not seem that it is necessary or expedient for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to attempt to go on with this Bill. It is another example of attempting to do things in an improper manner.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. On the contrary, this first Bill was prepared and submitted to the proper authorities. This second Bill was proceeded with in the same way. I have done what I was requested to do by the Board of Trade of British Columbia, I have been acting under their advice, or I have been attempting to come to their rescue.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not want to suggest that this Bill should not go through in the form in which it is unless that is the intention of the House. I understand from my hon. friend that the Bill was submitted to the Department of Justice, and a second Bill was redrafted by the department. I accept all the responsibility for it.

Mr. GALLIHER. I have listened to the explanation of the Minister of Justice and there is one point that strikes me forcibly.

If I understand the argument of my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), and also the resolution of the board of trade read by the Minister of Marine, it seems to me absolutely essential, in order that you may have sailors there to take service on the ship, that there should be some place where sailors could be taken care of in the interim. It is all very well to say that the agent or deputy shipping master could go out and gather sailors, but where are you going to get the sailors if there are none to be had? Who are going to keep the sailors there in the meantime? Now to-day the boarding-house keepers make a business of that; they take the sailors in and take care of them during a certain time, and the sailors are there and ready to take service on board ship. It seems to me you cannot reach your object in any other way. If you have no sailors there, and there is nobody to take care of them in the meantime the deputy shipping master or his agent will have great difficulty in finding them. I do not see how the business could be worked out along the lines suggested by the Minister of Justice, for the above reasons.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let me point out the inconvenience that, in my experience, results from the system such as the one intended to be established here. Here is a boarding-house keeper who happens to have six or seven sailors at his place. He takes these sailors and gets them so drunk that they do not know what they are doing. He takes them to the shipping master, who takes them on board ship without any knowledge on their part of their port of destination, or of the nature of the contract they have entered into. The boarding-house keeper may get a large fee, I understand that he gets $10 or $15 per head, or, is as in the case pointed out, $80. You will have in consequence a system of crimping established, and you will have these shipping masters or deputy shipping masters interested in inducing these men to desert, and in consequence, forfeiting their wages, and inducing them to go and live in these boarding-houses, so that they may make a profit in re-employing them.

Mr. GALLIHER. You cannot have many advantages without some disadvantage. This Act can be improved by making a boarding-house keeper a deputy shipping master, and as such he can be made responsible for any act of his. We can reach these people by the criminal law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If a half dozen men are sent to sea in that condition do you suppose you will ever hear anything about it again?

Mr. GALLIHER. I do not think the fear that a half dozen men may be sent off to sea in this condition should be held up as a bugbear to interfere with the trade of British Columbia ports. You cannot constitute yourself the guardian of every man in every walk of life; we all have to take chances; the sailors' is a roving life and it does not matter much to many of them what port they sail for. I do not think we live in an age when crimping can be carried on as it formerly was in England.

Mr. FOSTER. And here.

Mr. GALLIHER. And here perhaps. The ports of Vancouver and Victoria are not very large and it is easily possible to have such supervision over these boarding-house keepers who may be appointed deputy shipping masters, as will keep them well within the mark. I do not believe any bad result will follow, and in the meantime British Columbia ports will get the trade they are entitled to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I appreciate the fact that a serious grievance exists in British Columbia at present. It is quite easy for a member of this House to play the part of critic on any legislation, but if the minister will allow the matter to remain in abeyance for a day or two I will undertake to see if I can draft some clause that will meet the object we all have in view.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Very well. I was about to suggest that we could provide against persons who sell liquors from being appointed as shipping masters, but if you exclude boarding-house keepers you are in no better position than you are now. I tried to solve the difficulty on the request of the boards of trade of the Pacific coast, but I understand the objections very well. I move the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

PILOTAGE—DISTRICT OF QUEBEC.

Bill (No. 171) respecting the port and pilotage of the district of Quebec—Mr. Préfontaine—read a second time and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FOSTER. Before section one is read by the Chairman would the minister explain just what is the condition of things now and what are the reasons that led to this very decided change? How would things be bettered by placing it under the minister and in that way bringing it immediately under the party patronage system; none too good, none too conductive to discipline and morale in the force. Prima facie it would seem to be a step backward, to take it from a non-partisan board, as I think this is, and put it under the direct control of a party minister. I suppose the minister knows, as any one who has had to do with these things knows, that the harbour and river police business in Quebec has not been a bed of roses for any one who has attempted to administer it, and even with the buffer of the commission between the minister and the force it has been

a source of perennial trouble. Does the minister think he is going to make it better if he takes it away from the commission and puts it where every follower of his and where every adherent of his throughout the district will feel that they have a right to interfere in the appointments and everything of that kind. But worse than that, it brings immediately to every member of the pilot force the idea that he has to get political pull and political influence in some way if he wishes to better his individual condition or the condition of the force as a whole. It seems to me that in going from the commission to the minister and opening up all the influences, it is not a step in the right direction. Of course the minister will agree with me that this is a very important branch of the service.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not in the House two sessions ago when this matter was discussed. For years past the shipping federation has unanimously agitated for a revision of the laws governing the pilots. In the year 1887 a strike took place amongst the Montreal district pilots who were then under the control of the harbour commissioners, and a commission was appointed to inquire into the whole question. For twenty years past the shipping interests have agitated in favour of putting the pilots under the administration of the Marine Department, and it is only the year before last that the objections of the pilots themselves and of the Montreal Harbour Board were removed, and that a Bill was passed putting the licensed pilots between Quebec and Montreal under the control of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. That was to put the Montreal pilotage division under the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. There were strong representations to the government, and we were taken to task for not having the courage, as it was alleged at the time, to take the whole pilotage under the control of the department. I explained then to the House that there were two sides to the question, that I knew that the shipping interests were unanimously in favour of that being done, or that there would be somebody responsible for the conduct and qualification of these men. I said that we would try with the pilots of Montreal, who were ready to work hand in hand with the department and to submit themselves to the regulations that might be made by the department. Since this clause has been in force, now nearly two seasons, not only the shipping federation, which represents the ship-owners, but the pilots themselves, are perfectly satisfied. But there has been some agitation as regards other places. Last year a very serious accident happened on the Saguenay river through the incompetence of one of the pilots, resulting in the loss of a vessel and its cargo to the value of $250,000. Then the shipping people asked us to take away the Saguenay river at least from the pilotage authorities of Quebec and put it under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and last year I introduced a Bill for that purpose. The department succeeded in getting the corporation of the pilots of Quebec to select four or five of their number who knew the Saguenay river very well, and place them under the control of the department. The result was that last year there was scarcely any accident, and matters went on better than they had done before. This year the corporation of the pilots of Quebec, in view of the way matters had gone on between Montreal and Quebec, came to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and asked that they should be put under the control of his department. They felt that that would be more satisfactory to them and that the regulations would be better attended to ; and therefore, with the consent of the Harbour Commissioners of Quebec, I bring forward this Bill with the view of having the whole of the St. Lawrence pilotage under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The pilots' organization will of course keep its entity as it is, while the Department of Marine and Fisheries will be the pilotage authority as regards examinations and regulations for the admission of pilots, and all that is necessary to guarantee to the shipping interest the elimination as much as possible of all dangers from incompetency.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these regulations now taken in hand by the Department of Marine and Fisheries ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Yes. The pilots have their own corporation and regulations, but the pilotage authority will rest with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries instead of with the harbour commissioners. The harbour commissions are composed of a large number of men—in Montreal 11 and in Quebec 9 or 10. The shipping people believe their interests will be better served in this way. The masters, mates, engineers and captains are all under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and are obliged to pass their examinations and get their certificates from the department ; and the shipping people ask, why should not the pilots be in the same position ? They say that the pilots should be put under such control that the shipping people would know where to place the blame if a pilot committed an offence or an error or proved incompetent. He could be dealt with by somebody who would be responsible to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What privileges do the pilots retain to themselves as a corporation ? Do they regulate their own apprenticeships or the manner in which new pilots are to be

brought in, or does that go to the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. That goes to the department. When we took the authority over the pilots between Montreal and Quebec, the shipping federation met with the president of the pilots, and they agreed upon certain regulations for the best interests of themselves and the public in general, so that this body should inspire confidence. The result has been most satisfactory in the district of Montreal, and I do not see why it should not be equally so in the district of Quebec.

Mr. FOSTER. As soon as this Bill is passed, the Pilotage Board will no longer exist ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The Harbour Commission of Montreal is still in existence, but it has no jurisdiction over the pilotage ; and the same will be the case with the Harbour Commission of Quebec.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is a provision in the Harbour Commissioners' Act, giving the Harbour Commission authority over pilotage, and that provision will no longer have any effect.

Mr. FOSTER. I am glad to hear from the minister that things have improved in the Montreal district. If he can effect an improvement at the other end, and gain the confidence of the shipping men, which has not been very full, I am afraid, during the last few years, it will be a good thing. Meantime, I might say what I commenced to say. My fear in the matter was that the element of patronage and political interference would be allowed to creep into it. If that can be kept out of it, I believe the change might be beneficial.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. The rules will be the same for everybody. The board of examiners is composed of officials of the department. Sometimes they take an outsider to aid in the examination. I do not think that the question of patronage has ever arisen.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. Who regulates the distribution of those pilots ? I notice that ever and anon difficulties arise. Some shipowners, not being able otherwise to get the pilots they want, employ them by the year. Also, who regulates the coming in of apprentices and the terms under which they can come in ? Also, whether there is an arrangement for the pooling of the earnings ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. In the district of Quebec the earnings are pooled and divided at the end of the season under the authority of the pilots' corporation. In the district of Montreal there is no pooling. There is a very serious question at present among the Montreal pilots arising out of the system of allowing pilots to be engaged by the year by steamship companies. It has become a very serious question as to what regulations we will adopt in order to distribute the work more equally. That question will be taken up by the shipping federation and the department within a few days, and I think we will come to some arrangement that will be satisfactory.

Mr. FOSTER. Will this rule of distribution in the Quebec portion belong to the pilots or the department ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. It will come under the department, and the distribution of the work as well as the money will be subject to some regulations. It is not likely, however, that the department will reverse the present condition of affairs without due examination of all the circumstances.

Mr. FOSTER. Always keeping in view that the pilots are made for the shipping service and not the service for the pilots.

Mr. PREFONTAINE. Of course. As regards the regulations governing apprentices, these will come under the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The moment that this pilotage business comes under the Department of Marine, the minister will have to see that proper regulations for the admission of apprentices are made, and also for their yearly examination. We find that in the district of Montreal, unless a complaint was made, a pilot would not be called on every year to pass an examination as to his eye-sight and hearing. We have established a rule, with the consent of the pilots, that they should pass an examination every season and get a certificate as to their eyesight and hearing to show that these have not failed so much as to prevent their attending to their duties. We have also stipulated what kind of examination they shall be subjected to.

Mr. FOSTER. What happened the vessel in Montreal harbour the other day which went ashore ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. I have given instructions for an investigation. Her going ashore must be due to gross carelessness or something wrong with her machinery.

Mr. FOSTER. It could not be that a new sand-bar had been created ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. No.

Mr. OSLER. Have the laws and regulations of the pilots' association to be approved by the minister ?

Mr. PREFONTAINE. They have to be submitted to the Governor General in Council.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Intercolonial Railway—general vote, $7,000,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have from time to time, during the past three or four months, forwarned the House regarding the probable outcome of the year's operation of the Intercolonial Railway. In my detailed statement of some months ago, I rather predicted a large deficit. The information available up to this moment has confirmed my worst fears with respect to that deficit. This has been an extraordinary year for us in several respects. The snowfall in the maritime provinces last winter was beyond all precedent in the history of those provinces. For nearly two months traffic was practically suspended, except at certain intervals. These conditions not only immensely reduced the revenues of the road, but entailed an unparalleled outlay. We have been obliged to burn the candle at both ends. While traffic was paralyzed, suspended, the expenditure has been going on. Detention wages alone is an item of serious moment. Trains were sent out and men were under pay; but owing to the conditions, these trains were prevented from earning, though the expenditure went on. I cannot at this moment more than estimate the probable shortage of revenue as compared with working expenses for the current year, but the amount will no doubt be between a million and a half and two millions of dollars. Until full and detailed information is had, I think it would be improper to do more than give a general outline of the facts which have led to this result. While I am prepared to say that this is an alarming condition, I am also in a position to say that during the fiscal year there have been no undue appointments, no creations of office; but that normal conditions have prevailed in that respect But with respect to wages, we have made one very important change—we have been obliged to pay very much higher wages than have prevailed heretofore on the Intercolonial.

Coming to such details as I can give, I may say that, in the first place, the operation of the Prince Edward Island Railway for the nine months ending 31st March last was unusually expensive. The revenue fell off to the extent of $11,957 and the working expenses increased by $65,289 as compared with the preceding year. This result was largely due to the snow blockade. For example, the cost of handling snow in the year 1903-4 was $11,715; but the cost under the same head for the current year was $32,175. A further increase is explained by the addition to the wages. The men are paid, in many instances fifty per cent more than they have been paid hitherto. Still, we have not exceeded the wages that are paid by the other railways of Canada. The Intercolonial, within the last year, has simply been levelled up to the standard of the wages paid by other railways in this country. I do not think we are paying exorbitant wages—I am satisfied that we are not; we are simply paying a fair wage to the men of the Intercolonial as compared with the wage paid elsewhere. I do not feel that I should apologize for the fact that we have increased these wages. We have an army of men on the Intercolonial who are worthy of recognition. They are a splendid force of railway men and are entitled to what was granted to them. Perhaps it was delayed too long. But it is certainly unfortunate that this increase in wages serves to make the deficit of the past year one that is not pleasing for the people, or for me as Minister of Railways to contemplate. The increase in wages, in addition to that which we paid during the preceding year is somewhere about $750,000—that is to say that the Intercolonial to-day is paying practically the same number of men about $750,000 more than formerly, to say nothing of any additional men. Now, I know as a matter of fact that the work that is being carried on, particularly in the mechanical department, gives very much better results than before Take, for instance, in the repair of cars. We have increased the number of men, about 20 per cent, but we are realizing in work an increase of nearly 100 per cent. This is due to the fact that our system has been so much improved. Last year we were turning out in the repairs of passenger cars about 16 to 18 a month; this year we are turning out 29 or 30 a month. In the repairs of locomotives, with an increase of say 20 per cent in the number of men, we are turning out 66 per cent more engines.

Mr. BARKER. That is in the number of engines, not the quantity of work? The hon. minister (Mr. Emmerson) must remember that nearly all his cars and locomotives are now new.

Mr. EMMERSON. The amount of work has been greatly increased. By the re-organization of the shops and the system of change-hands and so on, they are accomplishing very much greater results than they hitherto accomplished. There was an increase in the wages account of $3,588, and $8,985 for additional ties on the Prince Edward Island road. The added cost of repairs, fuel and station expenses made up the remainder. It is, however, on the main line of the Intercolonial that the chief loss has occurred. This loss does not directly arise from a falling off in the revenue. As compared with last year, the income has actually been greater to the extent of a few thousand dollars than last year. Had it not been for the extraordinary conditions bearing upon the operation of the road, the revenue would pro-

bably have shown a sufficient increase to largely reduce the deficit.

Mr. HAGGART. Has the minister the receipts and expenditures for the couple of months in which he says that the loss occurred ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I will show that before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the loss on the Prince Edward Island road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not that separately. It is desirable that members on both sides of the House should view this matter from a practical standpoint, and not from a political standpoint. It is simply a question of dealing with a railway that, I think, is run fairly free from political influences, a railway that is managed practically by the same persons that have been there for years. The same general manager, the same chief superintendent, in fact all the officials are to-day identically the same as were there twenty years ago. We have the Intercolonial on our hands as an essential part of the pact of confederation, and we have reached the stage where we must calmly realize the full extent of our obligations in that regard. I do not feel like apologizing for even a deficit on the Intercolonial. I realize that the Intercolonial was part of the pact of confederation, I realize that it was constructed over a route that was not commercial, I realize that it was practically military and political influences that located that road.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the minister be good enough to say why it was not constructed over a commercial route ?

Mr. EMMERSON. For this reason, that it was constructed away round on the northern shore of the province of New Brunswick. It was not constructed through the centre of the province, it follows the route of the St. Lawrence, making a long detour. To make any earnings at all on our freight or passengers, we have to carry them hundreds of miles further than does the Canadian Pacific Railway, which runs through practically the same field. The Canadian Pacific Railway goes direct, we have to send our freight hundreds of miles further round, and our mileage is greater, the cost of operation is necessarily greater, but our returns are no more. We are not in a position fairly to compete with other railways. The government of Canada constructed the Intercolonial, it built an excellent road ; but the government of Canada afterwards subsidized a railway to run in competition with the Intercolonial. Therefore, the Intercolonial is not only in competition with that additionally subsidized railway, but it is in competition with the route all along down the shores of the St. Lawrence, down into New Brunswick, down to the Sydneys. The Intercolonial must also compete with the water system. It is true that that competition does not exist during the winter months, but our freight rates are necessarily affected, even though we do not have that competition in the winter, for the reason that we have to enter into contracts upon this basis. Shippers say 'If you will give to us certain freight rates throughout the year, we will patronize your road, not only in winter, but in summer as well.' Under these conditions we are seriously handicapped in freight rates, not merely with one company, but with many companies. And naturally precedent governs, particularly in the matter of the government railway. Precedent is very strong, and if you fix a certain rate in connection with the Sydneys, for instance, you are called upon to have proportionate rates fixed over the whole of the Intercolonial. There can be no discrimination, there must of necessity be uniformity. The ordinary company can do as it will, that is to say, they can withhold here or they can extend there.

Mr. BARKER. Just the reverse ; the ordinary company is bound by the commission and you are not.

Mr. EMMERSON. Well, there are ways and ways of doing it. We are bound by reason of its being a government road. There can be no favourites, there must be uniformity. The very moment you establish a precedent with respect to one thing, that precedent must prevail all over the line. Under these conditions I must say that the Intercolonial is to be congratulated, even under the results that are shown. Of course we do not take into consideration the cost of the canal system of Canada. The canals were constructed as part of the highways of the country. For long years tolls were charged, but in the interest of trade and commerce these tolls were abolished. There is an annual current expenditure of upwards of $1,000,000 on the canals. In whose interest is that expenditure made ? It is true that last year we had $1,000,000 deficit on the Intercolonial Railway, but there was also $1,000,000 deficit on the canals of Canada. The canals were a part of the compact of confederation. They were made free in the interest of the trade and commerce of the country. Now, the Intercolonial Railway was established as a bond between the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the provinces known as the maritime provinces. It was established to promote trade. It did promote trade. It is true that the freight rates are not high, but I repudiate the idea that they are not high simply in the interest of the maritime provinces, because, if they had been higher, there would not have been that trade created between these upper provinces and the lower provinces which has resulted.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. minister says that the freight rates are not as high as those of other railways. Would he give us a practical statement of what is the differ-

ence per ton per mile between the rates on the Intercolonial Railway and those on other roads ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the exact calculation, but I know that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway have been less by some fifty per cent.

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, nonsense; you have it in your own reports.

Mr. EMMERSON. The statement is before the House. It was laid on the table. The information is here. Take the tariff of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the tariff of the Grand Trunk Railway and compare it with the freight tariff of the Intercolonial Railway, and I say that you will find that the Intercolonial Railway tariff is all the way from 25 to 80 per cent less than the freight tariff of these different railways. Perhaps that is a condition of things that should not have prevailed.

Mr. BARKER. Are you speaking of through or local rates ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking very largely of local traffic. Necessarily the through tariffs must be governed by that of the other railways. Necessarily, if we accept freight at Montreal for St. John, we are governed by the Canadian Pacific Railway tariff, because they have the direct route, they have the shorter mileage, and we are compelled to carry that freight away around a much longer distance at the same rate. The local tariff rates are much less than are those of other railways, and therein is a very great loss.

Mr. BARKER. I understood the hon. gentleman to be arguing a moment ago that the low rates he was speaking of were not for the benefit of the maritime provinces, but for the benefit of the whole Dominion. Now he says that the low rates are local rates.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that most distinctly, and as to the other rates, because of the long distance we have to carry the freight, there is a greater cost, but notwithstanding that fact the rates are based on the shorter mileage of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We expend a greater amount of money in order to carry that freightage to its point of destination. It is also true—I admit it frankly—that our local rates are lower. I think they should be increased. I think they necessarily must be increased in the interest, not merely of the road, but in all interests. I think I may safely say that we have now passed the stage when it is possible to make ends meet. On the one hand, the freight tariff is practically fixed. The rates are exceedingly low as compared with those charged by the different railway corporations in Canada. On the other hand, we have an ascending scale of operating charges. Chief among these is the wages. The very moment you increase, by even a farthing, the wages of any of the employees you have what is practically not a controllable element ; that is to say, it becomes a fixed charge. You can never reduce. It is easy to increase, but you can never reduce.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Lots of railway companies cut down their wages time after time.

Mr. EMMERSON. But a government railway never could. I make the statement unequivocally and unhesitatingly that the government cannot, in justice, pay a lower scale of wages to its employees than that paid by ordinary commercial railways.

Mr. OSLER. Why ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Why ? Because the government cannot do it. Is it right, or fair, or just, that the government should pay a less rate of wages to its employees than that which is paid by other railways ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No ; but if other railways are reducing wages, does the hon. minister say that the government also should not reduce wages ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am making this statement, that even with our increased wages we have not reached the limit of the other railways. The men in the car-shops and the men in all departments of the Intercolonial Railway are not paid in excess of what other railway companies are paying ; in fact, instead of the government establishing the standard of wages, the government has simply followed in the line of the other railways, and all appeals that have ever come before me and all appeals that have ever been made to other Ministers of Railways in times past, as I know from personal experience, were made on the basis of the established rate of wages paid by other railway companies. Under these circumstances, we have simply followed on tardily, I admit, but we have followed on, and we are yet under the standard as established by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. In keeping to the rule of paying our men in accordance with the rate of wages which is paid by the commercial lines, we have been compelled, during the past two or three years, to grant very large increases to our employees in all branches of the service, and to this item of wages may be charged the principal cause of the financial results which we are now compelled to face. Fuel, ties, lumber, steel and all classes of materials are much dearer than they were three years ago. All these charges swell the operating expenses. We have not been able thus far to adopt the remedy of increasing the rates, which a railway corporation might apply. That is a very difficult thing to do. I think I can say frankly that there is no subject upon which the people are more sensitive than that of increasing freight rates on a government railway. From one end of the railway to the other, from the Sydneys to

St. John and from Halifax to Montreal, the very moment the suggestion of an increase is made, that moment you meet with opposition. That is necessarily the outcome of government operation of railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not necessarily.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, necessarily from this standpoint: the people say this is our line, this is our railway, we own it and we are going to run it in our own interests. I know that it is difficult for people in other parts of Canada to properly take into consideration the feeling that exists with respect to that very feature of the Intercolonial Railway. I have known it, I have felt it, I have been made to feel it. The very fact that you run your canals free, the very fact that these canals are operated without charge to those who take advantage of them, is used as an argument by those who would seek low freight rates on a government railroad. It is stated very freely all over the maritime provinces that if it were in the interests of confederation to construct canals and make these canals free, it is also in the interests of the confederation that the Intercolonial Railway should be operated at the least possible cost to the people who are interested in using it. I know that it is not a pleasing thing for me as Minister of Railways to stand up here to-day and acknowledge these things; it certainly is not a gratifying fact. We are all judged by results—circumstances are not taken into consideration, peculiar conditions are not thought of—it is the results that are looked to, and upon these results I stand measurably condemned before the people of Canada as the administrator of this railway during the present fiscal year. But, I want the people of Canada to bear in mind the conditions; I want them to realize the circumstances; I want them to travel over that railway from the 1st of July last down to the present moment and take into consideration the history of the road. If there has been any mismanagement I certainly have yet to learn of it. We have the same general manager, we have the same officials; there have been no offices created, there has been no extravagance; we have been buying as we bought heretofore by tender, there has been no favouritism to characterize this road during the past year as compared with previous years; the conditions have been normal as to purchase, as to operation, as to the employment of men; and yet we have a deficit which may reach nearly $2,000,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear'; he seems to gloat over the fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. Bad management.

Mr. EMMERSON. No doubt my hon. friend will say that.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the expenditure on capital account too?

Mr. EMMERSON. The expenditure on capital account is very large. I have not the figures at this moment before me but it is shown in the report.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the expenditure for last year; I want the expenditure on capital account for the current year.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not those figures.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the $2,000,000 deficit calculated to the 1st of July or to the present time?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is only an approximate estimate. I am figuring that up to the 1st of July the deficit will be between one and a half and two millions.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister bring, after six o'clock, the exact deficit as well as the expenditure on capital account?

Mr. EMMERSON. I shall endeavour to do so. The question of rates on the Intercolonial must sooner or later receive serious consideration. I am free to admit that even though the canals are free, even though the people of the west have the advantage of free freightage over the canals without tolls, and even though there is an expenditure of $1,000,000 or more annually on the canals for the benefit of the trade of the country, yet, I feel that so far as the Intercolonial Railway is concerned there must be some attention given to the freight charges. It certainly cannot go on from year to year that we should have a very large and increasing deficit, and under these circumstances I would feel that this is a matter which should receive very serious consideration. I desire as briefly as possible and purely in a general way, to go over some of the accounts connected with the operating expenses. In the maintenance of way department there has been an increase for the nine months ending 31st of March last as compared with the corresponding period last year, of $252,808. The principal items of this increase were: Snow and ice, $126,641; ballasting, $59,608; ties, $42,426; buildings and platforms, $15,480, and snow fences, $5,482. Against this increase there was a decrease aggregating $70,762, so that the net increase was $182,625 for the nine months.

Mr. TAYLOR. There was an election during that time.

Mr. EMMERSON. There was an election yesterday too, I believe.

Mr. TAYLOR. You spent a lot of money up there too.

Mr. EMMERSON. However that may be, I do not think that the election affected the deficit very much. The maintenance of way has to do with the keeping up of the high character of the Intercolonial, that is, its roadbed and condition; and the additional charges for ballasting and ties show that this work has not been neglected during the past year. In fact, the standard of the Intercolonial is being maintained. In the department of maintenance of way, the increase of the wages list for the nine months to the 31st of March last, amounts to $97,000. We paid out that additional amount to the same number of section-men along the line of railway for the same work which they have been doing for years for $97,000 less. This additional amount is not due to any added number of men; there have been none added; but it is due simply to the increase in wages. I am not taking into consideration the amount that was paid out in connection with the snow blockade. That of course, was exceptional. We require to have special men in addition to the regular trackmen. In the mechanical department the expenses of the nine months reached $3,098,482, showing an increase over the same period of last year of $621,563. The chief items making up this increase were: wages of drivers, firemen and cleaners, $81,660; fuel, $174,938; repairs to engines, $114,908; repairs to cars, $232,462; oil, tallow and waste, $8,398; snow ploughs and flangers, $6,948; and superintendence, $9,112. During the past year we have repaired a great many more cars and engines. The rolling stock of the Intercolonial to-day is in a condition which certainly bears splendid comparison with that of previous years. In fact, I think I can safely say that at no time in the history of the Intercolonial has the rolling stock been in a better condition than it is in to-day. All the old cars—that is, the first-class, the second-class, the baggage cars and all that description—have been in the shop, and they are certainly in a much better condition to-day than they were at this period last year; and I congratulate the superintendent of motive power on the splendid way in which he is attending to his duties in that direction. They are turning out more engines and cars daily and monthly; they have a better system; they have the work systematized in such a way that the best results are being accomplished. The men who are receiving higher wages are making greater and better returns for those wages than they have heretofore done. A greater number of men are employed, it is true; but the principal reason for the increase is the higher scale of wages paid to every class of men in the shops.

Mr. BARKER. How many new cars of all classes have been put on the Intercolonial Railway in the last four years?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can get a statement of that.

Mr. BARKER. The minister is talking of a large increase of cost for repairs. With a large increase of new cars, that ought to go down.

Mr. EMMERSON The average increase to all classes of employees in the shop was two cents per hour, and you can very readily realize what a burden that means. Take the men not merely at Moncton, but at Halifax, Sydney, St. John, Lévis, Rivière du Loup, Montreal, everywhere along the line of the railway. In the traffic department the increased cost of operation was very large. The chief items were: station expenses, $38,842, which is almost wholly an increase in wages. During the last session of parliament, as probably many hon. members know, there was a delegation here representing the telegraphers' union. Their schedule was gone over, and their wages were increased, with the result that during the past year they have been paid $38,842 more than the same number were getting in the previous year. The wages of trainmen during that period were increased by $116,608. I am prepared to give full details with respect to the comparative rates of pay of all classes of employes affected by the increases to which I have referred. Summing up the items of increased operating expenses to which I have alluded, the account would stand as follows, maintenance of way, $182,025; mechanical department, $621,563; traffic department, $145,447; making a total of $949,028. Adding this sum to the deficit of last year of $900,751, the shortage indicated for the current year would be $1,800,000. Until the year is completed, however, it would perhaps be imprudent to speculate as to what the actual amount of the deficit will be. That it will be large there can be no doubt. It is also certain that this result will be made the subject of general criticism. I think I may fairly ask, however, that judgment be suspended until full and accurate data are available for consideration in the light of the special conditions which have developed during the past two years in particular. As I have said, we have added to our wage account. It is only within the last two years that this has been felt, and it is unfortunate perhaps for me personally that it should have taken effect during that period, but these are the facts. I am not disposed to apologize for those increases. I think they were justified, I think they were warranted from every standpoint. I think that the men employed on the Intercolonial Railway are as good a class of men as are to be found anywhere in Canada. For intelligence, skill and attention to duty they are certainly not exceeded by any other class of men throughout the Dominion. There is no railway which can present a

better aggregation of men than does the Intercolonial Railway. They were entitled to recognition, they certainly were entitled to as good wages as are paid by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway; and I feel that I only did them simple justice when I acceded to their demands.

I may fairly be asked for my opinion as to the outlook.

Mr. FOWLER. Did the hon. gentleman state the deficit on this year's operations?

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that it would range between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000.

Mr. INGRAM. I think the hon. gentleman said $1,849,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that if certain things were true, it would be about $1,800,000. That is an approximate amount.

Mr. BARKER. Up to the 30th of June or to the date of your latest interim reports?

Mr. EMMERSON. Up to the 30th June. All my conjectures are based upon the year's operations and on certain results we have up to the 31st March, and even up to this moment. Taking it all in all, on the 30th June our deficit will not be less than $1,800,000 and it may reach $2,000,000. Of course a good deal will depend on what the operations of this month may be. This is usually a good month; and if we have favourable conditions, that very dark picture may be brightened up to some extent. Of course as regards the conditions at the close of the year, I could very much better give an explanation then as to the year's business and I prefer to leave it until then. It is not worth while my speaking of the conditions of the Intercolonial Railway or its prospects, but I simply recite the facts as they appear to-day. I think that I can fairly ask the sympathy of the House in facing the task of administering the Intercolonial Railway under the new circumstances which now prevail. Two ways of reducing the deficit are open to us. One to increase the freight rate generally and the other to carry, by means of better equipment, traffic at a lower cost. I do not know that the former method could be immediately applied, but the latter merits a trial. If we can equip that road so as to minimize the cost of carrying the traffic, that certainly would benefit the railway. Let me say that the cost of carrying the traffic over the Intercolonial Railway compares favourably, acording to the March returns, with any other railway in Canada. We are not paying more for our material. In fact we are paying less.

Mr. HAGGART. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are getting our materials for the Intercolonial Railway at less cost than do the other railways. We are not paying more wages, but there is this element which must not be lost sight of. We have to go mile after mile in order to earn the same results as are earned by the other railways. We have to travel additional miles and get no more returns than they do. That certainly figures very largely in our balance sheet at the end of the year, and we ought to recognize it. I have stated that the latter method, the method of obtaining proper equipment and thus lightening the cost of transportation merits a fair trial.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman overlook the fact that that has been going on the last four or five years? Every expenditure for the last five years has been justified on that ground and yet the minister tells us that it is impossible for this line to compete with others.

Mr. EMMERSON. For the past year the Intercolonial Railway has been short of motive power to the extent of seventy-five engines, and that has materially added to the expenses of running the railway during the last winter. And, more than that, we should have on the Intercolonial to-day at least fifty additional engines, if we are ever measurably to keep up with the increased traffic of the road. That point must not be overlooked—that there has been a great increase in the traffic and there has not been a corresponding increase in the motive power nor in the cars. Why, last winter, I could not go into my office, without being assailed with telegrams from all over the system complaining of lack of cars. When I telegraphed to Moncton, the only result was to ascertain definitely that we had not enough cars. And we were absolutely short of engines. Only last week the engine of the morning train going out of St. John broke down, and absolutely, there was not a spare engine anywhere in sight. We haven't them. Now, the people of Canada have a splendid railway, and that railway needs to be properly equipped—it certainly should be equipped so that it can take care of the traffic that offers. And, though I am not able to present a very pleasant picture of the current year's operations, yet, in my judgment, the Intercolonial is the greatest asset that Canada has. It has served its purpose, and is serving its purpose—that of cementing the provinces together.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then the minister is not going to let it be sold to the Grand Trunk Railway?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not through my vote That railway should remain an asset of Canada.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And be extended.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would be willing to extend it. Every move I have made has been in the direction of extending it.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. minister has extended the deficit most successfully.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, my hon. friend (Mr. Osler) speaks for another railway. I admit that the deficit has been extended, and I am not going to apologize for it. It has been done in the interest of Canada; Canada has got the benefit of it. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) is in favour of government ownership of railways, I believe?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. And I suppose of canals as well? Well I do not think that the expenditure of $1,000,000 for running the canals for a year would be a matter calling for apology. Nor do I think one should apologize for spending even $2,000,000 in the interest of the country in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. If it is deemed a desirable thing that the Intercolonial should be carried on so as to make ends meet, it is possible that both the methods to which I have referred should be adopted —on the one hand the improvement of the equipment, and on the other hand the increase of the freight rates. That is a matter calling for most serious consideration. And, as it is six o'clock, I will leave hon. members to consider what I have already said and resume after recess.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON. I trust that my explanations with respect to the Intercolonial are found to be satisfactory by the committee, and I do not think I need to dwell upon the subject any longer.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean that statement for sarcasm, that the explanations he has made are satisfactory to the House?

Mr. EMMERSON. I hope the explanations are satisfactory, whether the results of the year are satisfactory or not. I do not wish the committee to commit itself in that way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman means that he delivered his statement in a pleasing manner.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, in a frank manner.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister promised to give us a statement of the expenditure on capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am unable to do so, I found it is not in the office.

Mr. HAGGART. We have certainly listened with a good deal of interest to the statement of the Minister of Railways with respect to the position of affairs on the Intercolonial Railway, and a more lugubrious state of affairs, although it may have been a candid one, than that made by the Minister of Railways, was never before made in this House. We have been promised from year to year on account of the large expenditure which was being made on the Intercolonial, a better state of affairs than has previously existed. Let me state briefly what the position was on the Intercolonial under Conservative management. From 1891 to 1896 the Intercolonial was brought to a position where the revenue nearly met the expenditure. For the three years, 1891, 1892 and 1893 there was a surplus. In 1894 and 1895 there was a slight deficit, amounting to about $50,000 per year. The expenditure nearly balanced the receipts from 1891 to 1896. There was a comparatively small expenditure on capital account. The statement was made by myself in this House that the Intercolonial Railway, under proper management, with the rates which are at present in force, could be made to meet all expenses. What have we seen from 1896 to the present day? Let me tell you what the position of the Intercolonial was on the 30th of June, 1896. The total expenditure on capital account was $55,267,000. The expenditure on capital account up to the 30th of June, 1904, was $72,735,000. Then we have the extraordinary statement made to-day by the Minister of Railways that the difference between earnings and expenditure, independent entirely of capital account, was between $1,500,000 and $2,000,000. The Minister of Railways stated that the amount of the loss he estimated at somewhat more than $1,800,000, and that probably at the end of the year it would be $2,000,000. I asked the minister for an explanation, and the explanation he gave was that it was to a large extent owing to the unusual amount of snowfall in Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and that consequently there was an enormous extra expenditure. He stated also that to bring the payment of wages on the Intercolonial up to the standard that was in force throughout the Dominion, it would be necessary to increase them about twenty per cent. What is the expenditure on capital account? Why do we not get that from the minister? It is the simplest thing in the world for him to furnish the information. Why have we not got it? I find that the amount expended on capital account during the current year is $6,195,250, which with the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway amounts to $8,195,000. For this current year the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals explains that the receipts are nearly the same as they were last year. The total receipts therefore on the Intercolonial were in the neighbourhood of $6,200,000. In order to earn this $6,200,000, this country has expended $8,195,000 on

capital account on the Intercolonial Railway. Does it not seem extraordinary to the House ? This is the most extraordinary presentment of the management of the road that ever was made in this House since I have been a member of it,—$8,195,000 expended in cash out of the pockets of the people of this country when the total receipts from the railway are in the neighbourhood of $6,200,000 ! No wonder that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals was modest in the presentment of it. What excuse does he offer to the people of this country ? His excuse is that the people in the maritime provinces believe that they are entitled to some recompense for the canals which the people of the Dominion enjoy. What reason has he to advance that argument ? I have heard both the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals and the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) advance that argument. In the settlement of the indebtedness between the provinces, when the provinces were confederated into the Dominion, we had canals existing in the country. We had a debt. The debt was apportioned between the provinces and it was assumed by the Dominion as a whole. There was an allowance made for the expenditure we had made upon the canals up to that time and any expenditure upon the canals since that time has been fully compensated by like expenditure or by larger expenditures in the maritime provinces for works of public utility in these provinces from which the Dominion government does not receive a cent in return. I hope that will end the argument that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has made in reference to the maritime provinces being entitled to the free carriage of goods, because it amounts virtually to the free carriage of goods in the maritime provinces, in compensation for the free use of the canals. What benefit has this section of the country or what benefit is the province of Quebec receiving from the building of the canals ? The canals have been built for the purpose of diverting the trade of the Northwest both on the Canadian and American sides of the boundary through our Dominion and for the purpose of giving us the advantages which might accrue to us from the transportation of that trade through the Dominion. No especial benefit accrued to the people of Ontario or to the people of Quebec as a result of the construction of those canals. It was of no advantage to them. What advantage was the building of the Sault Ste. Marie canal ?—no more advantage to the people of Ontario and Quebec than to the people of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. It was a grand undertaking for the purpose of developing the Northwest and diverting that immense trade—which I suppose could be further diverted by the deepening of our canals to an extent which I have advocated hitherto—through the Dominion of Canada for the benefit of the whole Dominion. Not one dollar has been expended for the purpose of building these canals, but an equivalent expenditure has been given in compensation to the maritime provinces. Enough about that. We have no objection to that. As the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals has introduced the local issue into his argument let me say that the people of Ontario and Quebec have no desire whatever to secure any large return from the expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway. What does the expenditure amount to at the present day ? The expenditure to the 30th June, 1904, on the Intercolonial Railway amounted to $72,735,935. Add to that the deficit during the present year and this $6,100,000 expended on capital account and it amounts to over $80,000,000. Notwithstanding the fact that we have made this enormous expenditure which the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals declares was necessary in order that the people of the maritime provinces might be compensated for the expenditure which has been made to provide water communication in this section of the country, we have been obliged to expend during the present year on capital account and to meet the deficit over $8,000,000. But, it does not end there. The hon. minister foretells what he intends to do in the future. He says that the only way to bring matters to a different position from that in which they are at the present moment is to increase the facilities for transportation in the maritime provinces. He says that they want at least fifty more locomotives on that railway and that a further expenditure will be necessary for the purpose of bringing things to a level. We have heard sufficient about that. When the Drummond County Railway was taken over by the Dominion government, what was the promise made by the Minister of Railways and Canals at that time ? He stated that the Intercolonial Railway was opening up a new era, that there was life being put into the old concern, that they were no longer to keep on doing business on a back street, that they were to occupy premises on the front street and that the result would be one of financial benefit to the people of the country. What has the result been ? The result has been just as it has been depicted by the hon. minister who has presented this statement to us here this evening. I do not understand how it is that the Finance Minister allows an expenditure on capital account for the purpose of carrying on the work of this railway and for the purpose of making up the deficiency in the revenue amounting in all to $8,195,000. We remember the glorious picture which the hon. Minister drew of the finances of the country ; yet, last year for the purpose of balancing the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway there was an expenditure on capital account of $8,195,000. The hon. gentleman undertakes to give us the reasons for it. He states that they have been bringing up the wages

to the level of that attained upon other roads, and he states that the freight rates that they collect on the Intercolonial Railway are not mercantile rates and that they are not such as other railways charge for the carrying of freight. Most of the business done on the Intercolonial Railway is a local business. All the expenditure which has been made during the last twenty years for the purpose of increasing the volume of through traffic had not increased the through traffic of the Intercolonial Railway at all. The development which has taken place on the Intercolonial Railway from 1892 when the receipts were about $3,500,000 to the present day when they are $6,200,000 has taken place simply as a result of the development of the maritime provinces themselves.

The local business has increased, the through business initiating in the maritime provinces has increased, but the through traffic from or to Montreal has not developed one bit. The minister should have placed before the House a statement as to the freight rates charged on the Intercolonial Railway and a comparison with the freight rates charged by other railways. He ought to know the receipts per mile carriage for local freight on the Intercolonial Railway and also for through freight. He could have got that information in his department, but he did not go to the trouble of giving it to the House. In like manner he should have been able to tell the expenditure on capital account for the current year. We know that in 1896 the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway was $55,000,000, and we know that to-day it is $81,000,000. Since these gentlemen opposite came into power they have increased the capital expenditure by $26,000,000. They have promised from year to year that things would be better, but it has gone from bad to worse. Will the people of Canada continue to endorse this ? The fact that the Intercolonial Railway has been put into the position it is in to-day by this government can have no other object than to disgust the people of Canada with the management of the road, and with state management of railways in general, and to force them to seek a remedy in the management of this railway by a commission, or its sale to a syndicate, or the turning of it over to some of the large railway corporations of this Dominion. I warn the people of the maritime provinces that it is to their interest that the Intercolonial Railway should make a better showing ; I warn the people of the maritime provinces that it is to their interest that the Intercolonial Railway should be a state-owned and state-managed railway ; I tell them that under other management than the present, the result would be that the Intercolonial Railway—it might not pay interest on its cost, although it possibly could—but certainly there would be no difficulty at all in making the receipts and expenditures balance. The returns show that there has been a large development of trade in the maritime provinces. From Dalhousie to Sydney and Halifax and St. John, the railroad runs through a country which ought to make it as good a paying investment as a railway in any other part of the Dominion, if it were under proper management. The Minister of Railways tells us that there was a capital expenditure of nearly $3,000,000 at Moncton, with the result that the repairs of locomotives can be done cheaper now than hitherto. Well, we do not know anything about that, but we do know that there is an immense expenditure for repairs on the road. He told us that he built four locomotives last year, but I venture to say that he could have bought these locomotives in the market for just one-quarter what they cost to build in Moncton. Just fancy an institution that can only turn out four locomotives a year competing with the Grand Trunk Railway or the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose workshops will turn out one a day ; with the Baldwin Works, which have a capacity of ten a day, or with the Kingston Works, which can turn out thirty or forty a year. The Minister told us that the deficit was to some extent caused by putting the men on the same scale of wages as the employees of other railways throughout the country. He should have given us specific information, and made a comparison between the wages paid on the Intercolonial Railway and the wages paid on other Canadian railways. He is perhaps right when he says the government cannot afford to pay lower wages than private corporations pay, but there is no necessity for the Intercolonial Railway paying less. When I took over the management of the Intercolonial Railway I found a surplus of labour to the extent of nearly 1,600 employees on the road. I gradually got rid of that. There was a little kicking at the time, but it soon subsided, and the fact of the matter is that so long as you do not increase the freight rates those who use the railroad do not care whether you have double the number of employees necessary or a less number than is required. There must be a large number of employees on the Intercolonial Railway who are not necessary for the operation of the railroad. But the alarming part of the statement of the minister is that this unfortunate condition of the Intercolonial Railway is not going to end. He threatens to increase the freight rates, but I tell him there is no necessity for that. The minister told us that the freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway are from 20 to 80 per cent less than they are on the other railways. He gave us no exact figures to prove that, but I venture to say that that statement is incorrect. I state that for the carriage of local freights, which is the chief business of the Intercolonial Railway, fair remuneration is received. The inference from the whole thing is that the management of the

Intercolonial Railway is not what it used to be The Minister of Railways endeavours to justify himself by saying that the chief employees of the railroad have been the same for the last twenty-five or thirty years. That is true. The deputy minister, who is directly responsible to the minister, is the same man, and Mr. Pottinger, the general manager, is the same. He is perhaps getting a little old for the position, but the duty of the Minister of Railways to the country is to judge by results. If the results of the operation of the Intercolonial Railway is not what he thinks it ought to be, his duty is to get other employees. But I will say this in favour of Mr. Pottinger, from what I know of him, that if he is given instructions by the minister, he will carry them out to the letter, and if the instructions are such as they ought to be to the man who manages the Intercolonial Railway, the showing will be entirely different.

What justification has the Minister of Railways or his colleagues for the enormous deficit on the Intercolonial ? He promised last year that there would be increased freights this year. I tell him that there is no necessity for anything of the kind ; proper and economical management of the Intercolonial Railway would yield a result entirely different from what we have at the present moment. What must the people of the country think of the justification offered by the minister for a deficit and an expenditure on capital over and above the receipts for the current year of $8,100,000, or nearly $2,000,000 in excess of the total receipts of the road ? Oh, we are told, the people of the maritime province think that their freight ought to be carried at the rates which prevail at present, because the people of the other provinces have the right of free transportation over their canals. I have proved that for every dollar expended on the canals since confederation nearly an equal amount, according to population and according to the amount paid by the people, has been expended in the maritime provinces, in return for which the people of this Dominion never received a cent. If my statement is correct, we are in this position, that for the purpose of carrying freight on the Intercolonial Railway, we are taking $8,100,000 out of the pockets of the people of this country. I absolve the people of the maritime provinces for not paying their fair share of the freight on any goods carried on that railway. I say the rates are fair. The railway passes through a country in which, if economically managed, it ought to show a good revenue for the expenditure—not on capital account, because that has reached over $80,000,000 at the present moment. We are entitled to a detailed statement showing a comparison with rates on railways similarly situated in any other part of America, to see whether the people of the maritime provinces are paying a higher rate than they ought to pay. Matters will be worse in a few years than they are now.

The Minister of Railways has told us what he intends to do under the arrangement with the Canada Atlantic Railway. The Intercolonial, he assures us, will have a brilliant future, just as the same thing was predicted on the acquisition of the Drummond Counties Railway. I venture to tell the minister that any arrangement he makes with the Grand Trunk Railway Company for the running of trains over the Canada Atlantic from Montreal to the Georgian Bay, will be to the advantage of the Grand Trunk Railway—that any sum paid by the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of securing running powers over that road will be greater than the net receipts resulting therefrom, and that the result of acquiring those running powers will be a greater deficit on the Intercolonial than exists at the present time. The position of affairs in this country is alarming. The expenditure is increasing by leaps and bounds. Is it possible that the people of Canada, with the enormous expenditures which they are making in every part of the country, will be able to bear an expenditure of $8,000,000 a year for the purpose of running the Intercolonial Railway ? Bad crops in the Northwest for one year would put the finances of the country in a very serious position. The public debt is not decreasing, and it cannot decrease when a road which ought to be at least self-sustaining is costing the country so much. Yet the Minister of Railways could to-morrow make such arrangements with a couple of companies or with a syndicate that instead of an expenditure of over $8,000,000 a year the country would receive $750,000 a year for the Intercolonial Railway. Is the minister forcing the country to that position ? Why should he do so? There is no reason for it. The Intercolonial Railway is a benefit to the people of the whole Dominion especially to the people of Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, and a means of inter-communication. It is built, as I stated before, on as good a line, if economically managed, as any line of railway in the country. Oh, we are told, it runs against water communication. What is the position of the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Pacific Railway from the ports of Sarnia and Windsor to Quebec? They run against the finest system of water communication in the world for six months in the year. The Intercolonial Railway is in no different position in that respect from the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk. To a certain extent the Intercolonial parallels the St. Lawrence river from Point Lévis throughout the province of Quebec ; but when it reaches the maritime provinces, it passes through nearly the centre of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. What differ-

ent position does it occupy, then, with reference to earning powers, from the other railways? None whatever. Besides that he says it does not follow commercial lines. And yet that line from Quebec down to Moncton, which is at present a non-paying one, is to be met by competition. The people are asked to build for the Grand Trunk Pacific another line for the purpose of competing with it.

The hon. minister says that the freights charged upon the Intercolonial Railway are competitive freights against the Canadian Pacific Railway, which has a shorter line of communication. Well, then, in what position will we be when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built? You say that that will give a shorter line from Lévis to Moncton, but it will be another competing line in opposition to the Intercolonial Railway. It is time for our people to be alarmed at the position. We have statement after statement from Ministers of Railways, from one year to another, as to what the probable results will be in the future, and in that respect the present Minister of Railways differs from all his predecessors. He does not want to paint a bright future for the Intercolonial Railway. He says that there is bound to be a large deficit next year unless we give him unlimited powers for the purchase of locomotives and freight cars, so that he may be able to cheapen freight rates. I suppose another necessity in that respect would be to reduce the gradients. That whole matter would involve an expenditure, not of $8,000,000 a year only, but greatly in excess of that amount—and for what? For the purpose of making both ends meet. A more extraordinary statement I never heard from a Minister of Railways. The only way, he said, to remedy the deficit is to increase the rates of freight, and he does not think he can increase them, because there is a feeling in the maritime provinces against any increase on account of free tolls on the canals. But he also suggests another remedy. We are, he says, short of seventy-five locomotives, and we ought to have easier grades and an increased number of freight cars; and when we have these we will be able to carry freight cheaper and lessen the deficit. But he ought to be prepared with a financial statement showing what the expenditure in these respects will be and how much cheaper he can carry freight if he has these improvements made. But, Mr. Chairman, it will be the same old story next year and year after year. So long as the management continues to be as it is at present, we will find a continuous record of increased deficits.

There is another little detail. I see that the capital expenditure at the end of 1905 was $4,665,265 on the Intercolonial Railway. That is the capital expenditure during that year, and on the Prince Edward Island Railway it was $1,335,975. The hon minister states that the receipts of the Prince Edward Island Railway are about $11,000 less than last year, and the increase in working expenses is $65,000. Last year the deficit on that railway was in the neighbourhood of $90,000. Add the increased expenditure this year of $65,000 to the shortage in receipts compared with last year of $11,000, and you have $76,000 to the bad on these two items alone. The hon. minister has not given us the actual deficit or the expenditure on account of capital on the Prince Edward Island Railway, but he says that the difference between revenue and expenditure upon that road must be in the neighbourhood of nearly $90,000. Add that to the deficit of last year, and you will find that for the purpose of running a little narrow gauge road—which ought not to have cost more than $4,000,000, but on which the capital expenditure is $6,000,000—you have a deficit or nearly $200,000 per year. What excuse can there possibly be for any such state of affairs? I would say to the management of that road: If you cannot run things better, I will try something else. The hon. minister ought to have taken such a course, both on the Intercolonial Railway and the Prince Edward Island Railway, instead of coming down with that de profundis speech of his, in which he says, in the most melancholy of tones: I regret deeply to have to make such a statement. I would try some experiment, and see if the management of these roads could not be made more conducive to the interests of the people than they now are. Will the country accept such an apology? Will the country endorse such an exhibition of incompetency and extravagance? I am afraid that the people do not look narrowly into the expenditure of this country. They do not criticise the enormous extravagances of the gentlemen who are our rulers at present. If they did as any commercial concern would, look into their own business more closely, the results would be very different. Here we have a Minister of Railways blandly presenting us with a statement of these two roads, showing mismanagement in every line—one of these roads 1,300 miles long and the other about 230 miles long; one a narrow gauge road, and both running through as fine a country as there is in Canada. Both are roads which ought to pay, and yet the hon. gentleman comes down with a statement showing a deficit between revenue and expenditure of nearly $8,000,000, namely, $8,000,000 on the Intercolonial Railway and $1,335,975 on the Prince Edward Island Railway. I have not got all the figures as to the expenditure on the Prince Edward Island Railway, but I will venture to say they are between $900,000 and $1,000,000, making a deficit of $9,200,000 taken out of the pockets of the people for the purpose of running two mismanaged roads under the direction of the government.

I have my duty to perform; I have presented the facts to the people, and if the people will submit to a continuance of this mismanagement, I have nothing more to say. But it puts an end to all prospect of state-ownership of railways in this country. It is the most fatal blow that ever was struck at that policy. It shows that under the management of a government, such as now constituted, we can expect no economical management of any state concern. It puts back for fifty years in this country the prospect of state-ownership of railways or of state-ownership of any public utility. Nor do the conditions justify any such lamentable exhibition as we have had. As the Minister of Railways himself says, the government can buy materials cheaper than any other railway owner in the country. Under the system in vogue when I was manager of the Intercolonial Railway, when we invited tenders for supplies, I found that I got supplies of the best quality, because they were tested, whenever there was a dispute, by the McGill College in Montreal, whose decision was final, and we got them cheaper than any other railway in the country.

On a government railway you can get men at cheaper rates and men who will serve more faithfully than under private management. But, if you build work-shops greater than are needed, if you undertake extraordinary expenses for useless purposes from one end of the line to the other, of course you cannot look for success. When I ceased to have charge of the railway in 1896, I had reports from the officers who are at present in charge of the system stating that the system was in a better position than when we took charge of it. And not only was the position of the road improving, but expenditure on capital account had nearly ceased, as ought to be the case on the Intercolonial. There is no justification for expenditure on capital account on an old railway. The same is true, except for the expenditure on the branches with regard to the Prince Edward Island road. That capital account of the Intercolonial should close, as I said before. Mr. Chairman, I have set before this committee and this country the broad facts of the management of the Intercolonial; and if the people will submit to such management, they will submit to anything.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I do not intend to enter to-night into any criticism in the shape of a reply to the speech of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson). On two occasions since I entered parliament, I went through a very considerable amount of labour to analyse the annual report of the Minister of Railways of this government and to lay before the House, in some detail, the conclusions at which I arrived. But I found so little attention paid by hon. gentlemen opposite to any word that was uttered in criticism of the government management of the Intercolonial, that I consider it would be an absolute waste of my time and of the money of this country to spend an hour in the criticism of any Minister of Railways under this administration. I say that frankly, I say it deliberately; for, having spent weeks at examination of the long and most extraordinary reports issued year after year by the government as to the management of these railways, I felt that that labour was absolutely thrown away, and time occupied in addressing the House worse than thrown away, because it involved an expense to the country. I have said before in this House that in criticising, and giving my reasons for the criticisms, that if any ordinary company in Canada or the United States, were managed as the Intercolonial is managed under this government, the directors of that railway company would be liable to criminal indictment for the manner in which the business was administered.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BARKER I say that deliberately. And I know whereof I speak. I have had some experience in railways; I have had thirty years' experience; and I say, deliberately, that if a board of directors of any ordinary railway company laid their accounts before their shareholders and the public in the way in which the accounts of the government with regard to the Intercolonial are presented, those railway directors would find themselves in jail; and I defy contradiction of that statement.

So I am not going into the details to-night. I object to going to all that labour for the third time. But the minister of Railways has made one statement in my presence to which I wish to refer. I had not intended to speak at all, but after he had made the statement to which I refer, and while sitting here at my desk, I tested the accuracy of his figures. And I will give the House the result of that test and will leave the House to judge how far they can trust accounts as explained by the hon. minister. The hon. gentleman said that the Intercolonial was 75 locomotives short of the number it ought to have for the proper conduct of its business. Am I right?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. Well, after the hon minister made that statement I took the mileage and locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway and of the three other principal railways of Canada, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk Railway and the Canadian Northern. And I found that the Intercolonial has more locomotives to the mile than any of these roads. And I will prove it. At page I—6 of the Report of the Minister of Railways we find it stated that the Intercolonial has a mileage of 1,322 miles. And, at page I—115, of the same report, we find that the Intercolonial——

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, to be obliged again to call attention to the point to which I referred a few minutes ago, the manner in which this committee is conducted, as illustrated by what we see,—gentlemen standing up and talking all over this chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BARKER. I have stated that the Intercolonial has a mileage of 1,322 miles. At page I—115, of his own report we find that the minister has on the Intercolonial 299 locomotives in use and 3 locomotives in repair—a total of 302. That means that he has one locomotive for every 4⅓ miles of the system. In the same report we find that the Canadian Pacific Railway has a mileage of 8,062, and the locomotives owned and hired number 999. So that the Canadian Pacific Railway has 1 engine for a small fraction over 8 miles on the average—about half as many, in proportion, as the Intercolonial. The Grand Trunk Railway has a mileage of 3,158 and has 699 locomotives or 1 for every 4½ miles. So, the Grand Trunk Railway, with its enormous traffic, has a smaller number of engines proportionately than has the Intercolonial. The Canadian Northern has a mileage of 998 miles and 98 locomotives, or 1 locomotive for 10 1-10 miles. Here is the summary :

	Miles.
Canadian Pacific Railway, 1 locomotive for each	8
Grand Trunk Railway, 1 locomotive for each	4½
Canadian Northern Railway, 1 locomotive for each	10 1-10
Intercolonial Railway, 1 locomotive for each	4⅓

I put that as a sample of the sort of statements we get from the Railway Department.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. As a friend of public ownership, and as one who still at times advocates that principle in this House and elsewhere, I cannot agree with the statement made by the Minister of Railways. His statement is a very discouraging one ; and I agree with the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Haggart) that if a better showing cannot be made in favour of public ownership, the country will not long stand what we have of it to-day. There is nothing miraculous about public ownership. Public ownership must be vindicated by a sound business administration, and by nothing else. Now have we had a sound business administration of the Intercolonial ? So far as I can gather, we have had anything but that. There has been a political administration of it, there has been an extravagant administration of it, and there has been a use of it, or rather a misuse of it in the interest of other railways that happen to be rivals. Now if we are to have public ownership tried in this country, and the experiment is well worth being tried, there must be sound business administration, and good results must be shown. The road must be put into the hands of men who have no connection whatever with politics. We have seen public ownership of railways in Europe, and in every country in Europe, a budget is brought down every year containing an explanation of the state ownership of railways and its results. There is not a Minister of Railways who comes down in any of those parliaments who makes such a speech as has been made here to-night; on the contrary, he brings down a business statement, he shows his railway is being administered as a business proposition, he is showing a profit on the construction of the road, on the capital invested in the road, and he is showing that the people are getting lower and lower freight rates and a better service in every direction. Now public ownership, public administration of railways in all the countries of Europe has proved to be a success, and it is proved to be a success because it is under sound business administration and not the kind of administration we have in this country. That being the case I say we ought to make an effort to have a similar administration of our national railway. And why is not the experiment tried ? Why does not this government say : We are determined to make the experiment of a business administration of our public railway ? Let them get a man like Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, or Sir William Van Horne, or Mr. Chas. M. Hays. Let them do like the city of Glasgow, which gets a Dalrymple to administer its street railways, and the consequence is that it has the finest street railway system in the world. They are doing it in connection with telephones in the old country, they are doing it in connection with everything else, both by municipalities and by the state, and the basis of it all is that the administration is put into the hands of business men, and politics are not allowed to interfere.

Why can't we do that in this country ? Why can't we have the experiment made in public ownership by a proper administration of the railway we have ? It is a great railway, it is a great proposition, it could be made to pay, it could be made to pay in the maritime provinces which they say is a poor country. I agree with the hon. member for Lanark that it is a good place to try the experiment in. But let us first of all make the revenue pay the expenses, without any regard to capital account ; then let us try to pay on the capital account, and if we can do that we can extend the state system all over this country and bring great relief to the people. In Ontario we do not want to see the Intercolonial ruined, we do not wish to see it made a by-word to the people. We would like to see it prove a success in the maritime

provinces, and see it extended through Quebec and into our own province of Ontario. We would like to see the Intercolonial brought into Toronto, brought to the Niagara frontier, brought to the Detroit river, brought to the Georgian bay, and finally to the upper lakes. But we never can hope for that under such an administration as we have at the present time, and necessitating such a statement as has been made here to-night. Why, Sir, it brings the blush of shame to any one, to any citizen of this country, to hear the statement made here to-night that the railway is being run as a first-class railway with a third-class traffic, and is producing this enormous deficit that has been produced. If the character of its traffic is only that of a third or fourth-class railway, if the department is spending so much money to maintain it as a first-class railway, I want to see it maintained as a first-class railway, and I want to see it administered as a business proposition and nothing else, and as state owned railways are administered in every other country in the world. They are a success in Australia, they are a success in New Zealand. In Australia they found a Canadian railway man to take hold of and improve their system. We have got railway men in this country who can make a success of the Intercolonial to-day; we have railway men in this country who if you give them charge of that road, will make it pay running expenses out of receipts, and begin to build up a surplus against the investment on capital account. Why can't we have it? Why cannot the Liberal party take up a proposition of this kind and show that they can do something with it? The only thing I can see is that they have some ulterior purpose in view, they wish to discredit the principle of public ownership. We know what the Prime Minister said about public ownership in a speech made in this House when he tried to discredit the principle. Why don't they try and make it a regulator of transportation? In the United States they are trying now to improve transportation by increased government regulation, and if they are not successful in that, the only thing left is government ownership and they must come to that. If they come to that in the United States it must be on the principles of a business administration, and a man like Roosevelt will take hold of the railways in that country and administer them as a business proposition, and not as a political proposition.

Now I ask the Minister of Railways to tell the people of this country why he cannot make that railway pay. If it is not paying because the freight rates are not high enough, let the freight rates be raised. No member for the maritime provinces will stand up here and justify that road being run with freight rates that don't pay. They must do either one of two things, increase the rates or reduce the expenses. I agree with the hon. member for Lanark that the first experiment to make is in the reduction of expenses, and in the meantime an administration on business principles instead of a political administration. I hope some effort will be made in that direction. Let them try to get feeders for that road, and make alliances that will bring business to it. But unfortunately every arrangement that has been made up to the present with other roads is in a way to milk the Intercolonial, and turn it in as a feeder to other roads instead of making other roads feeders to it. The government went into what they called a great national transcontinental system of railways, they are expending millions and millions of the people's money, but they take good care not to make the Intercolonial a part of the system. Why are we building another railway down in the maritime provinces to compete against this road we now own, when the Minister of Railways confesses there is not sufficient traffic for three? On the contrary he should have used the Intercolonial as the basis of a thoroughly national system, and extended that system to the west and ultimately to the Pacific. But on the contrary we have given all the opportunities to a private enterprise, the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the result is that we are not having anything approaching to state ownership or a state owned railway, in this country, but the state is being bled enormously to build up great private railways which are not sufficiently checked nor sufficiently regulated. Now in this country we do not seem to have enough confidence in ourselves to make the experiment of a state owned railway as it ought to be made.

I deplore that fact. The hon. Minister of Finance will soon be in a position that he must justify the expenditure of state ownership we have here or be prepared to abandon it, because it is not sound financially and cannot be justified. The justification that was given here to-night as against the canal system in the west will not bear investigation. It has nothing to stand on. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has dealt with that and dealt with it in a convincing way. The hon. Minister of Finance and the government will be in such a position that they cannot justify what is taking place to-day and the call will go forth for an increase in the rates and a reduction in the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. That is the worst thing that can happen to the people in the maritime provinces. They ought to take a pride in the state owned railway. It is their servant, it is operated in their interest and they ought to take a pride in seeing that the state owned road is made a success, and that the railway is not something that ought to be milked and depleted and run in an extravagant way. Let them take an interest in having low freights, but let them take an interest in its economic and sound

business administration. If they do that they will benefit themselves and the whole country and they will see the demand for public owned railways in this country increased. I could talk for a long while this evening in favour of state owned railways, but I do not wish to do so. I only wish to enter my protest against any such statement as that made here to-night that the deficits have increased and are likely to increase. On the contrary the statement ought to be that the prospect is that deficits are soon to end on the Intercolonial Railway and that it will not only pay its running expenses out of its traffic receipts but that it will soon be earning enough money to pay something on the investment. That is being done by all other first-class railways, whether state owned or private, and it is the only principle on which to administer a railway. You must make it a commercial success. There cannot be any other reason for the existence of a railway than that. It must be made to pay, the traffic over the road must maintain it and any proposition in favour of any other kind of railway, whether state owned or not, cannot be justified. In Germany some of the railways are for the purposes of defence, but even these railways are made to work in with the commercial and business interests of the country and they are not only using them for the defence of the country but they pay from the point of view of aiding the trade of the country. In no country is the excuse made that a railway, because it is a government road, ought to be run at a loss. If the Intercolonial Railway is a round-about road why cannot it be shortened? It is easy to make a short cut but that short cut should not be made in an extravagant way. If the Prince Edward Island Railway can be improved and they say it can be improved an expenditure should be made for that purpose, but once it has been improved the road should be run as a business proposition and its receipts should pay the cost of its maintenance. If we do that we will do something for public ownership and we will see the idea spread. I am more than discouraged to hear the statement which has been made here to-night that to all intents and purposes a state owned railway cannot be made a success. What is this weakness in the Canadian people that of all the people in the world who have an organized government they cannot succeed in the successful operation of a public owned railway? There is very little competition. There are no railways cutting into the Intercolonial Railway except the Canadian Pacific Railway and that does not count in respect to local traffic at all. When we have conceived a great principle we ought to realize it and make it a success. If hon. gentlemen say that there is some kind of weakness in us as a nation, that our public men are not of the character to administer a trust of this kind, let them say it boldly, but I repudiate that idea as a Canadian. I say that there ought to be sufficient patriotism in the men engaged in public life here to take that railway out of politics, put its administration into the hands of a commission or of one strong man who knows his business and who would have no political interference, as I would like to see it, if we did that I am sure that we would find a way of making the traffic pay the cost of maintenance. Canadians are equal to that, but the confession is now made, as it has been made year after year in this country, that in some way a state owned railway cannot be made a success, and if that confession continues to be made I have no hope for the idea of public ownership of railways in this country. I say that public ownership is a great and growing principle. It is extending all over the world. It has justified itself in connection with railways, it has justified itself in connection with various municipal utilities and it is justifying itself in every direction today. It is a success in England, it is a success in Germany, it is a success in France, it is a success in other colonies such as Australia and New Zealand, and if it can be made a success there it can be made a success here, if we only try the experiment. Let the government take this department absolutely out of politics. Let them provide a new administration for the Intercolonial Railway. Let this new administration be composed of smart, able railway men. Let us try that experiment for three years. Let us try it between now and the next election even if it does cost some votes in the maritime provinces. The everlasting love of office seems to be the inspiration that actuates almost all of our public men. Why do they not form an ideal and try to realize it in connection with our public affairs? Surely ideals are better than love of office and better than votes, and if that is the case let them take the ideal of public ownership and try to realize it. If they do I believe the people will give them credit for it and be disposed to keep them longer in office rather than remove them. But this everlasting idea that we must not disturb this voter's interest, or the interest of that province, or else it will go against us in the next election must be got rid of. We must adopt a sound administration in connection with the Intercolonial Railway and if we do it will pay its way from this onward. Instead of having a deficit the cost of maintenance will come out of the traffic earnings and in a short time there will be a surplus which can be applied to the payment of the interest on the cost of the road.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Chairman, I want to correct a few figures I gave in reference to the expenditures on capital account and the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway. I find on looking over the report that the

amount of the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway on capital account for the current year was $4,214,750. Then, there is to supplement that in the supplementary estimates, $450,515. That makes a total expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, independent of the running expenses, of $4,665,265. To this add the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway which the hon. minister says is $1,860,000, or which may be $2,000,000 at the end of the year, and it makes $6,665,265. The amount of the expenditures on capital account on the Prince Edward Island Railway last year was $1,003,300. In the supplementary estimates for this year there is a vote of $85,050, making an expenditure on capital account for the current year of $1,101,825 to which is to be added the deficit between the expenditures and receipts of $200,000—I am estimating that but I think I am a good deal under the mark—making $1,335,975. I stated that the total deficit for the current year was $8,100,000; I find that it is $8,001,240.

Mr. OSLER. I do not propose to criticise the statement of the Minister of Railways; I do not think it is worth criticism. The short speech of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was quite within the mark. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to one phase of this matter. It is quite true that it has always been the custom to charge the deficits of the Intercolonial Railway to capital account, but that is making a false representation to the country and making the people believe that the Intercolonial Railway is providing for itself.

Mr. FIELDING. What does my hon. friend mean by saying that it has always been customary to charge the deficit to capital account?

Mr. OSLER. It has been customary.

Mr. FIELDING. To charge the deficit to capital account?

Mr. OSLER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not charged to capital account; it is charged to the debt of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. The deficit every year is added to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway; it is not paid out of revenue.

Mr. FIELDING. How could you pay it out of the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway when that revenue is not sufficient. It is paid out of the general revenue of the country.

Mr. OSLER. It is added to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. HAGGART. You are wrong; I looked into it to-day.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. FIELDING. The meaning of the expression 'capital account' in our public accounts is well known, and when the hon. gentlemen says that the Intercolonial Railway deficit is charged to capital account he is mistaken. It is charged to the general revenue of the year.

Mr. OSLER. Not of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. The general revenue of the Intercolonial Railway is not enough. The receipts of the Intercolonial Railway are credited to the revenue of the year and the exepnditures are charged in the outlay, so that the deficit is charged against the income of the country for the year.

Mr. OSLER. The deficit is made out in such a way that the country does not realize the immense amount of money it costs us yearly to maintain that railroad. It is the custom to charge the deficit of the Intercolonial Railway in this manner, but it is a wrong principle. Until the country knows exactly what this railroad is costing them, and until the government realize their responsibility and operate this railroad in a business like manner, the present condition of things is likely to continue.

Mr. FIELDING. When the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) takes the capital, expenditure and deficit for the year and charges and treats it all as the deficit of the year. I think he is unreasonable. The money charged to capital account, if properly applied, always goes to the betterment of the property, and the interest on capital expenditure is a legitimate charge on the year's operations, but to charge the whole of the year's capital to the deficit account is a method of calculation that my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) would not like to have had applied in his day.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Alexander Mackenzie when Minister of Railways said that the Intercolonial Railway was a completed undertaking, and that the capital account should have ceased altogether. That is my argument, and my statement is that the capital account or whatever you call it is expended on the railroad for the year, and in that way there is over $8,000,000 taken out of the pockets of the people of the country this year.

Mr. FIELDING. When my hon. friend takes the deficit for the year and adds that to the capital expenditure for the year, he is unfair. The money expended on capital, assuming it is properly applied, goes to the betterment of the property and you only have the right to charge the interest on that capital to the annual output.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) was taking the capital account and he was adding to that the deficit which must be paid from some source, and

he said the Intercolonial Railway cost the people of this country that much more than the people receive out of it. The Minister of Finance says that we should not charge the deficit to capital.

Mr. FIELDING. You should not charge the capital with the deficit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will you do with the deficit ?

Mr. FIELDING. You have to pay it out of the general revenue of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose a private corporation were operating a railroad and there was a deficit of $1,000,000 a year, and you had deficits of this kind accumulating year after year ; in the end that must be met by a fresh supply of capital or you must close up your railroad. It seems to me that the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway as on any other railroad must in the end be paid out of capital. The Minister of Finance says we have not added the deficit to capital from year to year.

Mr. HAGGART. As a matter of fact we have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Finance says not.

Mr. HAGGART. I say we have.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am assuming for the purposes of argument that we have not. It seems to me that that only makes the conditions worse, because while we have $76,000,000 of capital account, in order to get the true position of affairs we should have added to that year after year the deficit, which if this railroad were owned by a corporation would have to be added to capitalization or provided for in some way. I do not know much about railway accounts, but I think that is common sense. While we must accept the statement of the Minister of Railways as to some of the causes which in his opinion have led to this extraordinary result during the past year, it seems to me that the hon. minister did not give any satisfactory explanation as to why there is so remarkable a difference between the results of the operation of this railway and the results of the operation of the other great railways in Canada. I understand that the percentage of expenditure to receipts on these other railways is from 65 to 70 per cent while on the Intercolonial Railway the percentage of expenditure to receipts is 110 to 115 per cent. That is a very remarkable difference. We know that some peculiar conditions have to be taken into consideration in connection with the Intercolonial Railway.

We know that the Intercolonial Railway competes with water carriage more than any other railway in Canada; we know it runs through a portion of country in the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec, which is not very thickly settled; but outside of these reasons and the low rates which were mentioned by the Minister of Railways, I do not know of any reason which should operate to make the results so very different. It is remarkable that from 65 to 72 per cent of the gross earnings are sufficient to operate railways in other parts of Canada, and even in the same portions of Canada, while in the case of the Intercolonial it takes 110 or 115 per cent of the gross earnings. What is the reason for that? Is there not some other reason than what the hon. Minister of Railways has given us to-day ? My right hon. friend the Prime Minister declared in a speech within the past fifteen or eighteen months that the whole system was vicious. The Minister of Railways seems to have given very good evidence to-night that there is something wrong about the system, otherwise he would have been able to have set forth a different result from what he did. If the system is vicious and brings about such an extraordinary result as he has presented, how is it that we do not hear from the government some statement of the particulars in which it is vicious and some proposal or policy by means of which that vicious system can be modified so as to become at least less vicious and produce better results? There is no use of calling on the House and the country year after year for a million or a million and a half to pay off a deficit, or for three or four millions to be spent on a capital account that should have been closed long ago, and saying without any explanation that the whole thing is vicious. There is not much logic or reason or statesmanship about that.

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend think the capital account should have been closed? I know that the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) thinks so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That, I suppose is the proper principle to follow except so far as extensions are concerned.

Mr. FIELDING. And betterments.

Mr. BARKER. No ; betterments out of revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not profess to speak as an expert, but I think the usual principle is to make the expenditure out of revenue except for extensions, for an absolute change, for a better class of rails, making due allowance for the old ones——

Mr. FIELDING. Or increased rolling stock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Only so far as it does not supply the place of rolling stock purchased in the first instance.

Mr. FIELDING. Quite correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think we are very far apart; so that it might be sufficiently accurate to say that the capital ac-

count should have been closed long ago. At any rate, the additions should not have been so extensive as they have been in past years. It is no use to state bald results, and simply to say that the system is a wrong one. If the results are bad, let us know a little more in detail the reasons for these bad results and the mode in which they can be alleviated. I do not think the Minister of Railways has given us much information. He has argued along very general lines and made very general statements, but he has not given us any proposal or laid down any policy or made any suggestion which, so far as I was able to follow him, would lead to any amelioration of these results in the future. We must remember that these results have obtained during a period in which the country has been very prosperous and has been developing very rapidly, and in which railways all over Canada and the continent of America have been showing better results than ever before in their history. During that very period, when you might have expected some better conditions on the Intercolonial Railway, when there has been to my knowledge an enormous traffic over it in the maritime provinces, you not only do not have better results, but you have worse results, and that in face of the declaration made by this government in 1898 or 1899 when they extended the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal, that that extension would put an end for ever to those deficits of which we had heard so much in bygone days. My right hon. friend sat where he does to-day and heard his then Minister of Railways and Canals proclaim that in no uncertain words. But instead of the extension to Montreal producing any such results as were then predicted, it has produced the results set forth by the Minister of Railways this evening. If the system is vicious and the conditions are bad, why do we not have some policy or suggestion looking for an amelioration of those conditions?

Mr. OSLER. The Finance Minister says that expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway should be charged to capital, and that only the interest should be charged against revenue. That would be all very well if there were a profit from the expenditure of capital. The Minister of Railways told us to-night in his very lucid speech that we had come to the point where we must realize that the Intercolonial Railway must be operated at a loss. That being the case, do not let us deceive ourselves, but let us boldly face the fact and let the people of this country realize that all the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway is practically a charge against the revenue of this country. The Intercolonial has been in operation as a finished road for the greater part of twenty

five years. It is quite true that during the first ten or fifteen years in the life of a railway, expenditures for renewals, increased sidings, &c., are charged pretty much against capital. But having taken two trips over the Intercolonial last summer, I think the roadbed, the rolling stock and the railway generally is in a first-class condition.

Therefore there should not be any necessity for an expenditure exceeding the ordinary expenditure on a completed railway. Very few of the items now charged to capital account on the Intercolonial Railway would be charged to capital account by any ordinary railway company. We are deceiving ourselves by adding year after year $3,000,000, $4,000,000, $5,000,000 to capital account, on which there is no apparent possibility of our obtaining any returns. Therefore that money should be charged, not to capital, but to revenue, because it is so much less in the operation of the railroad. The extraordinary thing to my mind is that item after item is for extensions of sidings and extensions of accommodations, and yet, according to the minister's own statement, the gross earnings for this current year are not greater than they were two or three years ago. That is something no one can understand. The Intercolonial Railway is doing a large business, it is participating in the increased business all over the country, and as is has not, according to the hon. minister, changed its rates for passengers or freight it ought, in the ordinary course of things, to have received a very much larger gross revenue this year than it did the year previous. That is quite apart from the increased expenditure. But if you take the trouble to look over the items charged to capital account in the public accounts in 1904, you will see how utterly absurd they are, especially on a road which is not doing, according to the minister's statement, any increased business. The statement of the minister can have only one meaning, and that is that the business on the road to-day is not greater than it was two years ago, and yet an enormous sum has been expended the last two years on rolling stock and on renewals of rolling stock, so that the road ought to have a very ample supply of rolling stock for its business. Take item after item in this long list of expenditures charged to capital account, and you will find such items as increased accommodation at small stations, $662.57, siding to wharf at Campbellton, $1,250. Although there is no increase in business, these little sidings here and there are charged to capital account. Then there is a new freight shed $1,228, dwelling for agent $1,699 and freight house $1,300 charged to capital account, and these on a road which has been in operation for 34 or 35 years and has been a finished road for 25 or 30 years. No private corporation would dream of charging these items to capital account.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does an ordinary corporation charge to capital account ?

Mr. OSLER. Nothing except permanent extensions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It depends on whether there is an increase of revenue ?

Mr. OSLER. When a road has been put in first-class order, when all its bridges and other permanent structures are completed, there is no charge for maintenance or renewal added to capital account. Take such items as these charged to capital account: Alberton, new station, $24; Oxford and New Glasgow branch, $206.16. One item after another of this description, some of them large items, are charged to capital account when they should have been charged against revenue. I think that the hon. the Minister of Finance, when he brings down his budget, ought to face this question, because as this account is now made, the account of the new transcontinental road will be made. He should let the people know exactly what that new road is going to cost. Taking the statement of the Minister of Railways that we cannot expect anything but deficits on the Intercolonial Railway in the future, we are simply attempting to deceive ourselves when we do not charge the whole amount expended on the Intercolonial to revenue.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to recall to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance the argument he was so ready with two or three years ago, when, in this House, I called attention to the very objectionable system of the government of charging the renewal of rails to capital account. What did the hon. gentleman say ? He said : Oh, what difference does it make whether you charge it to capital or working expenses, the country has to pay all the same. If that be so, if the capital expenditure plus the deficit goes to the general debt of the country, what is the use of finessing about whether it is correct to make the charge to capital account or not. It is quite true the deficit is not charged to the capital of the Intercolonial Railway, but the debt of this country to-day is so much greater by the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. During this administration, the Intercolonial Railway has run short by nearly $3,000,000, including the present year. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say for a moment that our national debt is not thereby so much increased ? That I take to be practically what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) means, and the people do not seem to understand that our deficits on the Intercolonial Railway are running up the debt of this country. The hon. gentleman speaks as if calling the loss a deficit, wipes it off. But somebody has to pay the money; it must come out of the pockets of the people; it is added to the debt of the country. What is the position in the year reported upon in the Blue-book before us ? The Minister of Railways, who thinks he has made a most satisfactory report, has paid $114 to earn every hundred dollars we got in, and according to him that is satisfactory. If that were satisfactory to him in his own personal affairs, he would soon be wound up. No man is able to pay $114 out of $100 by any process I have ever learned unless he goes into debt, and this country goes into debt every year it has a deficit. Of that there can be no question. The Finance Minister may say that the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway is not added to by these deficits. That is quite true. We find at page ii 32 the whole thing set forth, and you find millions upon millions added from year to year to capital expenditure and in another column the deficits, but they all come out of the same pot and the country has to foot the Bill. Whether you call it technically capital account or not, the country has to pay it. What my hon. friend means is that the people ought to understand that.

Three years ago I argued that very large sums improperly charged to capital should be charged to revenue and that there should be no concealment of the real loss on working by turning over to capital account—But the hon. gentleman wanted a surplus on these occasions. He was then congratulating the country that in every line of our public finances there was a surplus. His surpluses were made out of deficits. He had a deficit on the Intercolonial, but he charged it up to another account, to capital, and, having pulled out the plum of a surplus in this way, he said : 'What a good boy am I !' But the hon. gentleman knew what he was doing, and I am afraid the Minister of Railways of that time knew also. He was covering up his tracks ; he was charging to capital what he ought to have charged to income. He simply ran the country into debt ; and then he said : 'What difference does it make whether you charge it to capital or anything else, for the country has to pay it just the same ?' All we say on this side is, tell the truth ; charge to revenue what ought to be charged to revenue, and let the country know the exact condition of affairs. But the hon. gentleman preferred to have a little surplus to add to the general balance, although the railway accounts were thereby all wrong. And the Minister of Finance knows it as well as I do, and I defy him to say that he does not. He knew that the system pursued by the ex-Minister of Railways was wrong. He knew that that gentleman was replacing steel rails that ought to have been replaced out of revenue and was charging them to capital account. The hon. gentleman knew that was wrong ; he knew that no railway in the world would tolerate that kind of thing. But it suited him then to say : 'Oh, what does it matter ; the country has to pay it anyway ?' That was the position he took then. But now he is very particular whether things shall be

charged to capital account or to revenue account. If the hon. gentleman would tell the people the facts, if he were ready to tell them that the country had to spend $114 in order to get $100, he could hardly join in the congratulations offered by the Minister of Railways upon the 'satisfactory' showing he has made.

Mr. FIELDING. It was very kind of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) to tell us what the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) meant, because it may be very helpful to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler). I was not dealing with what that hon. gentleman meant, except so far as what he meant could be gathered from what he said. He said that deficits on the Intercolonial were charged to capital account. I said he was mistaken, and I repeat it. All the explanations as to what the hon. gentleman meant will hardly help. The receipts of the Intercolonial form a part of the revenue of the country. And the expenses charged to income—not dealing, for the present, with the capital—are charged on the other side of the account; and if the receipts are not equal to the expenditure there is a deficit, and that deficit is paid out of the general revenue of the Dominion. The expression 'charged to capital' has a meaning in our public accounts and in the general discussion of our public affairs.

Mr. BARKER. So far as the railway is concerned.

Mr. FIELDING. Not only so far as the railway is concerned, but with regard also to public works. 'Charged to capital' means that that portion of our expenditure is not to be made out of our ordinary annual revenue, but represents some special service.

Mr. BARKER. If the minister will allow me, I will recall to his memory the fact I pointed out, two or three years ago, that what was properly chargeable to revenue should be charged to revenue, and the same with regard to capital, in order to show the true position; and the hon. gentleman said that it did not make any difference—that the same paymaster had to pay it in any case.

Mr. FIELDING. That is where the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is not fair. He insists: Tell the truth. I accept that, with one amendment: Tell the whole truth. If he looks up the debate—I am sure he will remember it—he will find that I said that it was important to have the accounts properly kept, but that in the end the result was that the country had to pay the cost. When the hon. gentleman said that I suggested that it made no difference whether an expenditure was charged to capital account or revenue account, he is stating that which is entirely wrong—I never made such a statement in the sense he has suggested.

Mr. BARKER. Will the minister be good enough to tell me, then, what possible application his remark could have to the argument I was making when he said that the country would have to pay it in any case?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) will have to go back and read the whole debate in order to see the application of my remark. I do not propose to do that to-night, but I have a distinct recollection of the circumstances. I had not the pleasure of hearing the statement of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) to-day, and therefore I do not intend to go into the debate as to the general question of charging to income or charging to capital. But I have heard some of the speeches in this debate, and I must emphatically dissent from the rule laid down by the hon. member for West Toronto as to charges to capital. He has read a number of items that are charged to capital account and made merry over them. He found a charge of $24 for a station charged to capital account. Well, if a new station had been constructed and $24 was due on it, why would it not be right to charge it to the same account as the previous expenditures on the same building? What difference does it make that it is only $24 if it is really part of the expenditure?

Mr. OSLER. Does the hon. gentleman say that this was a balance due on a station?

Mr. FIELDING. I presume it must have been. I do not think they would start to build a station for $24 and charge that to capital account.

Mr. OSLER. That is the way it was stated.

Mr. FIELDING. And it was fairly stated. It was charged to the same account as the other expenditures on the building—for it is a fair presumption that is how it occurred.

Mr. OSLER. But there is no presumption in this item.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman would not pretend that they could build a new station for $24?

Mr. OSLER. There is nothing in the item to show anything else.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) knows that he is putting an utterly preposterous interpretation upon it.

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. Will he pretend to say that he understands that the railway could build a new station for $24?

Mr. OSLER. Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. Well, if the hon. gentleman is absurd enough to try to believe

that, I suppose I can hardly say anything to convince him to the contrary.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know a sixteen-dollar station on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. INGRAM. I can tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) that there are a number of stations that have not cost more than $24. I could name such stations on different railways in this country. It is by no means a remarkable thing.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman knows that, he ought to give the Minister of Railways credit for greater economy for putting up a station for $24.

Mr. OSLER. There are many buildings put up along new roads in this country that cost less than $24. I know of such roads in the west.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) makes the statement, and I am not allowed to contradict him. But he must allow me to entertain a lingering doubt as to his acuracy. Another item to which the hon. gentleman called attention was one of $1,200. Well, if this represented a new building, if it meant an addition to the property of the Intercolonial, why not charge it to capital? It is a perfect legitimate charge.

Mr. OSLER. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) convinces me that he is absolutely unacquainted with railway matters. He has made the statement that I am very ridiculous. I say that his statement is so ridiculous from the railway point of view that I am amazed that he should make it. Here is a railway which is not earning money, a railway which has been built and in operation long enough to get into first-class condition, a railway whose capital account should have been closed ten or twelve years ago. I can tell him that there is not a railway managed by business men that would think of charging these items to capital. The Minister of Railways has stated that we must expect a deficit in the management of the Intercolonial. That being the view of the case, what is out duty? Our duty is to let the country know the truth, to let it know fairly and squarely that every dollar we spend on new railway stations, on renewals, on locomotives, is a charge that has to be paid out of the current revenue. It is absurd to add to capital that which is not going to make any return. It is nonsense to say that you are adding to capital account that which is not adding value to the work. The Finance Minister said that the value is there for all time. There is no value in an expenditure on railway property where there is no return coming from it. Therefore, all the money you expend on the Intercolonial from a business standpoint, the standpoint the government ought to adopt, no matter for what cause, unless it is distinctly going to produce a revenue, should be charged against operating expenses and the revenue. Let us know exactly what it costs; and until we do that, the country will not realize that the Intercolonial must be managed differently from the way it is now being managed.

Mr. FIELDING. Now we have the hon. gentleman giving us another most extraordinary doctrine of finance, more remarkable than those which were given by gentlemen preceding him. I understand him to say that because there is no return of revenue to the treasury on that item, therefore it must not be charged to capital but to income; he stated that in a clear and emphatic manner.

Mr. OSLER. In connection with the operation of this railway, yes.

Mr. FIELDING. In connection with any work for the Dominion government.

Mr. OSLER. No.

Mr. FIELDING. What is the difference?

Mr. OSLER. The minister must not put words into my mouth that I did not use. I am speaking now of one particular transaction, one particular item; and I say that when you are going into a new enterprise and expending money, then such expenditures are quite entitled to be charged to capital account. But when you have a railway that is already completed as the Intercolonial is, these items are a charge not against capital but against revenue, because the road will not bear them, it will not justify these charges, and then the money is thrown away so far as revenue is concerned, and should be charged to revenue.

Mr. FIELDING. That is a doctrine that the Intercolonial capital account should have been closed many years ago, and is a fad of the hon. member for Lanark.

Mr. BARKER. Supported by high authority.

Mr. FIELDING. It is not.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for Lanark referred to the statement as having been made by Mr. Mackenzie.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, he made that statement in the House here.

Mr. FIELDING. Did not that hon. gentleman add money to the capital account of the Intercolonial long before the advent of the hon. member for Lanark as Minister of Railways? Did not he himself as Minister of Railways add to the capital account of the Intercolonial after Mr. Mackenzie made that statement?

Mr. HAGGART. I did.

Mr. FIELDING. Of course he did. Then I take the position that the Intercolonial

capital account should not have been closed years ago, and that if Mr. Mackenzie were alive to-day, in the light of the new conditions, he would not say so. Close the capital account of the Intercolonial! Do they not know that the Intercolonial has had large sections added to it, that after its final completion it was enlarged by the additional Rivière du Loup road?

Mr. OSLER. Do not deliberately misunderstand me. My statement was made in connection with a road that is already completed and in running operation for many years, and has nothing to do with the extensions of that road. I know the Minister of Finance does not suppose that I suggested that new extensions should not be charged to capital account. For instance, the expenditure on the Drummond county entrance into Montreal is a legitimate charge to capital account. If the account is closed you cannot add anything to it.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from Lanark added to the Intercolonial the Prince Edward Island Railway; and the money paid this year for the extension of that new line in Prince Edward Island he says should be treated as part of the deficit of the year. So that even according to his contention, they are all wrong. But let us get away from the mere question of extensions. The hon. gentleman is a director of a great railroad, and I speak with deference to his views of the matter. But I am bound to say that his doctrine on finance is so utterly preposterous that if Sir Thomas Shaughnessy was in the gallery and heard him, he would be ashamed to have him as a director.

Mr. OSLER. And I can tell the Finance Minister that if Sir Thomas Shaughnessy heard him he would be ashamed to have him on the board as a director.

Mr. FIELDING. We differ in our estimate of what Sir Thomas Shaughnessy would think, that is all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps you will agree to refer it to him.

Mr. FIELDING. No, for I am sure the hon. gentleman might get an inside interview with him, which I could not get. However, leaving aside for a moment the question of extensions, we know that during the past ten years there has been such an advance in railroad operation in this country that many railroads have had practically to be rebuilt. For instance, where we had 56-pound rails before we now have 80 and 100-pound rails.

Mr. INGRAM. That is a very old story.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, of course it is an old story, and so is the Lord's Prayer, but some people have to be taught it all the same. Don't we know that where railways had small locomotives ten years ago they now have to have big ones? And in consequence of big locomotives we have to take down light bridges and build heavier bridges. None of these things belong to extensions. But you have your railroad improved, you have bettered your conditions by putting down heavy rails where light ones were before, by putting on heavy locomotives where you had lighter ones before, by building stronger bridges, by lengthening out curves, by changing grades, by doing all these things you may not have a new railroad but you have added enormously to the wealth of your property, and you charge all these things properly to capital account.

Mr. OSLER. The Finance Minister has referred to arguments that were made in this House in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway many years ago. This increased bridge accommodation, these heavier engines are as well known to us as the Lord's Prayer, and it is not necessary to remind us of them. There is almost no item in this account that I can see that refers to the items the minister has mentioned just now. The enormously increased expenditure on the Intercolonial for the items which the minister has mentioned, is no justification for these outrageous charges, and have not resulted in an increased business.

Mr. FIELDING. That is another question.

Mr. OSLER. I beg your pardon. If a mans' business does not warrant the extension of his warehouse he is a fool to add to his warehouse. The Finance Minister knows as well as I do that there are certain expenditures that are perfectly legitimate to charge to capital account; there are certain other charges that are not, such as every item in this long list which, in a well built and completed railway, ought to be included, especially where the railway is not earning interest on its cost, not only that but it is not earning its running expenses. Now I do not want for a moment to suggest that the Intercolonial is not an enormously valuable asset to Canada; I do not suggest that it should be run without any profit to the country, because it is of very great value. But I say that the country ought to know exactly what this luxury is costing, or what this work of necessity is costing. I say that as these accounts are juggled—there is no other word for it—in this statement, the country does not know what this road is costing.

Mr. FIELDING. I object to the word 'juggled' as being entirely unjustified.

Mr. OSLER. I did not mean it in an offensive sense.

Mr. FIELDING. I accept the hon. gentleman's explanation. The accounts are kept in precisely the same manner as they

have been kept from the beginning of confederation, and I say they have been kept properly too.

Mr. BARKER. I want to say a word about the question of capital account. The hon. gentleman seems to be surprised that there should be any recognized principle about a going concern finding whatever is necessary to carry on its business. The recognized principle is, and you will find it laid down in Adam's work, that a going concern has to provide without adding to its cost or its capital whatever may be necessary for its business from time to time. The principle is exactly the same as that which applies to a merchant or a manufacturer who wants to make some improvement about his premises. For instance, a merchant might want to put in plate glass windows. He does make a mortgage to pay for them or add them to the cost of his establishment. His business warrants the improvement and he puts plate glass windows in because the improvement is going to pay him and he is going to get a revenue immediately from it. That is the principle which must be applied. You must not add to your capital account. It is a check upon keeping your improvements in step with your business. The difficulty about that has arisen in this way: A very large number of railway companies found, when they wanted to put in heavier rails or get heavier locomotives or whatever the business at that time warranted, that they had not the money and these railway companies had to put a capital mortgage on their property. So, they did things which were contrary to the true principle—I can give the hon. gentleman the authority for it—which is that a going concern must maintain itself and keep up with the business of the times, and if it cannot do that it should show by its revenue accounts that it is losing and not cover it up.

Mr. FIELDING. That is what we show.

Mr. BARKER. No, it is nothing of the kind. What does the hon. gentleman do? Instead of incurring debts on revenue account he turns around and says: Give us $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 and we will pay for these things. Does he pay interest on this $1,000,000? Does he charge a cent of interest to the Intercolonial Railway? If he issued $10,000,000 of government debentures to improve the Intercolonial it would not add one cent to the annual charge of the Intercolonial Railway. Yet, the hon. gentleman says it makes no difference. He must go on with the improvements, buy locomotives, improve the stations, provide heavier rails, more equipment to the mile. He says: Let that go on; give them all they want. These betterments are worth $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 but the Intercolonial Railway does not have to pay any interest. It can make a profit on the betterment, which does not cost it anything. Well, it is the business of the government, but government business should not be conducted on that principle. The government should charge to the revenue of the road every item for the improvement of its business because it gets back the results of the improved business. Then, you will know whether your road is a paying road or not. You have expended on the Intercolonial some $70,000,000. If it were $170,000,000 you would make no difference in the charge against revenue of the road. Go on and spend all you like, that is the principle the Minister of Railways and Canals has been going on for the last ten years. The hon. gentleman speaks about a $24 station. I have seen charged to capital account the price of a bucket at a station. I have seen charged to capital account a chair in the Halifax office.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be quite correct.

Mr. BARKER. I can only say that if the auditor of a railway company, of the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, wanted to charge a chair, put into an office, to capital account, the general manager would probably think that he had gone crazy. I do not think there is a business man in this House who would say seriously that a little article of that kind bought in the ordinary course of a railway company's business, should be charged to capital account. Here, the accountant goes over the list trying to reduce his expenses to the lowest possible point and picks out a pail here, a whitewash brush there, and a chair in another place, as was done at the Halifax office, and charges it to capital account. That is the principle the hon. gentleman is going on. If the hon. gentleman constructs even 50 feet of siding for the purpose of doing more business and getting more revenue he charges that 50 feet to capital account, and it goes into the debt of this country. I think that in appealing to business men I can say this is simply ridiculous. The proper principle is that a going concern carries itself along and where there has been any departure from that has been the result of absolute necessity on the part of the company which could not raise the money at the time.

Mr. FIELDING. I think we had better have an exact statement of the facts about that bucket before we base any charges upon it.

Mr. BARKER. I referred to it before.

Mr. FIELDING. All the buckets that will enter into the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific are going to be charged to capital account, and the hon. gentleman will have a splendid chance to introduce buckets and hold them up before the House and say: You should not charge them to capital account.

Mr. BARKER. I do hold that on a railway which has been working for fifty years it should not be charged to capital.

Mr. FIELDING. I want to take exception again. It is my misfortune to have to take exception to the statements of those who make a profession of knowing so much more than I do about railways, but the hon. gentleman has laid down another dangerous doctrine as the true doctrine, and that is that a railway as a going concern must provide its own improvements.

Mr. BARKER. That is the strict principle.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the principle other companies adopted ?

Mr. BARKER. I told the hon. gentleman that these other companies from sheer necessity were obliged to charge these improvements to capital account and that was their only excuse for doing so.

Mr. FIELDING. Then, it is only bankrupt companies, I suppose, that do it ? Very well then ; I have my hon. friend put on record on that point. I am obliged to disagree there again because when the Canadian Pacific Railway applied for the last amount of additional capital they said that one of the purposes for which they wanted that was to buy additional rolling stock for the road.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman made some comment as to the way the accounts were kept.

Mr. FIELDING. I said they were all right.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman said that the accounts are kept in the same way as they were in my day in reference to revenue and what should be charged to capital. My orders to the accountant of the Intercolonial Railway were to charge nothing to capital account unless he had strict instructions from the head office to do so. All the expenditure on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, when I was at the head of the department, were expenditures which perhaps ought not to have been charged to capital account but which were required. One was a large expenditure in St. John and there were expenditures at two or three other places of a similar nature which the officers of the Intercolonial Railway thought ought not to be charged against them. My instructions were that all the expenditures—and that is the only proper way—on the Intercolonial Railway should be charged to revenue and expenditure. The hon. gentleman spoke about placing new steel rails upon the road. I laid as many steel rails per year as have been laid under the administration of the hon. gentleman, and I never thought of charging them to capital account. They were charged to revenue account. I did not even charge the difference between the weight of the rails taken up and the weight of the rails put down to capital account. There is only one way of doing it. Unless some abnormal expenditure is required in connection with the railway, or unless a new railway is being built, you should cease your capital expenditure altogether. The hon. gentleman says that there were many expenditures added to capital account which were for additions to the Prince Edward Island Railway, but he did not say one word about the $4,666,000 which was added to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway nor justify that expenditure as being for additions to the road in any way whatever. It is true that the $1,100,000 capital expenditure on the Prince Edward Island Railway includes the Hillsboro' bridge, but was that a new line.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly; it is an extension.

Mr. HAGGART. If it is a new branch altogether it is justifiable to charge it to capital account. My criticism was chiefly directed against the Intercolonial Railway, and I say that there was no justification for charging one dollar of that $4,466,000 to capital account.

Mr. EMMERSON. This question of expenditure on Intercolonial Railway capital account is brought up year after year, but it seems to me that some hon. gentlemen do not consider the fact that we have a capital account in connection with our canal system. Year after year we vote millions for capital expenditure on our canals and millions for the working expenses of these canals. If you apply to the canals the principle which my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) would apply to the Intercolonial Railway, then, the canals are completed and the capital account for them should be closed.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the object of that comparison ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That if the people of the country want to know what is expended on canals and what is expended on government railways, these facts must be taken into consideration. Not long since the Canadian Pacific Railway got power to issue a loan of $20,000,000 for the express purpose of betterments to their road.

Mr. BARKER. Was it not for extending the road ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No; a large proportion of that amount was for betterments of the railroad, and the Canadian Pacific Railway did not seem to think it wrong to have a capital account. It has been asserted here to-night that the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway are not increasing. That idea is seriously erroneous.

Mr HAGGART. It was your own statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made no such statement.

Mr. BARKER. I said the net earnings were not increasing.

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me point out that the increase of gross earnings in 1902-3 over 1901-2 was upwards of $650,000; the increase of gross earnings in 1903-4 over 1902-3 was $14,000, and it is estimated that for the current year the increase in gross earnings will reach $400,000. My hon. friend (Mr. Osler) said that this was a finished concern; that its earning power was at a standstill and that therefore we should close the capital account——

Mr. HAGGART. The railway report shows that there was a decrease in gross earnings last year as compared with the year before.

Mr. EMMERSON My hon. friend is entirely wrong. An increase in gross earnings is shown by the report, and it is estimated that this year the increase will be $419,474.

Mr. BARKER. Do you not see that if you pay $114 to earn $100, the greater the gross earnings the more you will lose ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is another question altogether. It was stated here that the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway were not increasing, and I have shown by the figures that that statement is erroneous.

Mr. BARKER. What I said was that the net earnings were growing worse from year to year. There was nearly $1,000,000 short last year, and the minister tells us that this year there will be $2,000,000 short.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) and my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) made the positive statement that although we had extended the railway, the business had not increased. I have shown that that statement is wrong. Furthermore, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) looks at the figures he will find that in the capital expenditure of the Intercolonial Railway last year is included $800,000 for the acquisition of the Canada Eastern, and that fact he has ignored. The other expenditures charged to capital account last year were for extensions to the road, improvements, betterments, double tracking at different points, and the strengthening of the bridges on the Drummond County section which are not adapted for the passage of the very heavy engines used at the present day. If the cost of management of the Intercolonial is only to be computed upon the basis of capital expenditure, I think it is only a fair proposition that the same method should be applied to the canals. The people of the country want to know what the Intercolonial is costing them by way of capital and other expenditure. They also want to know what their canal system is costing them. I think we should look at this matter fairly. The Intercolonial has many burdens ; but it is doing and has done a great work in connection with the building up of this country. It is a splendid road, and it is kept in condition. I think the conditions prevailing on the Intercolonial to-day are such that no man will say that there is a better road anywhere in America. Its train service is modern and up-to-date, and its roadbed is in splendid repair.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I would like to ask a question of the hon. member for Hamilton in reference to capital account. Suppose a mine were discovered on the line of the Intercolonial, and a town sprung up there suddenly, and the management came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to construct a new railway station there, and also a hotel costing say $500,000. We understand that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, now that they are taking over the Canada Atlantic, propose to build a new railway station and a hotel in Ottawa. Would not these two items be properly charged to capital account ?

Mr. BARKER. With regard to the hotel, we might perhaps go into the question whether or not the hon. gentleman would allow me to sell whisky and a number of other things. With regard to the new station, I would say that, on the principle on which all such accounts are kept, if there were business forthcoming from that time that would justify the building of the station, then the station should be built and the revenue from the mine should pay for it.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT. I am not asking what should pay for it. I am asking whether that should be charged to capital account or not ?

Mr. BARKER. No, it should not. It is a strict rule that a going concern maintains itself. The principle is that the going concern adds to its facilities according to the business it sees before it from these improvements, just as my hon. friend would in carrying on his business as a merchant.

Mr. LEFURGEY. On this item of the Murray Harbour branch and the Hillsboro' Bridge, the minister promised to bring down the contract and some other things.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the papers were all brought down.

Mr. LEFURGEY. We have not received any notice of the papers having been brought down up to the present time. I do not think we can very well proceed with this item until they are brought down.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The minister is in error. I asked for papers with regard to

railway extensions in the province and also for papers in regard to expenditures on railways and canals in Canada, and these have not been brought down.

Mr. HAGGART. I think the hon. minister must have them in his desk, as the clerk of the House has not received them yet.

Mr. EMMERSON. Instructions were given to have all that information prepared, and I was under the impression that it was brought down. I shall certainly have it prepared for my hon. friend.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Before the item passes we would like to know what the minister is doing with regard to railway extension in the province. With regard to surveys from Stanley bridge, I think there are some in the department, but would like to know what the government propose doing ? There are also in the department, as the minister knows, some claims for damages sustained by parties in connection with those surveys, and the papers with regard to these ought to be laid on the table.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend mean the papers relating to the land damage claims ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes. The minister knows that some demands have been made on him which the department very unfairly refused to pay, and there is a report of his own engineer in his department which gives some information in regard to them. I would like to see those papers.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it has a bearing on this at all. That is on the Murray Harbour branch ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. No, on the Stanley and New London branch.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will have an opportunity of discussing it on the supplementary estimates.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I would suggest that as the information promised is now down, we should let this item stand until the supplementaries are down.

Mr. EMMERSON You could pass it now and discuss it then.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Will the hon. gentleman give us the assurance that there will be some items in the supplementaries on those lines ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I can say that to my hon. friend.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. On the 13th March there was an order of the House for copies of all correspondence, &c., relating to land damages claimed on account of lands expropriated on the Murray harbour branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway. That has not been brought down. We were also promised the contract between the government and the contractor and we have not yet got it. This item cannot be intelligently discussed until that information is before us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As the papers are not down, it would be perhaps better to take this item up with the supplementaries.

Mr. EMMERSON. There will be an item in the supplementaries on this very matter when the whole item can be discussed.

Mr. LEFURGEY. When will the supplementaries be brought down ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Some time next week.

Mr. R L. BORDEN. I think we are justified in insisting that the papers should be down before we pass this item.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no desire to prevent discussion and only suggest that, in order to expedite business, we should pass it now, and discuss it later on in the supplementaries. My hon. friends will then have no cause to complain of lack of information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The other course would be more desirable and there will be no time lost.

Item allowed to stand.

National Transcontinental Railway—surveys, construction and other expenses, $1,328,500.

Mr. HAGGART. There was a map brought down which partly explains what surveys have been made, but we have no report of the expenditure.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is all contained in the report of the commission.

Mr. HAGGART. Is there any information in it in reference to gradients and curvatures ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has very full information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have never received any copy.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was laid on the table three weeks ago and ordered to be printed immediately and ought to be here now. I cannot understand why it is not.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister will see we cannot discuss this without any information. But if the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) wishes it, we could make an arrangement under which this matter could be discussed on an item in the supplementary estimates. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, so far as I am concerned ; but I do not wish to press it upon any other hon. member. The only conditions I would make are that we shall have the printing expedited—the printed copies should have been in our hands long

ago—and that the supplementary vote to which reference has been made shall be brought up at a reasonably early date. With that understanding, we can pass this item.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do I understand that objection is taken to item 87?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, that item stands.

Public Works—chargeable to income—harbours and rivers—New Brunswick—Cape Tormentine—improvements and repairs to harbour works, $22,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to provide for works required to make good the damage done by the teredo, the harbour works having been greatly weakened by that destructive sea worm. This work is in Westmoreland county.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. I understand that a great deal of money is spent every year on this work, as the storms are very heavy and the waves break over this work. It is stated that the work is not rip-rap. It is open to the storms and in the first storm of the autumn some portion is apt to be carried away. It is contended that it is absolutely necessary that this should be rip-rapped with heavy stone.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is what is being done by the department, as it has been found that the work done hitherto is not satisfactory.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Has a contract been let for this?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it is done by day's work.

Chance harbour—breakwater, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This work is in the county of St. John. The item is a revote to provide for the completion of a small submerged breakwater. The estimated expenditure on the work is $4,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the work be completed this season?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is hoped so.

Clifton (Stonehaven)—breakwater—improvements and repairs, $9,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for maintenance.

Mr. TAYLOR. That can hardly be, for only $2,500 was voted last year, whereas $9,000 is asked this year.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is intended to render the harbour more secure and to prevent the waves bringing in sand and filling in the harbour and reducing its depth. The total cost will be $9,000 according to the estimate of the engineer.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is this being done by contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, by day's work.

Dipper harbour—breakwater, $35,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will this complete the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. This sum of money will complete it. But it may not all be spent this season.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimate is $48,000.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Three thousand dollars. It is estimated that $33,000 will be spent before the end of the fiscal year. This work is in the county of St. John.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose there have been some changes during the last year that increased the estimate. I noticed in the discussion of the item last year the minister stated that the total cost would be $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that new plans have been made.

Mr. BLAIN. I would regard that as rather unusual, that the estimated cost was $30,000 as stated last year, and then the following year new plans are prepared increasing the amount to $48,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Tenders were called for on the original plans and none came in; so the plans had to be changed and new tenders asked for.

Durham—wharf, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Tenders have been called for and received, but the contract is not yet awarded. This estimate is for a wharf to be built at the eastern end of the parish of Durham, which will give a depth of six feet in low water and fifteen feet in high water. It is a new wharf.

Great Salmon river—groyne and breakwater combined, $4,300.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is also in the county of St. John. Some tenders were called for but none were received, and we will have to call for new tenders. Nothing has been spent during the past year.

Miscou harbour—wharf, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract, in Gloucester county. The contractors are Messrs. Burns and Charleson. It is a new wharf. There are about 70 houses on the island including 11 lobster factories, two of which are engaged also in canning salmon. The population is estimated at about 500. The occupation of the people is mainly fishing for lobsters, herring, salmon and smelts. Farming is carried on to some extent.

Mr. FOWLER. The lobster factories are mere sheds. The whole bunch of them

would not be worth $2,000, and you are spending $15,000 for a wharf to accommodate about 50 houses.

Mr. TURGEON. If the hon. gentleman lived on the north shore he might change his opinion. The lobster factories there represent a large amount of capital, thousands of dollars are invested in each one of them. There is an immense trade in bringing provisions to these factories, but they are without any shipping facilities.

Mr. FOWLER. How many months in the year are they in operation ?

Mr. TURGEON. For about three months Operations commence early in the spring and last into the middle of the summer. A large amount of provisions is brought in from the west. There are deep sea fishermen there also. Ten or twelve years ago there were 25 or 30 deep sea fishermen there who had large schooners, but they had to abandon the business because they could not get their schooners into the harbour. They belonged to Miscou harbour, but they could not use the harbour for the want of shipping facilities. Now they will be able to use their own harbour. They are about to build another wharf which will give the island communication with the mainland. Cargoes of flour come every week from the west.

Mr. INGRAM. How long has all this been going on ?

Mr. TURGEON. For years and years. Unfortunately the government has neglected those people.

Mr. INGRAM. I can tell the hon. gentleman that all the exports he is talking about do not amount to $75,000, and the imports only amount to $50,000.

Mr. TURGEON. I cannot give the figures, but I know there is an immense trade done there which requires these facilities.

Mr. INGRAM. The contract price is $13,700. Why are you increasing that amount ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not asking for a larger amount. The contract is for $13,700, but there is superintendence and contingencies in connection with the execution of the contract, which raise the amount to $15,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister excuse me for going back to the Salmon river item, and tell me when are these tenders to be called for.

Mr. BRODEUR. They will be called for as soon as possible, this season.

Mr. FOWLER. I suppose the minister is aware that the mill property at Salmon river is owned by a private corporation. Are there any people living there except those who are working for this corporation ?

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a public work.

Mr. FOWLER. I say there are no people served except the people of this corporation. I know the property very well. It is a mill property and it is owned by an American corporation.

Mr. BRODEUR. It belongs now to the government.

Mr. FOWLER. I am speaking of this place, Salmon river. There is no public interest, but that of the people who are engaged by this corporation. The facilities you put there will simply be for the advantage of this corporation.

Mr. DANIEL. This corporation exports a good deal of lumber, does it not ?

Mr. FOWLER. I say that. Does this property belong to the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It belongs to the government.

Mud cove—breakwater, $1,600.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for a small cribwork and breakwater 80 feet long which it has been decided to build at Mud Cove on Grindstone Island at the head of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. BLAIN. How much was expended last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. This is $1,000 of a revote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Where did the hon. minister say Mud Cove is ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In King's and Albert county.

Mr. FOWLER. What point ?

Mr. BRODEUR. At Grindstone Island which is 30 miles long and a quarter of a mile wide.

Petit Rocher—breakwater, $25,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the amount of the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $32,900.

Mr. BLAIN. Will that complete the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. That will complete if it can be spent during the year.

Pointe du Chêne—repairs to breakwater, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR—This vote of $15,000 is required to make provision for carrying out the undermentioned works of reconstruction and repair on the Pointe du Chêne breakwaters in order to make good damage caused by the severe storm of November 4, 1904, and to strengthen the harbour works generally which have been much weakened

by the teredo, by protecting the seaward face or the outer breakwater with a stone slope to break the force of the waves and placing additional stone along the outer face of the inner breakwater.

Quaco—harbour improvements, $27,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked for to make full provision in accordance with the estimate submitted by the chief engineer for extending the east piers at the entrance to Quaco harbour a distance of 250 feet to protect this high water harbour effectually from southeast seas. The total cost will be $27,000.

Mr. DANIEL. Will it complete the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes

Mr. DANIEL. Will it be finished this season ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We hope so.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that an extension of the present breakwater ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. It will cost $30,000 will it not ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a revote of $16,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is a revote of $16,500 out of $20,000 and you are asking for $27,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The amount has not been expended. We expected that a certain amount would be expended by the first of July, but it will not be expended.

Richibucto—extension of north pier, $19,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is required for completing the projected 300 feet extension of the new work off the north beach in Richibucto harbour. It is under contract.

River St. John—including tributaries, $16,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the ordinary vote.

Mr. WILMOT. What is proposed to be done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. These are the general works of improvements on the river.

Mr. WILMOT. What is the nature of the improvements ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I might give the hon. gentleman what was done last year. It is the same class of work that is going to be done this year :

Repairs to tow paths, removal of obstruction to barge navigation, &c., English Toladi, river St. Francis, to lengthen present structure in timber	$200
Trout river, Little Madawaska, improving channel	50
Rocky river, blasting at and near forks	100
Green river, blasting near Little Forks	150
Little river—to improve falls, blasting and timber sheer dam	400
Blasting in channel between Grand Falls and mouth of Aristook	200
Blasting between Aristook and River Des Chutes	150
Removing sand, gravel, &c., in channel on Tobique river below Plaster Rock	150
Blasting channel in Red Rapids, Tobique river	150
Blasting channel, &c., Sisson Branch Falls, Tobique river	300
Blasting channel, &c., in Upper Little Tobique	300
Extending breakwater at Grand Falls	500
Building breakwater at Clairs	500

Mr. FOWLER. Under whose direction is this expended ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Shewen's.

Mr. FOWLER. No money is expended without his instruction ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Without his supervision and instruction.

Mr. WILMOT. Is any provision made for dredging ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not out of this vote. There is another vote in regard to dredging.

Mr. WILMOT. There will be dredging done, I suppose ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there are two dredges there now.

Mr. WILMOT. Are they at work now ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is one which is working now.

Mr. WILMOT. In what locality ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer cannot give the information now as to the exact locality.

Mr. WILMOT. There are localities on the river where dredging is required.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will my hon. friend be kind enough to mention the places ?

Mr. WILMOT. Dredging is required at Oromocto shoals, nine miles below Fredericton, and on the Washadermoak river which is a tributary of the St. John.

Mr. BRODEUR. Surveys of the river are being made just now.

Mr. WILMOT. What report do the surveyors make ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No report has been made yet.

River St. John—to provide for contributions to local government not to exceed one-half the

first cost of wharfs built by them in tidal waters, $5,000.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to say in connection with this item that it does seem to me that the time has arrived when the Dominion government should pay the whole of the cost of these wharfs. The finances of the province are not in a healthy condition and the total cost of works of this character constructed in other provinces is paid for by the Dominion government. I think that New Brunswick should be placed on the same footing as other provinces in respect to this matter. It is very important to navigation that you should supply these facilities to the people along the St. John river. This is just as important as it is to build a wharf at Miscou where this lobster industry is carried on. The St. John river is the highway of commerce running through the centre of the province of New Brunswick and, I do think the Dominion government should defray the whole cost of these wharfs instead of compelling the local government; which is very ill able to do it, to pay half the cost.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that is in virtue of an agreement between the local and federal governments. I suppose the agreement will have to be carried out until it is changed.

Mr. FOWLER. I might relieve the mind of the minister by saying that I have not the slightest doubt the local government would be perfectly willing to cancel the agreement if the Dominion government would take on itself the burden of providing the whole cost. I know this custom has existed for many years, but there always comes a time when it is well to change, and it seems to me the Dominion government should now consider whether they will not provide the whole cost of these different constructions along the St. John river.

Mr. BRODEUR. That might be discussed when we are considering the relations between the Dominion and the provinces.

St. John harbour—repairs and extension of protection work at base of Fort Dufferin, $500.

Mr. FOWLER. Is this an annual vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOWLER. What repairs were necessary?

Mr. BRODEUR. The timber decays and has to be renewed.

Mr. FOWLER. Could it not be built of stone and made permanent?

Mr. BRODEUR. It would cost a large sum of money.

Mr. FOWLER. But it might be cheaper in the end.

St. John drill hall, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) on a former occasion asked for some information as to the site of the Drill Hall. I understand the decision of the Department of Militia is that the drill hall will be erected on the government property?

Mr. DANIEL. Can the government say whether they will commence the construction this season or not?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; plans are being prepared.

Mr. DANIEL. Are they the same plans that were prepared once before.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are general plans.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. There is a Railway Bill, and then we will resume the discussion of the estimates of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not the Autonomy Bill?

Mr. FIELDING. I think there is an understanding with the leader of the opposition as to that—I do not expect the Autonomy Bill will be taken to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 15, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. I have received a communication from the Toronto District Labour Council in reference to two matters. The first portion of it is in reference to the Alien Labour Act. The statement is made on behalf of the council that an officer was duly appointed when the Act was passed, that deportations were made from time to time on the report of that officer, that a request was then made for an extension to enable a private individual to take action in addition to any powers which the government had, and an amendment was made. But the Dominion government, it is said, take the position that its powers to act are gone as a result of the amendment, and that a conviction ought to be obtained at the suit of a private individual before it can order deportation. The council has always maintained the opposite view, namely, that the power of the government is intact, notwith-

standing the amendment made as I have stated. Now, they contend that their view has been proved correct by the action the Dominion government has taken in ordering deportations upon the report of Judge Winchester in respect to aliens upon the Grand Trunk Pacific and recently in respect to the Père Marquette employees or officials. They state that Judge Winchester, while making such an investigation, seemed to be acting practically as an alien labour officer, and that the evidence taken goes to prove that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which has refused to honour the award of the arbitrators in favour of the Grand Trunk telegraphers, and the Canada Foundry Company are at present flagrantly violating the provisions of the Alien Labour Act.

Then they say that :

> Certain amendments were introduced by the government at the last session of the House of Commons that would have had the effect of making the Act something more than the farce it is at the present time.

And it is resolved by the council that the Dominion government be requested to appoint a commission to at once investigate the charges made by them against the Grand Trunk and the Canada Foundry Company of violating the Alien Labour Act.

There is a further resolution that :

> This council further request, inasmuch as it has been publicly charged that the amendments of last session were introduced simply because a general election was then impending, and as the council, in union with the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, expressed its faith in the sincerity of the government in this regard, that the government reintroduce at the present session the amendments desired to make the working of the Act both expeditious and effective.

That is the case they set forth and that is the request that they have laid before the government. It is that, in so far as the Alien Labour Act is concerned, a further investigation take place in reference to two of the charges that they have made, and that the government introduce again and pass this time the amendments which were introduced last session, but which, as I understand, were not passed. They think it is wise to do this, both in the interest of the government and in the interest of labour organizations. They seem to be anxious that the government shall demonstrate its good faith that these amendments, as introduced last year, were not introduced simply for a purpose before the general election, but were meant to become a part of the law, and that therefore they should be made part of the Act during the present session.

The second complaint which they wish to be preferred here is with reference to complications which they say have arisen in the old country, and which no doubt have arisen wherever certain classes of emigrants are induced or encouraged to come to Canada by certain agents, with the promise that ready employment will be found, and, going further, with actual recommendations to certain parties, and with the assertion that they will be employed immediately on their making application to them. In some cases I believe these agents have gone so far as to make a form of contract and give it to the emigrant, with the suggestion that it will be implemented as soon as he arrives at the proper place in this Dominion. They contend that Mr. Preston, who after some discussion of the subject gave over doing this, did it of his own accord as Dominion immigration agent, and that the matter is effectually done through the agency of one Leopold, who, it is alleged, has an office in the same building in which the Dominion immigration quarters are, or near by. They say that the modus operandi is that when applications are made to the Dominion officials there, they are sent with the parties making the applications to this man Leopold, and that consequently he is assisted in carrying out his part of the business under what seems to be the patronage or auspices of the Dominion authorities in the immigration office. They feel very strongly upon that point. As a result, either through Leopold or others following out the same plan—because they themselves make something out of it—they say that skilled immigrants have been sent over with these letters and these forms of contract, that they have come to different cities of Canada—to Toronto as one—and that, going to the persons to whom they have been directed, they have found neither any employment, contract nor any employment, and have been left stranded and at the mercy of circumstances ; and that there have been many cases of great hardship. They append and have sent to the government statements made by certain of these immigrants—among them Colin A. Gunn and William A. Moore—as corroboration of what I have said and of their charges. These statements, if true—and we have no reason to believe that they are not true—show a state of affairs which is very undesirable and very unfair to these skilled artisans themselves, and which ought to be remedied, so far as the government can do it. More especially I think it will be admitted that the government itself ought to keep free of any possible suspicion of a connection between its agents in London or in Europe, and these parties who act as employing agencies, who get fees from these men, and who send them to a far-off and unknown country, where they are put at very great disadvantage in the way just stated. What they want is an immediate investigation into the charge which they have made in this respect. I do not see why that should not be granted. If the circumstances are as the Trades and Labour Council say they are, they have a grievance on behalf of their fellow workmen in Great

Britain and a grievance on behalf of their workmen in this country. I think I have done my part in presenting simply and solely their point of view at the present time, so that it may be before the House and the government. Any further discussion on the subject will be had after the government has made its statement, and it may have another side to it.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER. Mr. Speaker, in reply, first of all, to the hon. gentleman's statement in regard to the question of an amendment to the Alien Labour law, I may say that within the last few days, since the departure of the Minister of Labour (Sir William Mulock), the representations in question have reached the government, that they are under consideration, and that the action of the government will be announced in a short time. In regard to the other matter which my hon. friend has brought up, as to what are called immigration bureaus or offices in England, this matter was brought to the attention of the government more than a year ago. It was then gone into by the minister in charge, and the information was put before the country to a very large extent. I have in my hand at the moment the file in connection with this, and I may say that the condition of affairs is this. There is in the same building with the Canadian immigration office in London an office which is in the name of a certain Mr. Leopold. It has no connection whatever with the Canadian immigration office.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Canadian immigration office occupy the whole building?

Mr. FISHER. No, it does not. This gentleman, with some others, occupy some offices in the same building.

Mr. FOSTER. We rent simply a part of a building?

Mr. FISHER. We rent a part of a building, and this gentleman is a tenant of the same proprietor. The Canadian office is on the ground floor. I do not know whether it occupies any other portion than the ground floor.

Mr. FOSTER. It goes below the ground floor.

Mr. FISHER. But this gentleman apparently occupies a portion of an upper floor. The accusation is that immigrants applying to the Canadian office are referred to him. Now, the Canadian officers have direct instructions from the department here that the class of immigrants they are to encourage to come to this country are agricultural labourers, people wishing to go on the land, and domestic servants; and when other people come for information, they are not in any way encouraged to emigrate to this country. Those people sometimes insist on getting information, and on certain occasions apparently some of them have asked where they could get the information, and I think probably some time ago, not recently, officers in the Canadian office did say to them, 'You can get information on that point at Mr. Leopold's office.' More than this does not seem to have been in any way established as to anything suggesting that people should go to Mr. Leopold's office. There is, however, one letter on the file, in which a certain person applied to Mr. Preston personally, saying that he had had communications with Mr. Leopold's office, and he wished to know what its standing was; and Mr. Preston's reply acknowledged his letter, and stated that he believed that Mr. Leopold's office was an office of good standing, and was able to carry out anything that it undertook to do. So far as I have examined the files, I see that there is no other proof of connection of any kind whatever between Mr. Preston or any other officer of the Canadian immigration office and this Mr. Leopold. In consequence of similar representations being made last year, Mr. Smart, then deputy minister who was in England, published in the British press a warning to the people, and that warning was also published in the 'Canadian Labour Gazette.' It was as follows:

> The government of the Dominion of Canada have been informed that certain persons conducting labour agencies in London and elsewhere in the United Kingdom, have been promoting the emigration to Canada of mechanics and other skilled workmen; have been giving false information respecting labour conditions in Canada, and have represented themselves as agents of, or as having the sanction and endorsement of the Dominion government; notice is hereby given that the Dominion of Canada has no such agents in the United Kingdom, has not authorized, sanctioned or in any way given its approval to any agency in the United Kingdom for promoting the emigration to Canada of mechanic or other skilled labour.
>
> (Sgd.) JAMES A. SMART,
> Deputy Minister of the Interior of Canada.

This was a positive announcement that the Dominion government had no connection with these different agencies. It came to Mr. Preston's knowledge that he was accused of being in league or in collusion with this Mr. Leopold, and Mr. Smart discussed the question with Mr. Preston and he reported to the minister that the Canadian government had no means by which they could interfere with Mr. Leopold's occupation of the office as he held it under lease and was paying his rent. Mr. Smart seems to have had an interview with Mr. Leopold and to have investigated his business to some extent, and Mr. Smart reported apparently that nothing could be found which would go to throw discredit on the business. At the same time it was evident from circulars which had been issued by Mr. Leopold and probably by other agencies of a similar character, that representations with regard to the labour conditions in Canada were made to the English people, which the facts would hardly justify.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this office of Mr. Leopold's over the flat which is occupied by Mr. Preston for the Canadian Emigration Department ?

Mr. FISHER. It is in the same building.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Within the last four or five months Mr. Preston has received instructions to report to the High Commissioner instead of reporting direct to the department here; has this business which he was apparently mixed up in had anything to do with that ?

Mr. FISHER. Nothing whatever. I am informed by the emigration branch that this question has not been discussed lately at all. In consequence of the action of Mr. Smart last year and of the categorical statements of Mr. Preston to the minister that he had absolutely no connection, personally, pecuniarily, or in any other way with Mr. Leopold's business or office, the minister seems to have decided that nothing further could be done in the matter at the time, and nothing has arisen since which required any other action. The proprietor of the building leases the office to the Department of the Interior just as he leases an office to Mr. Leopold, and although this government would be powerless to deal with Mr. Leopold's lease or occupation, apparently Mr. Smart did try last year to see if Mr. Leopold's presence could not be got rid of, but he failed in the attempt. Mr. Preston denied explicitly any connection with Mr. Leopold, and he went so far as to say that he had even tried to see whether Mr. Leopold could be induced to leave the office but without success. In addition to the advertisement published in English newspapers by Mr. Smart, and which I have read, he also made representations to the Colonial office :

> That designing persons were apparently making use of bona fide emigration movement to Canada for the purpose of defrauding and deceiving people in the United Kingdom, and sending them to Canada under false representations, and that the Colonial Office were asked to communicate the substance of this despatch to the Home Office, with a request that steps be taken to prevent the continuance and recurrence of these frauds.

These representations were made to the Colonial office with the view of seeing if the authorities in England could put any machinery in motion to prevent these false representations. I think it will be seen that the Interior Department is absolutely cleared of any disregard or neglect in this matter, and I think it is also clearly shown that there is no connection officially or personally of any kind between the department or its officers and this particular agency or any other of these agencies in Great Britain. It is undoubtedly unfortunate that an agency of this kind should have offices in the same building as our Canadian offices, and no doubt that fact may frequently give them an advantage and may result in inquiries, instead of going to the Canadian emigration office, getting into the wrong hands and false information supplied.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Did I understand the minister to say that they had distributed Canadian government literature from Leopold's office ?

Mr. FISHER. There is nothing to indicate that.

Mr. BARR. How long has Leopold's office been in the same building with the Canadian emigration office ?

Mr. FISHER. It was there in June, 1904, and it probably has been there for a year and a half, or may be longer.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Would the minister lay this correspondence to which he has referred on the table of the House ?

Mr. FISHER. I see no objection ; it will have to be copied of course.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. This matter was brought before the House last session and the facts were gone into very much as they have been gone into to-day by Mr. Puttee, then member for Winnipeg, and by the late Mr. Clarke, member for West Toronto. On that occasion especially the minister seemed to have been actuated by a desire to find out if possible some connection between the officers in the government department in London and the Leopold people. Let me quote from the debate last year, page 7330 of 'Hansard' :

> Mr. CLARKE. Is the minister aware that the officers of his department send men up stairs to this man to book their passages ?
>
> Mr. SIFTON. I do not think that is the case. If my hon. friend has any information to that effect, I would be very much indebted to him if he would send it to me, and I will promise, if he so desires, to regard the source from which it comes as confidential. The instructions which I have given have been most explicit, and there can be no possible excuse for any officer of the department, either directly or indirectly, in any shape, form or manner, being connected with or encouraging the traffic these people are carrying on.

The matter seemed to have rested there on that occasion, and in the correspondence to which the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has referred we find statements by two men, presumably first-class mechanics. One of them, Colin A. Gunn on the 16th May, said :

> We went to the emigration office. They told me they could not guarantee work for machinists, but there was a man up stairs who would do so. That was Leopold.

Mr. Gunn is speaking of an interview he had at the government offices in London. He says he was instructed to go upstairs

and interview Mr. Leopold. Then there is the statement of Mr. William A. Moore, of the 15th May, 1905, in which he says :

We asked for Mr. Preston, the commissioner of emigration for Canada, but he was too busy to see us. However, one of his numerous staff plied us with questions, and when we stated our occupation, he said : Well, we do not cater for men of your particular craft, we are only interested in farming, but we have a gentleman up stairs who will give you all the information you require. He then called the office boy and told him to see if Mr. Leopold was in his office. We saw Leopold.

These are statements made by persons who saw Mr. Leopold and who came to this country as the result of their interview. In pursuance of the policy declared by the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) it is only right the government should have an investigation into these matters.

Department of Labour—printing and stationery, including printing of 'Labour Gazette,' allowances to correspondents, administration of Conciliation Act, Railway Labour Disputes Act, travelling expenses, &c., and $500 each for an accountant and French translator, which sum may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $29,900.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). This is required to meet the general expenses of the Department of Labour for the year 1905. It is less than it was in the previous year—$7,000 less.

Mr. BERGERON. What are the attributions of this new office ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It covers the 'Labour Gazette' and the Conciliation Act.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the circulation of the 'Labour Gazette' ?

Mr. EMMERSON. About 10,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What was it during the London election ? I understand there was an extra issue for that election.

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there was not.

Mr. INGRAM. Then there was an extra circulation. What was the object of it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There was not even any extra circulation.

Mr. INGRAM. Some persons received them by the half dozen rolls.

Mr. EMMERSON. That does not prove there was an extra edition.

Mr. INGRAM. It proves there was an extra circulation.

Mr. EMMERSON. If there was, the deputy minister knows nothing about it.

Mr. INGRAM. I know that there were rolls of half a dozen circulated in London, and the object evidently was to cover a point under discussion in that election, namely, the alien labour difficulties that occurred on the Père Marquette Railway at St. Thomas, out of which the government were endeavouring to make political capital. The object of the circulation was to influence the electors, although we were given to understand that the Labour Department is non-partisan.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is nothing in the 'Gazette' that could improperly influence an elector. It gives simply a statement of facts, and no expression of opinion. No addition has been made whatever to its circulation but it may be that private parties secured copies and mailed them.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is it printed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. At the King's printing office.

Mr. BERGERON. Then what we pay for printing goes to the Bureau ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. What has been the result in the way of conciliation ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Upwards of thirty-five of the largest strikes in Canada were settled during the operation of that Act.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In spite of the interference of the Labour Bureau ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It has done a very excellent work, and this is recognized throughout the country.

Mr. BLAIN. How is the 'Labour Gazette' sent out ? I understand, of course, that a large circulation is sent out to members of parliament, public libraries and so on, but I would like a detailed statement as to the circulation and at the same time I think the minister should clear up the statement of the member for East Elgin that to his own personal knowledge half a dozen rolled-up copies of this gazette were sent to private individuals during the recent election in London.

Mr. EMMERSON. The 'Gazette' can be purchased at 3 cents a copy. It is possible for any one to order a dozen or half dozen or more copies. The same edition is being published as prevailed during the past year, there have been no extra copies issued nor any special circulation from the department. The total circulation is about 10,000 ; there are about 7,000 paid subscriptions and there are 3,000 copies for distribution to boards of trade, labour organizations, members of parliament and the public libraries and newspapers of the country.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the subscription ?

Mr. EMMERSON. 20 cents a year.

Mr. BLAIN. Perhaps the minister would give a list of the correspondents of the 'Gazette' and the manner of their selection and appointment.

Mr. EMMERSON. I fear my friend does not read the copies that are sent to him,

because this information is furnished in each issue of the paper. They have a correspondent in every city, practically in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. I am asking how these are selected ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By the Labour Bureau ; they are paid $100 a year. The names are contained in each number of the 'Gazette' and are as follows :

Sydney, Nova Scotia, John Moffatt ; Halifax, Nova Scotia, F. W. Smith ; Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, J. F. Nash ; St. John, New Brunswick, W. H. Coates ; Quebec, E. Little and P. J. Jobin ; Sherbrooke, Quebec, H. Loggie ; Three Rivers, Quebec, John Ryan, sr.; St. Hyacinthe, Quebec, Victor Phaneuf ; Montreal, Quebec, Gustave Audet and T. J. Griffith ; Hull, Quebec, Rudolph Laferriere ; Ottawa, T. W. Quayle ; Kingston, Wm. Kelly ; Belleville, H. C. McDiarmid ; Peterborough, W. J. Johnston ; Toronto, Phillips Thompson ; Niagara Falls, Ernest Green; St. Catharines, James A Wiley ; Hamilton, S. Landers ; Brantford, J. C. Watt ; Guelph, O. R. Wallace ; Berlin, Harry Peters ; Stratford, Joseph C. Carlin ; London, A. Woonton ; St. Thomas, A. Roberts ; Chatham, John R. Snell ; Windsor, D. Mitchell ; Sault St. Marie, Edward Barry ; Winnipeg, J. A. Appleton ; Brandon, S. P. Springer ; Calgary, J. Gillespie ; Nelson, A. B. Docksteater ; New Westminster, J. George Hargreaves ; Victoria, British Columbia, J. D. McNiven ; Nanaimo, A. E. H. Spencer.

There are 38 correspondents in all.

Mr. DANIEL. What are the qualifications required of the correspondents ? Are they members of labour organizations or working men or on what ground are they appointed ?

Mr. EMMERSON. They are men in the first place who have some literary ability who are capable of furnishing correspondence. They must of necessity be familiar with the industrial conditions prevailing in their districts ; they must also have the confidence of the employers as well as of the employees, that is to say those who are hiring and those who are hired.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister seems to repudiate the idea that this is a partisan gazette. This department is partisan. I can state why these copies of the 'Gazette' were circulated in London. We had an election there and the success of the Liberal candidate on that occasion largely hinged on how the labour vote could be swung in his favour. I find here a letter from the Hon. Mr. Hyman to the Postmaster General and Minister of Labour calling his attention to the fact that a certain railway company in that district were importing aliens from the other side and urging upon the department the necessity of taking action and having these aliens removed. What did the government do then ? They employed a gentleman named Marks to go to St. Thomas and inquire into the difficulty brought about there by the importation of these aliens. Then Judge Winchester was appointed as commissioner. He went there, made inquiries and through the inquiries and the report which he made these officers were ordered to leave the country, some of them within 24 hours, others within 7 days and others forthwith. The purchasing agent of the Père Marquette Railway left and went back to Detroit and the next day we find Mr. Marks, who is supposed to be a leading and shining light in the labour movement, employed by the government to assist the commissioner in his duties in investigating the difficulties in connection with these alien labourers.

Next we find this Mr. Marks, who is supposed to be a labour leader, who is supposed to be engaged by the 'Labour Gazette,' performing duties for labour, we find him charging the Conservative candidate with being an enemy to labour. Mr. Marks prepares an affidavit in which he charges that the Conservative candidate is an opponent of labour, and as a result of that charge the labour men of the city of London were requested not to vote for the Conservative candidate but to vote for their true friend, Mr. Hyman, who is said to be the friend of labour in the city of London. Now in an ordinary sense that is all right enough in a political campaign, and I have no objection to it ; but when this non-partisan Labour Department lends a hand and takes part in a political contest, then the sooner it ceases to declare itself non-partisan the better it will be for the labour interests of this country. That is the charge I make, and it is perfectly true. Why did Mr. Marks, in the 'Labour Gazette,' take part in the political discussion, take a partisan part in this election, charging the Conservative candidate with things of which it was positively proven he was not guilty ? If the Liberal party in the city of London chose to take that stand I have no fault to find, the Liberal party has a right to take whatever line in the contest they chose ; but when the 'Labour Gazette' and the Labour Department take a hand in a political contest, then they must not come down to parliament and pretend to be a non-partisan department.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Marks is in no way connected with the 'Labour Gazette,' he is in no sense connected with the Department of Labour. Long before the recent election in London, in fact some time before the death of the late lamented Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Marks was appointed to hold a certain investigation. He is editor of the 'Industrial Banner,' is a very capable man, familiar with the industrial conditions, and because of his qualifications he was selected by the department to hold an investigation. Now that investigation was held before the vacancy in London, or before a vacancy could be anticipated ?

Mr. INGRAM. Not at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) will not say that the investigation was not held previous to the election altogether.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman said this was done before the election was anticipated. There is not a member in this House who does not know perfectly well that for the whole of last year an election was anticipated in the city of London.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman give me the date of that letter of Mr. Hyman.

Mr. INGRAM. 2nd of March.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now there could not have been any preconcerted action on the part of Mr. Hyman or anybody else; this investigation was not organized and entered upon in anticipation of any possible election in London. I think my hon. friends are straining overmuch in endeavouring to show that.

Mr. BARKER. Does the minister tell us that there was no anticipation on the part of the government in March last that there would be an election in London? Does he assert that as a fact?

Mr. EMMERSON. The point is this: The action that was taken was not and could not be in anticipation of any possible election. True, there might be an election in the distant future; but investigations are not held simply with a view of influencing some election that may possibly arise in the future. Now the question is: Was the action taken proper? Did not the facts revealed by that investigation justify the department in holding it? All that there is revealed by the 'Labour Gazette' is a calm statement of the facts, given simply for information, with no expression of opinion, no argument of the case, simply a bald statement of what had transpired. And surely that is proper, surely it was proper in that paper to record those facts and to give the people interested in such matters all that information. It appears there.

Mr. BARKER. It never appeared in March.

Mr. EMMERSON. Because the investigation had not been held then. It came on in the regular way; this report in the paper appeared in its natural order, and as soon as it could be prepared. It may be a coincidence with the election, but certainly nothing can be twisted in any shape to show that there was a preconcerted action on the part of any one with a view to affecting the election. Surely the hon. gentleman will not say that the mere statement of facts affected the election. I venture to say to my hon. friend that there is no statement in that 'Gazette' to which he can properly take exception.

Mr. INGRAM.

Mr. INGRAM. Now, Mr. Chairman, I know probably as much about the facts of the case as the minister does. I live in that district, and I think I may say that I know more about the actual facts than the minister. I have no fault to find with the hon. gentleman in his endeavours to defend the department, though I think he will find it a difficult thing to do. The 'Labour Gazette' has this report:

> On the 2nd of March the Honourable C. S. Hyman, M.P., Acting Minister of Public Works, in a communication to the Honourable Sir Wm. Mulock, K.C.M.G., Minister of Labour, pointed out that strong representations had been made to him in reference to the continued violation by the Pere Marquette Railway system of the Alien Labour law, and that if such a state of affairs existed as he had been informed of, he thought that immediate action should be taken by the Department of Labour to remedy it. In his communication the Honourable Mr. Hyman further said:
>
> I may explain that some time since the Pere Marquette system of Michigan obtained control of the Canadian portion of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway (Erie and Huron), and that they have now added this to their American system.

Then he goes on to give the information he has received. Then Mr. Marks of the 'Industrial Banner' went and inquired on the 31st of March. So you see there was a period from the 2nd of March to the 31st. Then after the progress of the inquiry commissioners were appointed on the 5th of April, and on the 21st of April, His Honour Judge Winchester received the commission. Then the communication ends up in this way:

> It is expected that the commissioner will submit his report, together with the evidence, to the hon. the Minister of Labour during the month of May.

And it has already been received and laid on this table.

Mr. EMMERSON. It naturally came in this month's 'Gazette.'

Mr. INGRAM. And it was naturally circulated among the workingmen of London. Now, I want to point out the fact that there was an alien employed in the city of London by this railway company, and that one alien was ordered to leave the country forthwith, and he did leave and went to Detroit. But the other aliens were employed in St. Thomas and west of St. Thomas. Mr. Hyman was advised, no doubt, to take this action, and I presume that he did so for political purposes. I am not finding fault with him for that. That is not the phase of the question that I am finding fault with. Mr. Hyman had a perfect right if he felt disposed to do so. I do not quarrel with him or with the department for that, but what I am quarrelling with the department for is that they employed Mr. Marks, who is the editor of a labour paper called the 'Industrial Banner.' They had a perfect

C

right to employ Mr. Marks if they chose in a non-partisan way. Mr. Marks was instructed to assist the commissioner in making this inquiry, but the Labour Department had no right to allow Mr. Hyman or anybody else to make use of this non-partisan official for the purpose of carrying the London election. Would the Deputy Minister of Labour take part on the political stump? Dare he do it and come down to this House and say that the department is not a partisan department? The government have claimed that this is a non-partisan department, and it is on the strength of being a non-partisan department that they have sought credit for themselves for having established and carried on that department, but the government used a non-partisan officer connected with a non-partisan department for the purpose of carrying the London election. That, in a nut-shell, is what I am complaining of. I want to tell the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, the hon. Minister of Labour and the Deputy Minister of Labour that they cannot go to the city of London and say to the labour men that they are conducting a non-partisan department after the shameful conduct of that department in the London election. More than that, I want to refer the hon. gentleman to the fact that in the very district in which the workingmen of the city of London are employed they had more faith in this man who was charged with being against the interests of labour than they had in Mr. Hyman, and, as a result, the people there polled their votes in favour of Mr. Gray, who was their candidate on this particular occasion. Therefore, the intrigue that was attempted did not succeed in so far as humbugging the workingmen of London was concerned. I have never on any occasion charged the Department of Labour with being a partisan department, but in view of what took place in London in the recent election I think words cannot be used too strongly to show that the department is not the non-partisan department that it has claimed to be.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my hon. friend, in his remarks, has been indulging in too violent language in connection with the facts presented. He is relying upon violence of language and upon a very fervid imagination. It is very easy to make the assertion against the department that it is partisan, that it is run in the interest of a political party, but I will put it fairly to my hon. friend: Has he demonstrated one single fact that would in any way prove that assertion? I venture to assert that he has not. In the first instance, this gentleman, Mr. Marks, before any election is in sight, before it might properly be anticipated, is called upon to hold a certain investigation. He is qualified. He holds a very responsible position. He has the confidence of the labouring element, and has the confidence of those who are interested in the industrial life of that city. He is chosen to hold this investigation, he does so, and he does it well apparently. An investigation is held, the facts are brought out and these facts justify the investigation. In the first place, it is brought to the notice of the department that there are questions that should be investigated. They do not rush headlong into it. They simply hold an ex-parte inquiry; they satisfy themselves that an investigation is necessary, and thereupon they hold an investigation. Mr. Marks, having concluded that investigation, and having made his report to the department, discharges his duty. He is no longer a servant of the government. He is not in any way connected with the department by virtue of his appointment to that position. He is selected to act in a judicial way. He performs his part, and his connection with the department ceases. Anything that transpired since then is simply a matter of individual responsibility on the part of Mr. Marks. Any action he has taken is the action that any free citizen of this country is justified in taking if he so chooses, and I am sure the reflections of my hon. friend are entirely unwarranted in so far as he has produced any facts. He has certainly not produced a scintilla of evidence to show that the department should be condemned for its action in this matter. There was an alien in London. He received his notice the same as the others. He voluntarily and of his own motion left. There was no action taken as against him that was not taken against the others. That gentleman left voluntarily when he need not have done so. He could have taken the attitude taken by some others who were in a like situation. Perhaps it is too near the result of the election to condemn my hon. friend for his very strong language. There is some justification for it. It is merely a coincidence that there was an election. The machinery was put in motion long before that. It was put in motion because there was a necessity for it. It went through in the regular order, and the facts were published in the 'Labour Gazette.' There can be no reflection cast upon the 'Gazette' for doing that. The labour element in London wanted the information. It was important that they should have it. Any action of Mr. Hyman in connection with the matter shows that he simply performed the part of a prudent representative of the city. He brings to the attention of the Minister of Labour certain facts that are alleged. That is done on the 2nd March. The department, without hastily jumping to a conclusion in the matter, without plunging into it, inquired, and finally, on the 31st March, the Department of Labour takes action in respect to the investigation, which seems to have been justified by all the facts disclosed. This was an investigation for which, I think, the department should receive credit, and an in-

vestigation that has certainly reflected some credit upon the gentleman, Mr. Marks, who was engaged in it.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend seems to be a little vague on this question. If I did use very strong language, evidently it did not seem to strike him as being very serious.

Mr. EMMERSON. I forgive you.

Mr. INGRAM. At the general election in November this Mr. Marks seems to have let the Conservative candidate, Mr. Gray pass without objection. But when Mr. Marks was employed by this non-partisan Department of Labour—and I would like to impress this non-partisanship on the minister and the deputy minister—Mr. Marks had to do something for his money. He was sent down to St. Thomas to investigate and report, and then he was called in to assist Judge Winchester to make an inquiry and Mr. Marks had to make some return to this non-partisan department, and so he made this affidavit:

I, Joseph T. Marks, of the city of London, in the county of Middlesex, editor, do solemnly declare that during the recent street railway trouble I made a visit to the London Old Boys' Association in St. Thomas as the official representative of the London Trades and Labour Council and the Street Railway Mens' Union.

That I went there with the object of securing their sympathy and to induce them to refrain from going to Springbank. I used every argument in my power to plead the cause of the men who had the active sympathy of the majority of the citizens of London. At that meeting Mr. William Gray, the present Conservative candidate, was present although not a member of the St. Thomas association, and he used every argument in his power to have the St. Thomas association go to Springbank.

He stated that but for a few interested agitators the strike would have been settled long ago, and that I was a curse to the city of London. For nearly two hours there was a very heated controversy between Mr. Gray and myself, and a great deal was said that would take up too much space to repeat here.

There were members of trade unions present at said meeting who can also testify if necessary to the truth of the above statement.

The remarkable feature of this whole thing is that what Mr. Marks complains of in this affidavit seems to have occurred five years ago, and it is peculiar that Mr. Marks would seem to have forgotten it at the general election, and to have remembered it at the last by-election. The truth is that Mr. Hyman discovered on the 3rd of November that Mr. Gray was the friend of labour men and got the labour vote, and then Mr. Marks the employee of this non-partisan department put his brains to work to see if he could not find something which would depreciate Mr. Gray in the eyes of the workingmen of London. That was the sole and only object of his so-called non-partisan department employing Mr. Marks to do this non-partisan work. I charge that against the Department of Labour, and I say that if this non-partisan department should commit a few more acts like this the sooner the workingmen of Canada realize that they are contributing to a partisan Department of Labour the better it will be for them. Let me give you another sample. There is in St. Thomas a good honest Liberal, but a mighty independent one, who for years has voted as he thought his conscience required him to do. I refer to Mr. Roberts, who acted as correspondent for this 'Labour Gazette' and who was dismissed. Why? He was dismissed because he refused to vote for the Liberal candidate; he reserved his right as an independent Liberal and workingman to vote for the candidate of his choice, and as a result Mr. Roberts, who was a good, honest, and highly respected citizen of St. Thomas, was removed and Mr. Killingsworth, a very active partisan, was put in his place. Every workingman in the city of St. Thomas, Liberal and Conservative alike, knows that my statement is correct. Mr. Roberts was removed because he was acting in a non-partisan spirit, and this non-partisan department discharged him and put an active Liberal worker in his place. I have no objection to an out and out Liberal fighting the Conservative party if he wants to, but if he does so I object to his putting on the cloak of non-partisanship, and I object to have this supposedly non-partisan department coming to the House and telling us that they are conducting the Labour Department in a non-partisan way.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ingram) to say that this Mr. Marks was in the employ of the Labour Department when he made that affidavit?

Mr. INGRAM. He was in the employ of the Labour Department when he made these investigations, and this whole matter was arranged, cut and dried at the time.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) state that when Mr. Marks took the action he did in the recent election, he was in the employ of the Labour Department in any sense whatever?

Mr. INGRAM. I am not in the confidence of that non-partisan department; I do not know whether he was or not.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend seems to have no information on that point; if I say that Mr. Marks was not in the employ of the Labour Department would he dispute that assertion?

Mr. INGRAM. I say positively that Mr. Marks was in the service of the Labour Department and performed work for that department, for which I presume he was well paid.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I would remind my hon. friend that I could tell of a personal grievance which I might have against the Department of Labour if I were thin skinned enough to notice it. I could point out that employees of the Labour Department and

men employed on the 'Labour Gazette' took a very active part in the last election in opposition to some of the government candidates. My hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) has singled out one instance, although he is not able to verify it, and perhaps when the whole story is told it may be revealed that this man was not at the time in the employ of the Labour Department.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very thankful to my hon. friend (Mr. A. Johnston) for proving my argument. He has cited another case in which a partisan employee of this non-partisan department took a partisan part. If the minister and the deputy minister do not pay attention to what I have said, I trust they will believe their own supporter that they have partisan employees, and the sooner they get rid of them the better.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) name one single partisan employee of the Labour Department?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, sir, I will. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Johnston) has named one, and I can state that there is a partisan employee in my own city.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I made no charge whatever. I have absolutely no complaint to make. I am perfectly satisfied with the course he took. He took the course of an independent man who differed with me, and up to this moment I have never expressed any difference of opinion with him; I never brought it to the notice of anybody, and I state most positively that I have no fault to find with the attitude he assumed on that occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. In respect to this being a question of partisanship, I rather think my hon. friend has made out a very good case. The hon. minister does not just see it in that way, and we are sorry for him. A letter comes to the minister with reference to some people employed on the Père Marquette Railway, and what happens after the letter arrives? Here is the statement of the 'Labour Gazette':

> Upon the receipt of the Hon. Mr. Hyman's communication, the hon. the Minister of Labour appointed Mr. Joseph T. Marks, the editor of the 'Industrial Banner', of London, Ontario, to inquire into the matter and prepare a confidential report for the consideration of the government.

This is a communication to the government from one of its own members. Another member of the government appoints a partisan to investigate the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. Who is the partisan?

Mr. BLAIN. Mr. Marks, who just the other day took an active part in the London election. What then happened? On the same page I read this:

> Mr. Alfred O. Jefferys, K.C., of London, Ontario, was appointed counsel to represent the government of Canada for the commission, and the commissioner was required to report his findings to the Minister of Labour with all possible despatch. Mr. Marks was retained to assist the commissioner and the government counsel during the inquiry.

Here is another strong partisan, an active Liberal of the city of London, appointed to take care of the government's interests. That is the way it goes. It is a well known fact that that investigation was made by active partisans; there is no question about that; the minister will not deny it. In reference to the question whether these correspondents are politicians or not, it would be useless for me to occupy the time of the House in giving many instances. Let me give the minister one. The correspondent in the city of Belleville receiving $100 a year from the government is Mr. McDiarmid, a strong and active partisan, a gentleman who takes part in elections, a sub-editor of the leading Reform newspaper in that city. Does my hon. friend suppose that the people of Canada will believe that the Labour Department is free from partisanship if the minister selects Reform editors in the different cities and towns throughout Canada to act as correspondents? What would happen? An election comes on and the Reform editor, who is interested in the success of his own paper, supports the candidate of the Reform party, and is on the pay roll of this government. The salary, of course, is not very large; but if the minister wants the people of Canada to believe that there is no politics in the Department of Labour, he should find somebody in the city of Belleville to act as correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' who is not directly interested in the success of the Reform party or of a Reform newspaper in that city. This is an example to show that there is some politics, after all, in the selection of these correspondents, and I rather think that somebody outside of the Labour Department of the government has some say in their selection.

Mr. EMMERSON. Every one of these correspondents is required to send his material in over his own signature. I challenge any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House to point out one single paragraph in the 'Labour Gazette' during the past year from any city in Canada that would be characterized as the partisan utterance of a Liberal. That is the test.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman undertake to say that the documents appear in the 'Gazette' as sent in by the correspondents; or will his deputy say so?

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, they are edited. Necessarily all manuscript coming into newspaper offices must be edited and corrected; but the reports are kept in the department for a year, and can be laid upon

the table of the House if necessary. For my hon. friend to make the bald assertion that there is partisanship in the Labour Department may satisfy his mind, but it cannot satisfy the people of this country, or even the labour element.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister regard a correspondent who is a sub-editor of a Reform newspaper in the city of Belleville, as a man fitted to leave the impression that there is no party politics in the 'Gazette'?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly, I would appoint the man. The question is, does the character of his work show that he takes his partisanship into his official position? The city editor of the Ottawa 'Citizen' is the Ottawa correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette'; perhaps my hon. friends would not characterize him as a partisan. As to Mr. Marks, I am informed on excellent authority that he is not only not a partisan in the strict sense of the world, but that he is a strong supporter of the Hon. Adam Beck, and supported him very strongly in the recent local election in London. Mr. Marks is at liberty as a citizen to support whomsoever he chooses; he is not responsible to the Labour Department. This investigation commenced in March, and it was all concluded, so far as Mr. Marks was concerned, on the 30th of April.

Mr. INGRAM. On the 13th of June. He did not deliver the goods until then.

Mr. EMMERSON. He had none to deliver; it was not for him to deliver any goods. These vain imaginings of my hon. friend surely do not satisfy even his own analytical mind as respects the general charge which he has made. My hon. friend says Mr. Marks took part in the recent election against Mr. Gray. Not many months since he supported the Hon. Adam Beck, and I am informed that in the election in November last he was active against Mr. Gray. I do not know of this personally.

Mr. INGRAM. How did the hon. gentleman get this information?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have been informed of the fact.

Mr. INGRAM. By your deputy?

Mr. EMMERSON. Not by the deputy at all. He has not given me any information with respect to the political features, but I have information from very authentic sources, just as likely to be as reliable and well informed as my hon. friend.

Mr. HENDERSON. A short time ago my hon. friend for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) made the statement that to his own knowledge there was an increased distribution of copies of the 'Labour Gazette' made in London during the late election. It is a well established rule in this House that when an hon. member makes a statement of his own knowledge, every other hon. member is bound to accept it. In violation of that rule, a young gentleman, who has been granted a seat within the walls of the chamber by the courtesy of this House, chooses to prompt the minister and tells him that the statement was not true, and he did this although as a matter of fact he had no personal knowledge. When a deputy minister is permitted to come within this chamber, he is here by the courtesy of the members of this House; and if the gentleman in question should be guilty of such conduct again, I will call the attention of Mr. Speaker to the fact that there is a stranger in the House and have him ejected. Any man admitted into this chamber by the courtesy of the House has no privilege not accorded to the members of the House. This young gentleman had no right to prompt the minister because he knew nothing about the facts and was not in a position to contradict what the hon. member for East Elgin said. You talk of partisanship in the 'Labour Gazette,' what an exhibition we have had of it during the last three quarters of an hour. Here is the Deputy Minister of Labour keeping up a running conversation with his minister and prompting that minister when he had no right to do so. His duty is simply to answer questions put to him by the minister. He has given an exhibition of partisanship unworthy of any man occupying a position in the civil service. He had better be more guarded in the future because he is not occupying any position of privilege and must limit himself strictly to his duty.

Mr. EMMERSON. We have just had a splendid exhibition of valour. The deputy minister is here in the discharge of his duties, and he is the only source of information I have, as I am not connected with the Department of Labour. An hon. member says that the edition of the 'Labour Gazette' for the recent month had been increased.

Mr. INGRAM. I did not. Do not put words in my mouth which I did not say.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend said that there had been an increase in the circulation of the 'Labour Gazette' during the recent election. I asked the deputy minister whether there had been an increased number of copies issued, and he said most distinctly there had not. The circulation was not increased and the number of copies had not been in any way added to. He must have personal knowledge of that, and I may tell my hon. friend that the orders to the King's Printer and the accounts from him will verify every statement made by the Deputy Minister of Labour in that connection. My hon. friend seems to take exception to the fact that the 'Labour Gazette' was circulated in London during the recent election. I have already explained that the 'Labour Gazette' is on sale at three cents a copy. Any one can purchase copies and send them

to London or elsewhere. Would that be any crime? Is it political literature? In no sense can it be so characterized. It contains statements of facts, and surely my hon. friend is not afraid of the facts. Apparently he is. Any one could send these 'Labour Gazettes' out, and surely that would be no charge against the Department of Labour? When my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) calmly reflects he will feel that his words had been better left unsaid.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have been calmly reflecting for the last three quarters of an hour waiting an opportunity of drawing to the attention of the minister the most unseemly conduct of the Deputy Minister of Labour. I made the statement I did after the most calm reflection. We have had this afternoon an exhibition of political partisanship from the deputy minister such as I have not seen in the last 15 or 16 years. There was no necessity for his keeping up a running conversation and taking the minister's attention away from the hon. member who had the floor, merely for the purpose of prompting him with reference to matters that were not at all directly before the House, but that had come out perhaps in the newspapers. All the deputy had to do was to remain in his place until some question was put to him by the minister about the work he is here to perform. He is here with the courtesy of members of this House and had no right to prompt the minister to say that the statement made by the hon. member for Elgin was untrue. The minister has given the whole case away by admitting that there might have been a very large increase of distribution because these gazettes are on sale and may be purchased in large numbers.

Mr. EMMERSON. What harm would that be?

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not saying there is any harm, but the point I wish to make is that the minister's deputy had no right to prompt the minister to say that the member for Elgin had made a statement which was not true. The statement of the hon. member for Elgin should have been accepted without contradiction, and much less contradiction made by a minister at the prompting of his deputy. The fact is they were afraid. The word of the member for Elgin ought to have been accepted and no contradiction should have been made whatever, much less should a contradiction have been made by the minister after being prompted by the Deputy Minister of Labour.

Mr. ALEX. JOHNSTON. Before this item finally passes I desire to say one or two words. A deputy coming on the floor of this House and supplying the minister with information is not a new system. I am sure that the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has seen this plan carried out for many many years. I have seen it in operation for five years, and this is the first time in my experience that such an attack, I may say such a violent attack—an attack which I am sure the member for Halton in his quiet moments will regret—has been made upon a gentleman, let me tell my hon. friend from Hamilton, who occupies a splendid position throughout the length and breadth of this country, and who is not in a position to defend himself from the attack. Let me remind the hon. gentleman that he is making an attack upon a gentleman who has endeared himself to the workmen of this country. I am in a position to speak for the workmen of this country as perhaps even the member for Halton is not; I have a great army of workmen in my constituency who have made the acquaintance of my friend the Deputy Minister of Labour who occupies a seat on the floor, as my hon. friend says, by the courtesy of this House. Members of this House have extended courtesies like this to deputy ministers on former occasions; is there any reason why special attention should be drawn to the fact that members of this House have extended such a courtesy to the Deputy Minister of Labour? Is it because he chances to be Deputy Minister of Labour that the soul of the member for Halton is disturbed on this occasion, because the House has extended permission to him to appear on the floor of this chamber? Let my hon. friend be disturbed as he may be; it may be that the presence of my friend the Deputy Minister of Labour is a serious menace to the conscience of the member for Halton, but let me assure him that the presence of the Deputy Minister of Labour is not a menace to the great body of workmen and citizens of this country. He has supplied the acting minister with information, that is all he is doing here, and all he has done. He did not seek to contradict any statement made by any person in this House; he sought only to give to the minister information which the minister was seeking and which was necessary in order to put this committee in full possession of the facts. That is all he has done, all the crime that has been committed.

Reverting for a moment to the discussion which was in progress, what are the facts of the case, in reference to the work of the various correspondents throughout the country? As the minister has said the test of their work is the items they supply to the 'Gazette.' My friends who have found fault with the work of these men have been asked to submit for the consideration of this committee any items sent by these various correspondents published in the 'Labour Gazette,' which could in any way be construed as being of a partisan character. These hon. gentlemen have not seen fit to produce for the information of this committee the items that in their judgment were of a partisan character. I must con-

fess that I am not perhaps a very close reader of the 'Labour Gazette,' but I do read it. There is scarcely an issue published that I do not read, although perhaps rather hurriedly, but I am bound to observe that in no issue of the 'Gazette' have I any recollection whatever of reading anything that could be construed as being in any way of a partisan character. Now that, after all, is the important matter for this committee to determine. As I said before, as the minister has very well stated, the test of these correspondents' work is the items they send to the 'Gazette.' It has not been shown to the committee that their work is of a partisan character, and therefore there is no very good reason why this committee should find fault. It is, I am bound to observe, a very great pity that this gentleman mentioned by the member for Peel (Mr. Blain), who happens to be editor of a Reform paper in Belleville, does not abandon every other calling in life and confine himself strictly to the earning of this $100 salary in Belleville. It is a great pity and I hope that some official connected with the department will bring the matter to his notice and ask him to abandon every other means of livelihood, and endeavour to convince him that the proper way for him is to live hereafter on the $100 salary furnished by the 'Labour Gazette.'

Mr. HENDERSON. I do not propose to follow the member for Cape Breton through his rambling remarks outside the question to which I referred. The hon. gentleman seeks to make a point against me, and I was surprised that so many hon. gentlemen behind him cheered. Evidently they did not know what they were cheering. He said I was making an attack on a gentleman who could not defend himself.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is there an hon. gentleman in this House who has never made an attack on persons outside of this House who could not defend themselves here? If there is, let him cheer.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. They can get back.

Mr. HENDERSON. They are silent, even our cigarette friend. I exceeded no privilege, I did not go beyond my rights, I did not go beyond what any member of this House does and does day after day, criticising the actions of men outside the House. Now I think the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Alex. Johnston) will see how silly his statement, how extremely silly his argument was, and that the members of this House behind him will see how silly they were when they cheered and applauded the statement that he made when practically there was nothing in it. There is but one other point. The member says that he spent five years in this House and never heard a charge of this kind made before.

I have been here seventeen years and I never saw the necessity for it. That is my statement and my reason for making the statement I made. When I see an impropriety carried on in this House I am going to call the attention of the minister in charge to it. I am not afraid; my friend may throw out his threat, it is nothing to me; when I think anything in the House is improper I am going to draw public attention to it, and I will stand by the result. I say that I never before saw an occasion for making such a charge as I have made to-day; otherwise in all probability I would have done so. I hope and trust we will never again have an exhibition in this House such as we have had to-day.

Mr. INGRAM. In connection with the circulation of the 'Labour Gazette,' I knew it to be the case that they were being delivered to parties in London by the half-dozen and I asked for information whether the department were sending them out in that manner. I said that they were being circulated at the time of the election and the minister denied it and said that was not so which in effect meant that the statement I had made was not a true statement and the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) had certainly good reason to complain, because I think the deputy minister prompted the minister that such was not the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. All I said to my hon. friend was that the department was not circulating these papers. If there was any point in his remarks with respect to the issue and circulation of the 'Labour Gazette' as against the department it would be that the Labour Department was circulating copies. I asked the deputy minister and he told me fairly and very promptly that they were not being circulated by the department.

Mr. HENDERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was very fair, and I am sure my hon. friend will take my word for it. I have been here in this House for some years and I will say that the Deputy Minister of Labour shows that he is well informed as to his department. I have had occasion to ask him for this information, he has given it to me in a gentlemanly way, in no uncertain way and I am sure there must be some ulterior motive that would prompt a statement to the contrary.

Mr. INGRAM. I am not going to allow the minister to get away from the point. I made this inquiry, and the minister answered, no, they were not being circulated But on rising this last time he has added 'by the department,' a statement which he did not make on the first occasion. Now the statement I make is a fact. If they were circulated by some person it was done with an object, and the object was, as I have shown, to draw the attention of the

workingmen of London to certain acts of the member for that city with a view of influencing votes. There is no doubt about that. Now with respect to the correspondence for this non-partisan department. I want to impress the minister again with those words 'non-partisan.' The object in organizing the Labour Department was to obtain information on non-partisan lines, to obtain statistics in order to promote the interests of the workingmen. They felt the need of a department of that kind, and the object was to obtain information that would be reliable. The workingmen wanted it to be conducted on non-partisan lines. Now, would it not be the part of a non-partisan department to employ such men as are considered independent labour men, men who could get statistics unbiased by party considerations or outside influence ? If that is so, let me ask if the workingmen of Canada are so driven that the department cannot find among them independent workingmen sufficiently capable to act as correspondents for the department, without going out and getting, if you will, the editor of the Ottawa 'Citizen,' for instance, or the editor of a Belleville paper, for another instance ? Are there no independent workingmen in the city of Ottawa capable of furnishing correspondence to this 'Gazette,' no workingmen in Belleville who are capable ? Take my own city of St. Thomas. Mr. Roberts is a very competent and capable man, recognized as such by Liberals and Conservatives. Mr. Roberts was performing his duty well and faithfully by the workingmen of the district of St. Thomas. He is a man that will vote against me, but I do not care for that. Now why was he discharged ? He was discharged because he would not vote for the Liberal candidate, and I make that statement on the floor of the House frankly and above-board. Who was appointed in his place ? Mr. Killingsworth, who is associated with the Liberal organ of St. Thomas, is appointed to take this man's place ? Why ? Because Mr. Roberts refused to act the part as a partisan, that is the reason he was dismissed. There is no question about that, because I can prove my statement from the files of the Liberal paper in St. Thomas. Now the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) asked : Is a man going to give up his independence for the sake of a paltry salary ? I say, no. But, whoever expected that the editor and proprietor of the Belleville Liberal paper would give up his independence in the interests of labour in furnishing correspondence ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Has my hon. friend any evidence to submit as to the impartiality of this correspondence from Belleville ?

Mr. INGRAM. I have already asked the minister if the correspondence that is sent here by the various correspondents appears over their signatures when sent into the department. I say, no, it does not, and let the minister and his deputy deny it if they can.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. That is not an answer to my question.

Mr. INGRAM. It is an answer. Now, I have no fault to find with any other department of the government, except this one, acting in a partisan manner. They have a perfect right to do so. A Liberal has a perfect right to defend the government, he has a perfect right to support the government candidate. Liberals have a perfect right to take any measures they choose so long as they comply with the law of the land. But when this government runs a department which they tell the people is run on non-partisan lines, and if I can show that it is not run on non-partisan lines, I say the sooner they abandon that contention the better. Mr. Marks was employed by this department to do certain work. Now if the department was running this paper on non-partisan lines would they tell this man to prepare an affidavit in the heat of a political contest, digging up something imaginary that occurred five years ago, in order to defeat the Conservative candidate ? Is that the part of a man who is selected because of his independence ?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Is it true ?

Mr. INGRAM. It is not true. Let me tell the right hon. premier that this question involves serious consequences to the Dominion of Canada. It involves the welfare of a prominent railway in the Dominion of Canada. This American railway company has purchased a certain railway in Canada, and they are operating it. They have sent into Canada certain employees for the purpose of managing the affairs of that railway, and the Labour Department, for the purpose of influencing the votes of labour men in the city of London, appointed a certain gentleman as commissioner to take evidence and report to the government. He did so, and the government, in pursuance of his report, issued an order, and some of these alien labourers were given twenty-four days to leave the country, others were given seven days to leave the country, and others were ordered to leave forthwith. As a matter of fact the railway company is resisting in the courts the order of the government, and the question may become an international one between Canada and the United States. So I say to my right hon. friend that this is too serious a question to be kicked around as a football in a by-election. It is not a new thing for Americans to come into this country and work on railways. Every man knows perfectly well that the Grand Trunk Pacific has brought in large numbers of aliens for the purpose of working on that line. The civil engineers of Canada have complained month in and month out to the government about

large numbers of these aliens coming in. This non-partisan department, that is supposed to look after the interests of labouring men of this country, appointed Judge Winchester to inquire into these charges against the Grand Trunk Pacific. He made a report, which has been printed. Has there been any order issued for the arrest of these men ? Have any of them been given twenty-four days to leave the country, others seven days, and have some of them been ordered to leave forthwith ? No. Why has that not been done by this non-partisan department ? Why is this one particular railway selected instead of the Grand Trunk Pacific ? Why is discrimination exercised against the smaller company and the larger one allowed to go free ? Is it because there was no election going on in the country that could be influenced ? Was it not for the purpose of influencing workingmen's votes in the city of London that this smaller railway company is discriminated against ? I want to tell my right hon. friend that in the administration of this department all that has occurred recently has been sufficient to cause this government a good deal of trouble. Now one word more to the minister. I recognize that my hon. friend is now performing the duties of the Minister of Labour, and that he does not know the details of the department we are discussing. He must of necessity rely on the information given him by his deputy for the moment. Then, I want to know from the minister or his deputy, either of them for that matter, how it is that the minister is so familiar with the free working of the Liberal and Conservative party in London during the last general election and this recent by-election ? How does it come that my hon. friend is so familiar with the workers in the contests in November and in the contest which has just closed ? Was he prompted by the deputy ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I had a note placed in my hands coming into the House so that my hon. friend need not waste any breath on the deputy in connection with that.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman was not furnished with this information by the deputy I am very glad to hear it.

Mr. EMMERSON. It came from outside altogether.

Mr. INGRAM. It certainly did not come from the hon. gentleman himself, because he possibly could not know it, and if he were furnished with that information by the deputy, it would be an evidence of the partisanship of the department. The partisanship of the department is already proved by the hon. member for Cape Breton, because he says that there are partisan officials in connection with the department, and that is all I am complaining of. We do not care if other departments are conducted upon partisan lines so much, but we do want this to be a department conducted on non-partisan lines.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) was very anxious to inform the committee about the $100 paid to the correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' in Belleville. My hon. friend wished to leave the impression upon the committee that I was anxious that this gentleman should give up every other calling in order to earn $100 as correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette.' Surely the hon. gentleman could not gather that from any statement I made in the House. It was surely imagination on his part.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I was simply curious to know what charge the hon. member had to make in that connection.

Mr. BLAIN. I had nothing to say against Mr. Gillespie, but I made the statement that I did not think the minister could expect that the country, and the House would form the impression that this is a non-partisan department when this Belleville correspondent is one of the editors of the Reform newspaper in that city.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Unlike my hon. friend from Elgin, I am sure that, having made that statement, my hon. friend from Peel will be prepared to submit for the information of the committee some evidence to justify the assertion that he is a partisan.

Mr. BLAIN. In answer to that I am free to say that I cannot pick out of this 'Gazette' anything from the correspondent at Belleville that would lead me to believe that he is a partisan, but I will make this statement that if the hon. member will lay on the table of the House the correspondence as it comes from these men and allow the committee to make a complete examination of it, I think I will be able to produce evidence of partisanship.

Mr. EMMERSON. We are perfectly willing to do that.

Mr. BLAIN. However, that matter is unimportant. I make the statement that in my opinion in the city of Belleville men could be found who do not take an active part in politics as Mr. Gillespie does to act as correspondents of this 'Gazette.' My hon. friend will not differ from that statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. I suppose it would be all right to take a mild-mannered man and one who happened to be a friend of my hon. friend.

Mr. BLAIN. When I make application for a friend of mine to get such a position as that I will inform my hon. friend in writing so that he will know it and be able to deal with it in a proper way. But, that is not the point. We make the statement that the Department of Labour is surround-

ed by political partisanship. The correspondent in the city of Belleville is an active politician, the sub-editor of one of the Reform papers in that city, a gentleman who attends political meetings and who writes political reports, and we say therefore that another man who does not take this active part in politics would be better if my hon. friend comes to the decision that this should be a non-partisan department. Then we have another gentleman in the city of Chatham by the name of Snell. I would like my hon. friend to take his name down and make an examination of this case as well. Mr. Snell is a very active partisan in the city of Chatham in West Kent.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, he is not. I have known him for twenty years.

Mr. BLAIN. That is all right. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) has forgotten since he left West Kent. He has come down into what was formerly West York, but which was fixed up in the redistribution, and called Centre York. I have a better informant than my hon. friend, a gentleman who has been more recently in the campaigns in West Kent, and I am sure my hon. friend would think that he would be a better informant. I make the statement and I have no fear of contradiction that Mr. Snell is an active partisan, and takes an active part in every political contest up there. Yet, he is the correspondent of this 'Labour Gazette.' If my hon. friend will wait a moment I think I have some evidence that is a little more recent and perhaps a little more startling. In Calgary we have Mr. J. Gillespie, correspondent at $100 a year of this non-partisan 'Gazette.' Who is Mr. Gillespie? Mr. Gillespie is a gentleman who takes a very active part in every election. After the election is over what does Mr. Gillespie do? He signs the protests against members sitting on this side of the House for Calgary and he does this in the Liberal interest.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Is Mr. Gillespie still in the employ of the 'Labour Gazette'?

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend from Cape Breton should not ask information from me that he has at hand. Ask the minister. I will just stop to find out whether that gentleman is the correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette,' because I am rather interested in that myself. I will ask the minister. Perhaps my hon. friend from Cape Breton is well informed?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I follow these things.

Mr. EMMERSON. This gentleman has resigned.

Mr. BLAIN. When?

Mr. EMMERSON. Last month.

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, yes. He discharged his duty while he was correspondent. The election was in November, but the protest was signed in December. May I ask the hon. minister if Mr. Gillespie was paid for his December work by the department, because in that month he signed the protest against my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) who represents Calgary in this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. He would naturally be paid down to the time of his resignation.

Mr. BLAIN. Well, there is the condition of things. We have brought a little to light. We could present samples of a great many other cases to the committee if we wished to take up the time of the House. That is the position of the Labour Department. We find that they have in their employ active politicians and men who are not satisfied with being active politicians, but who must go even further. In this case we have a man who puts his name to the protest against the election of my hon. friend from Calgary.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Why should he not?

Mr. BLAIN. I have nothing to say about a gentleman putting his name to a protest if he sees fit to do so, but he should not be the correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' and at the same time be an active politician.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. I know that some of my friends on the other side of the House are very sore, but I want to argue this in a very quiet way.

Mr. BLAIN. After I get through.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend expect, amongst all the labour men in Canada, to find men having no ideas relating to politics in order that they may be the correspondents of the 'Labour Gazette' and receive $100 each? This is the most ridiculous discussion I have ever heard in this House. How could you expect a man to abdicate every political idea he has ever had for a position worth $100 a year? How can you expect a man to shut his eyes to the prosperity of the country, which is so evident all round him, and refuse to mention it in his correspondence to the 'Labour Gazette'? A man need not necessarily be partisan in this correspondence, because he is Liberal or Conservative; you may find men in this country who have strong political ideas, and who would make impartial correspondents; but it would be an insult to the workingmen of this country to think that you can find amongst them men who have no interest in the welfare of the country, and who are ready to sacrifice their political opinions one way or the other for a trumpery $100 a year. This discussion is ridiculous.

Mr. FOSTER. We had better go home after that.

Mr. BLAIN. I am glad I gave way so as to give an opportunity to my young friend to present his contribution to the debate. I never said anything which would

lead one to believe that a correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' should give up every avocation in life to get $100 a year. That would be a ridiculous contention indeed.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Even if a man does accept that position at $100 per year, why should he not retain his political ideas like every other citizen?

Mr. BLAIN. Why, of course, he should. It may not be good policy for the government to appoint politicians to this non-partisan Labour Department, and I do not object to them employing supporters of their party, but I do complain that not only do they select politicians who take part in elections, but that they select men who, after the election is over, sign petitions and prove themselves partisan. It is said that this man signed the petition on Sunday, and I have been told that the petition was dismissed because it was signed on Sunday, but with that I have nothing to do. At all events, we have quoted enough from the 'Labour Gazette' itself to show the minister that if he selects Liberals as contributors, he should not select active politicians.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Does my hon. friend believe that because a man is a Liberal he cannot write an honest report for the 'Labour Gazette'?

Mr. BLAIN. I certainly believe that a Reformer might be a good contributor to this 'Gazette,' although my hon. friend (Mr. A. Lavergne) may think a Conservative could not be.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. Oh, no.

Mr. BLAIN. I do repeat that if a man is going to be a contributor to a non-partisan journal, printed under the direction of the Labour Department, he should not be an active politician.

Mr. FOSTER. We have had an interesting discussion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Opinions will differ as to its being interesting.

Mr. FOSTER. I think probably a moderate man may point a lesson which the Minister of Labour might take to heart. If there is one department that has been formed by the government under the idea that it should be entirely disjointed from party politics, it is the Labour Bureau. It is not the best way to give a non-partisan character to the Labour Department by making active political partisans correspondents of this paper and this bureau. The question is not whether it is not possible for a partisan to write a reasonable and fair article on occasions, but to prove that he could do so would not remove my objection. The Labour Department will take its character from its published press and its inner spirit and work, which is shown by its compilations and publications. I appeal to members on both sides of the House if it is the best outside dress to give this non-partisan department, that heated partisans of either political party, and especially heated partisans of the party in power, should be appointed to office in connection with it? The men who know these appointments in the different localities will come to the conclusion that the Labour Department is partisan just the same as other departments of the government, and they will lose confidence in it. That you should take the subeditor of a Liberal paper and appoint him to be a correspondent of the 'Labour Gazette' is not a crime, but there was no necessity to appoint such a man. The hon. gentleman who said you could not expect him to give up his other employment for the sake of $100 a year, would not exercise any great intellectual effort if he took the other side of the argument, and said that it would have been better to have avoided appointing such a man in the first place. If you want to get this department into a position in which it will do the most good, you had better give up employing correspondents who are active political partisans. It is no compliment to the great labour organizations of this country to say that you cannot find a reasonably fair-minded man who could do this work for you a mighty sight better than a newspaper editor. The particular class of information you want can be better given by a labour man who is versed in the work of the organization than by a newspaper reporter or editor. No answer has been given to the statement made here that a gentleman in the city of St. Thomas, who had acted as a correspondent, was removed because he was not partisan enough for the government. Unless there is a fair answer given to that, it is a pretty strong condemnation of the Labour Bureau. If the dismissed correspondent were competent, why were his services dispensed with—although he was a Liberal and a non-partisan—and a heated partisan put in his place? If it can be shown that the first man did not perform his duties fairly well, there would be good ground for his dismissal, but there would be no fair ground for putting an active partisan in his place.

I want to say a word or two with reference to the 'Labour Gazette' itself. It is a little difficult to criticise this paper on the cursory knowledge a member of parliament is able to get of it. I read it occasionally, I note some things in it, but what is the object of this publication? Is it to make a readable magazine for labouring men in this country? What number is printed and distributed?

Mr. EMMERSON. Ten thousand.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, to what proportion of the hundreds of thousands of labouring men in Canada does this magazine go? There are magazines and labour papers which go into hundreds of thousands of

labouring men's homes in this country, which have all kinds of information. Is it the purpose of the 'Labour Gazette' to compete with these publications ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a statistical record.

Mr. FOSTER. I myself think that is what it should be, and therefore I have a criticism to make of it, which is that a large proportion of the space of this magazine is taken up in chronicling scissorings from the newspapers which go into the homes of the labouring men in ten thousand cases where this goes in one. I could show you page after page of these. Take the issue for May. It has a general summary of the industrial and labour conditions during April, which is helpful, and a fair thing for a publication of this kind to give ; but in addition it gives a lot of items in respect to all kinds of things under the sun which have nothing to do with a labour publication of this kind. For example :

At a special meeting of the stockholders of the Dominion Coal Company, held on April 17, it was decided to issue $7,000,000 of thirty-five year five per cent gold bonds with $3,000,000 preferred cumulative 7 per cent stock.

Why should that be in a publication of this kind ? Of what earthly use is that to a labouring man ? That is a scissoring from a newspaper, put in here for the purpose of padding out this journal or making it readable. As the minister says, the purpose is not to make this a readable and competitive journal for the workingmen. I could give dozens of these, which are good enough in their way, but have no bearing whatever on the labour of this country. Here is another :

Shares in the Hudson Bay Company have risen by nearly £20 at London, England, within the past few weeks, as a result of the proposed new transcontinental railway——

—that may be debatable—

—being quoted at over £70 during April. The capital of the company is now divided into 100,000 shares at $10 each.

Imagine the thrilling news, and how it brought comfort and added hopes of sustenance in their declining years to the large numbers of workingmen of this country who hold as an investment Hudson Bay Company shares, to be told that they had this enormous rise in the British market. This is very good for the few of a certain class who hold that kind of shares, but it is rather poor comfort to the poor workingman who has to depend on his day's labour. I could read, I was going to say nearly one-fourth of this magazine to show that it is made up of stuffings and paddings of this kind. I think that is useless surplusage ; it is expensive, and it does not serve the purpose for which this labour bureau was organized. It seems to me that what we want to get at by means of this bureau are the conditions, the wages, the betterments, the prospects of the working-people of this country, and whatever may be helpful to them. There are some things in this book that are excellent. What I want is to cut out the padding, and confine it to the real object in view. I do not know but you would do better to put the publication in the form of bulletins dealing with special labour subjects, and giving them a circulation of hundreds of thousands, in place of issuing a magazine of 130 pages once a month to a very small number of labouring men. These are some of the considerations that impress themselves as we look through these pages. I think we could keep down the expense very much and make this labour bureau much more effective if we adhered solely to the idea that it is for the purpose of digging out, examining and putting before the labouring men facts which they are not in a position to obtain for themselves, and left all these other matters to the newspapers, which attend to them more effectually, and which go into hundreds of thousands of workingmen's homes where this magazine goes into none. I wish to add emphasis to my first suggestion, that it will be better for this commission and the minister who has it in charge, if they will keep from it these outside traces of political partisanship, which prejudices it in the localities where it is known immediately, and which cannot help having its effect on the publication and on the thoroughly good aims of the department itself.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think many of the workingmen of this country will agree with the sentiments just uttered by the hon. member for North Toronto and the other members of the opposition who have spoken. I think the workingmen of this country feel that the 'Labour Gazette' is filling a long-felt want. They have desired for many years to have some medium by which they could learn the conditions of labour in the different parts of this vast Dominion. It is true, we have labour papers. We have one in the city of Toronto, but its circulation is confined largely to that city. The 'Labour Gazette' was started principally for the purpose of giving the working classes of this Dominion the news as to the conditions of trade, the scale of wages and the thousand and one things that interest them very much ; and I believe that it is accomplishing the end aimed at. The hon. member for North Toronto, with all his ingenuity, could only find two items to which he took exception. One was a report of the Dominion Coal Company. I would like to know if the men working in the mines of Nova Scotia are not interested in the condition of the Dominion Coal Company. I would also like to know if the men all over this Dominion, many of whom own stock in the Hudson Bay Company, are not interested in the affairs of that company. What are we doing for the manufacturing classes of this Dominion ? We are publish-

ing monthly returns of the exports and the imports to enable these classes to get an accurate knowledge of what is going out and what is coming in, and where the best markets can be found. We are publishing these at great expense. My hon. friend has no objection to that ; but when we publish a 'Labour Gazette' for the purpose of giving to workingmen all over this Dominion the information they want, hon. gentlemen opposite find fault with that, and try to make out that the Labour Department is a partisan department. These hon. gentlemen have been challenged here to-day, and they have not been able to show one single article in this paper that is of a partisan character. It does not matter who sends in the articles, whether they are by the city editor of the Ottawa 'Citizen' or the city editor of a Belleville paper, if they are partisan articles and are published in this 'Labour Gazette,' the department is to blame ; but unless hon. gentlemen opposite can show that these articles are partisan, they have brought no charge against the department at all. The name of Mr. Snell, of Chatham, has been mentioned. I have known him for thirty years, and he is a most competent man for this work. He is a workingman ; he votes Liberal, of course, as nearly all the workingmen of this country do, and they are doing it more and more all the time. He could not do anything else. He understands the manner in which the government are conducting the affairs of the country. He knows that the country is prospering, and being intelligent he votes for what is good and best for himself and the country. I defy the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) to take up Mr. Snell's articles during the last twelve months and find one word in them indicating partisanship. But what is all this fuss about ? The acting minister must make considerable allowance for our friends opposite. They are not in very good humour and require an outlet for their indignation. They went up to London and told the whole world that all the workingmen there were going to support Mr. Gray and that Mr. Hyman had no chance at all. They challenged us to open a seat in London. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) and the whole outfit went there and boasted they would carry London without fail. But their hopes were dashed to the ground, and Mr. Hyman's majority is sixteen times what it was last November. No wonder they feel sore.

Mr. BLAIN. What about Centre Toronto?

Mr. CAMPBELL. There is where we made the mistake. If we had gone there, we would have carried it, and it was against my judgment that we did not contest it. We would have carried it as we did North Oxford and London and Edmonton and Levis and how many more ? No wonder these hon. gentlemen are irritable. They made a vicious attack on the deputy minister. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) is going to invoke the rules of the House and have him turned out. I must say that I have never seen such an exhibition of ill-temper and chagrin as we have just witnessed. I would advise these hon. gentlemen to crawl into a hole and then draw it in after them. That would be much more dignified than wasting the time of this House and making a travesty of parliamentary government by trying to make a mountain out of a mole hill. They will no doubt learn by experience. Let them take Peruna or some other of these patent medicines, which will cure everything.

Mr. INGRAM. I am very glad the hon. gentleman has at last some courage. Only a few weeks ago he was challenged to resign his seat, but he took mighty good care not to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Why should I resign my seat and go to all the trouble and expense of running another election just to gratify my hon. friends. Would my hon. friend resign his seat ? His majority was only 16 at the last election.

Mr. INGRAM. The chunk you cut off just gave 529 of a Tory majority, but still I pulled through all the same. The workingmen have evidently very little use for the 'Labour Gazette' because only 10,000 copies of it are issued.

Mr. EMMERSON. They get it in their unions and associations.

Mr. INGRAM. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon being so well informed. But the total number is only 10,000, and therefore the labouring men evidently do not find it necessary to get it. Nor is that surprising. Associated with this department are certain men who were associating with the Ontario government for years, and when such men were brought down to this non-partisan department and when they were sent out through the country, and acted in the partisan manner they did, the workingmen lost what little faith they might have had in the Labour Department or 'Gazette.' I want a little information from the minister with respect to the difficulty on the Père Marquette Railway. I find that Mr. Hyman wrote to the department on the 2nd March. Had the minister received any other correspondence previous to that date or since in connection with this matter?

Mr. EMMERSON. There has been no other complaint laid. Hr. Hyman's was the first.

Mr. INGRAM. I understand the department had another letter.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will bring all the correspondence down.

Mr. INGRAM. Was there another letter from Mr. Hyman previous to the 2nd March in connection with this matter, and was there any other letter previous or since ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am informed by the deputy that, as far as his memory goes, Mr. Hyman's was the first letter. Several hon. members spoke to Sir William Mulock on the subject, but the first formal complaint came from Mr. Hyman.

Mr. INGRAM. Was that made on March 2?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, on March 2.

Mr. INGRAM. That was the first complaint and the first letter to the department?

Mr. EMMERSON. Except that there had been some verbal communications previous to that by an hon. member of this House.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman tell us whether there was not other correspondence since the 2nd of March from any other quarter?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Then I understand there was no correspondence with any person except Mr. Hyman in connection with this matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. A number of persons communicated with Mr. Hyman; Mr. Hyman then communicated with the Minister of Railways both verbally and by written communication. That is practically all there is in the department.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to state to the minister that during last winter, when there was a good deal of difficulty on this railway, and some changes were made in the officers of that road, I understood a number of men complained and had written to the Department of Labour in connection with the changes that were being made on that railway and that this letter of the 2nd March is the outcome of the complaint then made. Does the minister say that there was no correspondence making these complaints?

Mr. EMMERSON. The deputy does not recall that there was, although he will have a search made in the morning and if there is any correspondence copies will be furnished.

Mr. INGRAM. That ought to be satisfactory. Then again I would like to know, because I live in the place, why Mr. Roberts was dismissed. I know of no reason.

Mr. EMMERSON. The information I have is that because of the gentleman's very active political partisanship it was thought that he would be doing an injury to the 'Gazette' and his services were dispensed with.

Mr. INGRAM. I have this statement to make, that Mr. Roberts did not act in a partisan spirit as a Conservative, and did not act in a partisan spirit as a Liberal. Now how was he acting in a partisan spirit? I make that statement as a member of this House.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am only giving the reasons assigned. Of course I must accept the hon. gentleman's word anyway, but I am not familiar with the circumstances in any sense; I am only giving the reasons assigned by the department.

Mr. INGRAM. I cannot understand who would complain of a man who is not a partisan. How did he show it? As an active Liberal or as an active Conservative?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Minister of Labour was satisfied that on account of the attitude taken by that gentleman his services to the 'Gazette' could best be dispensed with. Of course it all depends on the point of view. We are very apt to look through coloured glasses occasionally, and possibly what would seem to be a very inoffensive action in the eyes of my hon. friend might in the eyes of some one else be very offensive partisanship.

Mr. INGRAM. I will make the statement to this House that if ever there was a correspondent who carried out what the aims and objects of the 'Labour Gazette' should be Mr. Roberts was doing it. In that constituency there were three candidates, my hon. friend from West Elgin (Mr. Wm. Jackson), the Liberal candidate and a third candidate who was largely a labour candidate. Mr. Roberts, instead of supporting the Conservative or Liberal candidate, supported the labour candidate, and that is the reason why he was dismissed. I am very sorry that this non-partisan department should adopt the plan, when they found a loyal, true supporter of a non-partisan department, a loyal and true correspondent on the principles which ought to be laid down in this department, of dismissing from his office. It is very discouraging for those who desire to act in a non-partisan spirit.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I observe that the item covers expenditures for outlay in connection with the Railway Labour Disputes Act. Proceedings were taken under that Act, as I understand, in connection with an arbitration between the Grand Trunk Railway and the telegraphers. Arbitrators were appointed, a reference was had and an award was made by a majority of the arbitrators, Judge Teetzel and Mr. Harvey Hall joining in the award, and Mr. Shepley, for the railway, dissenting. That award was made some months ago, I am informed, but up to the present time the Grand Trunk Railway has not in any way recognized the award or agreed to it or carried out the provisions of the finding of that award. The situation has grown so acute as the result of the railway company not complying with the findings, that I am informed a second strike is now threatened

by the telegraphers or at least that trouble is threatened between the telegraphers and the company. I desire to bring this matter to the attention of the government and to ascertain if possible the attitude of the government in regard to the administration of that Act, the enforcement of its provision, whether it is to be allowed to be a dead letter, or whether, when a reference is made under it and an award found in accordance with its terms, a party to the award is to be at liberty to utterly repudiate the findings and treat them as though no reference had been made. The matter is of great importance to the labouring classes and to the telegraphers. The Act was said to be a solution for the troubles of railway disputes, but the railway men as yet have not received any of the benefits that were predicted at the time of the introduction of the Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Before the minister explains I would like to read to the House the attitude of Mr. Hays. The member for South Toronto (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) has anticipated me in bringing it up, but in the Montreal paper this morning, Mr. Hays puts himself on record in regard to it. Mr. Hays stated to the Committee of Telegraphers who waited on him yesterday :

> That as he had already explained to them in his letters on the subject, the Grand Trunk was in favour of the principle of arbitration, but such arbitration, to be effective and equitable, must be voluntary on both sides. This was not the case in the instance of the arbitration between the Grand Trunk and the telegraphers. The company had protested, in writing, to the Minister of Labour against being forced into the arbitration, but notwithstanding the protest, it was compelled to acquiesce to the proceedings being taken under the statute, which, however, does not give the findings of the arbitrators any power of enforcement.
>
> 'Since this arbitration,' remarked Mr. Hays, 'has resulted in a disagreement on the part of the arbitrators, the company, in view of its previous notice to that effect, does not consider itself in any way committed to abide by the findings of the arbitrators, which are not in the nature of an award, as claimed by the telegraphers, but merely a report or recommendation.

Now, here is the Grand Trunk, as the member for South Toronto has pointed out, objecting to the jurisdiction of the Act, and saying they are not compelled to abide by the decision of the arbitrators and do not intend to carry out the findings. He states this to the representatives of the telegraphers who are now in Montreal trying to obtain a settlement of it. It does seem that this great and powerful corporation located in Montreal, which is in close alliance with the government, can defy the labour laws of this country, and that the smaller railroad finds these laws enforced against it. Therefore it is in order to ask the government why this law is not enforced, and why the finding which has been made by these arbitrators is not complied with by the Grand Trunk.

Mr. EMMERSON. The best evidence of the wisdom of that legislation is found in the fact that a strike has been averted. During the past twelve months that matter has been under consideration. A strike that was imminent was prevented, and today, as I understand it, the representatives of the telegraphers' union are negotiating with the Grand Trunk people in Montreal. The Act is not enforceable except in the sense that it compels an arbitration, compels the facts to be presented and an award to be given. That award is largely subject, so far as its enforcement is concerned, to public opinion. I feel that sometimes the Act does not go as far as it should. But it is a great step in advance, the greatest that has ever been taken in Canada. From the information I have the likelihood is that this matter will be settled amicably. Not long ago I met the chief of the Telegraphers Union of Canada, and at that time he seemed to think that the matter would be adjusted satisfactorily. We had some difficulty with that order a year ago, on the Intercolonial—not a difficulty, but we had some negotiations with it, and reached a conclusion that was satisfactory, both to the order itself, and to the railway.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When Mr. Hays says that the company does not consider itself in any way committed to abide by the findings of the arbitrators, does the minister consider that under the law the parties are not bound to accept the findings?

Mr. EMMERSON. If it did, it would be in defiance of public opinion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am not talking about public opinion, I am asking the minister his view as to the legality of a law.

Mr. EMMERSON. What law does he refer to?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I refer to the law of arbitration passed by the government. Under this law a reference was made to arbitrators to settle certain labour disputes, and both parties consented. An arbitration was had, a finding was made and an award was handed in. The telegraphers were simple enough to think that what had been found in their favour would be enforced. Mr. Hays says he is not bound in any way to observe the findings of the arbitrators. I ask the minister to say whether that is his view also.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it is quite correct to say that both parties consented to the arbitration, it was forced upon one of them. We pointed out, when the Minister of Labour insisted on passing this legislation, that ridiculous results of this kind would inevi-

tably ensue, and they are most ridiculous, absolutely absurd. The government of this country forces a great corporation to go into arbitration, an arbitrator is appointed, a hearing is had before three arbitrators, one of whom is a judge, and a majority of those arbitrators, as is always the case, makes an award which ought to be binding. Then one of the parties to the award simply snaps its fingers in the face of the government, as it can do under the law, and says it will deal with the situation exactly as if no award had been made. Can any one imagine a more ridiculous situation than that in which the government of this country is placed at the present time under legislation passed by itself? It insists upon an award, a hearing is had, witnesses are called, an award is made, and the Grand Trunk says, We will deal with the situation exactly as if that award had not been made; and the Minister of Railways, acting for the Minister of Labour, says, Well, this will be enforced by public opinion. What steps are the government taking at the present time in order to have this award enforced by public opinion? What are they doing about it? If that is the ultimate court of appeal to which you must look for enforcement of this award, what steps are being taken to arouse public opinion on the subject? It seems to me the best thing is either to repeal the statute or go further, and provide that any such award shall be enforceable, because it is a mere mockery to have an award made and have it treated in this way.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may say that the railway company has not so far refused to carry out that award, when a decision is reached; and they informed the department that action can then very well be taken.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They can refuse, however, can they not, under the law, it is not binding upon them?

Mr. EMMERSON. The law, as I understand it, does not enforce an award, but you can enforce the investigation that is made under the Act, you can have a public investigation, all the facts can be brought out, and the arbitrators can render an award.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the use of it all?

Mr. EMMERSON. Only in so far as the facts developed by the investigation can influence the company to enforce it.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is the government in a position to compel compliance with the award?

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Harbours and rivers—Ontario—Amherstburg harbour—improvement of channel, &c., including purchase of land, $30,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Tenders for this work were called for and the contract awarded to the Chatham Dredge Company. The total amount of dredging contemplated is $28,700.

Mr. INGRAM. What land did you purchase ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We did not purchase any land yet ; we may require to purchase some water lots.

Belle Rivière—dredging entrance channel, &c., and renewing close pile protection work, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in North Essex. The total cost is $6,500 and the dredging is to be done by contract.

Mr. INGRAM. When was this work first undertaken ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It was originally undertaken many years ago.

Mr. INGRAM. When did this particular work commence ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year.

Mr. INGRAM. Why was it not included in the report of the Public Works Department for last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That report is for the end of the previous fiscal year and this money was only voted last year.

Bayfield—repairs to north pier and dredging, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in South Huron. It is proposed to increase the dimensions of the channel and to get 14 feet depth at low water. It will be done by day labour and the total cost will be $2,500.

Mr. BLAIN. What volume of business is done at Bayfield ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a fishing village.

Mr. INGRAM. If you are going to dredge for the purpose of accommodating the fishermen, this amount may be sufficient, but I know the place very well and if you want to get 14 feet of water you will have to spend more money.

Beaverton—harbour improvements, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of North Ontario. It is to cut a channel 60 feet wide and for the construction of close pile protection bank and breakwaters 150 feet in length. The total cost is $11,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It is a very necessary work.

Blanche Rivière—improvement of, $9,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in the county of Nipissing. The vote is to provide for the removal of snags and other obstructions; the total cost will be $15,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Has this work been commenced ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any government money expended there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; the department is building a small snag boat to do the work.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is not navigable water in the sense of being connected with the sea. With the exception of a few little favoured places in the province of Quebec, the custom hitherto has been that no public money in the Dominion has been expended on this class of work. I am not opposing it ; I am in favour of it, but I want to know if the minister is introducing a new policy, and if so, we will give him lots of inland waters on which the snags require to be removed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not sure that the statement is correct, that this kind of work has hitherto been confined to Quebec, but at all events we are extending it to Ontario and I suppose that is all right.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It has not been done on Ontario inland waters, except up here between Ontario and Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been done in Temiskaming.

Bracebridge—wharf, $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete payments in connection with this work which has been built under contract ; the total cost will be $9,000.

Mr. BARR. Will this finish the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is under contract now.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I call the attention of the minister to the fact that this work is in a rather peculiar position. The wharf which has been in existence is some little distance down the side of the stream from the falls and is in a very accessible place. The present wharf is being built in an inaccessible place, and whether by the action of the falls or otherwise, a sandbar has been raised just below it, which will make it practically of no use for the larger boats unless a sufficient amount of dredging is done to enable them to reach the wharf. I would like to inquire whether it is the intention of the government to make provision for dredging across the sand-bar so as to allow the larger boats to reach the wharf.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that the wharf has been located where it is at the request of the business men of that locality. The hon. member says that another site was advocated by some persons in the locality, but it was found on survey that the present location would be more suitable. If some dredging is required to enable vessels to reach the wharf, it will have to be done. There is no vote for that, but I will take a note of the hon. member's suggestion.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. The information I have from persons who have some knowledge of the locality is that it will be practically useless without dredging. It is inaccessible to a large majority of the business men ; they are opposed to having it placed there, and they say that they will not use it.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is it not near the business centre of the locality ?

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. There is practically very little difference between the two sites, so far as that is concerned ; but it is right at the foot of the falls and is inaccessible for teams taking anything to or from the wharf. But I am not raising an objection so much to the location of the wharf, because that is a matter for the steamboat people and the town, and if both are satisfied, I am. I would like to know if any provision is to be made for dredging in order to make this wharf of practical use to the public ?

Mr. BRODEUR. If some dredging is absolutely required, we have a general vote for dredging, and the money for the work will come out of that vote.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I must compliment the government for carrying out this work. This is one of the promises made by the Postmaster General during a by-election up there. On that occasion he selected the site for this wharf, and made a very extravagant promise, and I am glad to see that it is being carried out.

Mr. PATERSON. It was a proper promise, then ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In the wrong place.

Bronte—harbour improvements, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the repairs to the east and west piers which were commenced in 1904-5. This is in the good county of Halton.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think this work was commenced as far back as four or five years ago. Will this vote complete all the work that the government propose to do in the Bronte harbour, as regards both dredging and the construction of docks ? It is desirable that the work should be completed as early as possible.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me that this will probably complete the work.

Cobourg—repairs to piers, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to make repairs to the piers in Cobourg harbour

where they are mostly needed ; 300 feet of the superstructure are to be rebuilt and filled with stone. The total cost will be $5,000. Nothing has been done yet.

Mr. BLAIN. How much has been expended there up to date ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $216,349.22. Even before confederation $62,000 was expended.

Mr. BARKER. The $3,000 voted last year is not marked as a revote.

Mr. BRODEUR. These estimates were prepared in January, and it was expected that a certain amount would be expended before 30th of June, and therefore we did not mention it as a revote.

Mr. INGRAM. In the year 1903-4 you expended about $5,000 on this harbour. Was that done by day labour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. And you purchased about 50,000 feet of lumber. What is your system for purchasing lumber for harbours of this kind ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The engineer in charge asks for quotations, and makes the purchase from the lowest tenderer. That is the general practice of the department.

Collingwood—harbour improvements, $60,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for further improvements required for Collingwood harbour, to complete the widening of the channel and improving the approaches to the dry-dock. The contract has been awarded for this work.

Mr. INGRAM. What will the total expenditure amount to ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $660,000.

Mr. BARR. Who are the contractors ?

Mr. BRODEUR. C. S. Boone for the dredging, and Joseph Battle for the construction of the wharf—the lowest tenderers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With regard to Collingwood harbour, my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who is unavoidably absent, would like to have it stand over or to have an opportunity to discuss it on some other item.

Mr. BRODEUR. There will be an opportunity on the supplementary items for next year.

Mr. INGRAM. Will they be brought down soon or only a day or two before prorogation ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably during next week.

Mr. BARR. Where does this dredge come from ? I was not aware that there was more than one in that northern region.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a Canadian dredge which has been working for three or four years at Collingwood, and which is owned by Mr. Boone.

Mr. BARKER. Is this the 'General Meade' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer thinks it is the 'Kingsford.'

Mr. INGRAM. Did it do any work in Sarnia ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BARR. Then it has been in Collingwood some years ?

Mr. BRODEUR. So I am informed by the chief engineer.

Mr. BARR. And other places ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; not during that period.

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman quite sure the name is Boone and not Bowman ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is Boone, and it is his own dredge. As far as the department knows, he is the owner of three or four dredges.

Mr. INGRAM. I notice that the department did pay Mr. Boone for towing a dredge from Sarnia to Maitland.

Mr. BARKER. You paid Mr. Boone, the year before last, $15,000 for towing his dredge from Sarnia to Port Maitland.

Mr. BRODEUR. That policy has been dropped.

Mr. BLAIN. How was the $50,000 expended which was voted for the Collingwood harbour last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $42,219.80 were paid to Mr. C. S. Boone for dredging with dredges Nos. 10 and 14. The price was $2.30 per yard.

Mr. INGRAM. And hard-pan $1.40 and mud 35 cents ; rock $2.30 per cubic yard.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To ask this item to stand would involve the standing of them all. I am content to let this pass on the understanding that an opportunity will be given to discuss it on some other item within reasonable time, or that there will be no objection to reopen the item, if the hon. member for Simcoe so desires.

Mr. BRODEUR. There will be no objection to that.

Mr. BLAIN. When will this part of the work be finished and the expenditure cease in this harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the season of 1906.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this new work or a continuation of last year's work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a continuation. The total cost will be $60,000.

Mr. BARR. Do you expect to spend it all this season ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This summer or next. If we can finish before the 1st July next we shall not require another vote, but if not we shall require a revote next year.

Mr. BARKER. I understand you have not spent a dollar yet ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; we have paid to Mr. Boone $42,219 from the 1st July, 1904, up to date ; and to Mr. Coghill, $6,540, for dredging with dredge No. 7.

Mr. BARKER. Therefore, the whole $50,000 is spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARR. And this additional $60,000 will make the total $110,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BARR. Will that finish the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We expect it will.

Mr. BLAIN. I notice last year that the minister told us that the $50,000 then voted would complete, and now you are asking $60,000 more. Yet it is the same contract.

Mr. BRODEUR. Since then there has been a contract let for an addition to the town wharf at the upper end, 75 feet by 40 feet, and besides it has been decided to improve the approaches to the dry-dock.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the price for the new work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The same prices as in the original contract.

Mr. INGRAM. Supposing the season closes, have you a continuation agreement by which the work is renewed by the contractor in the spring ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a contract and it goes on in the spring until completed.

Mr. INGRAM. So no tenders are called in the spring ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some new tenders were called for this spring because the method was changed ; it was decided to call for tenders in all cases for dredging and the contract was awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. INGRAM. Where a contract for dredging is given to the lowest tenderer at so much per cubic yard for each class of material, do the department keep a record of the time the dredge is at work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We require some officers on hand to classify, because the price is not the same for clay, sand or boulders, and at the same time to see how much dredging is done.

Mr. INGRAM. So that you have so many cubic yards of rock, &c.

Mr. BRODEUR. The inspector measures the scow. I do not think it is absolutely necessary they should keep a record of the hours, because when the contract is given by the cubic yard there is no necessity for keeping the hours. That is only necessary when it is by the day or the hour.

Depot Harbour, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete payments for 1905-6 in connection with the breakwater for the prolongation of the elevator wharf and the landing pier which are being built under contract at Depot Harbour. The total cost of the work will be $237,000. The contractors are Messrs. Davis, Haney & Miller.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the railway contributed anything towards the construction of the work at Depot Harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the contract price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The price is $157,500, and additional riprap foundation $37,500.

Mr. INGRAM. So that since 1904, when the contract price was $106,000, some new contracts have been added ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. In 1903-4 your contract price was $106,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The original contract was for $195,000. That is to say, the two amounts I have just mentioned. Then there was some riprap foundation and the construction of an addition to the elevator wharf extending from the outer end, 1,350 feet.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. As this is of use to nobody but the Canada Atlantic Railway do they pay anything to the government for the use of the wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They do not pay anything for this.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. This wharf is vested in the Crown and in the event of the government acquiring rights over the Canada Atlantic, would they have the right to use the wharf ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is to be used by all companies. At the present time there is one corporation using it a little more than any other company, but it is for the general use of the public.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the government anticipate any large expenditure by reason of the Grand Trunk Railway taking over the Canada Atlantic ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing decided yet in reference to the government taking the Canada Atlantic.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there anything being considered ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought my hon. friend had reference to the government taking running rights over the Canada Atlantic. There is nothing decided yet as to that.

Mr. INGRAM. Nothing has been decided, but there is some amount under consideration evidently by reason of the Canada Atlantic being handed over to the Grand Trunk. Am I correct in that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. No items are being considered at all ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. And there is no anticipation of the expenditure of a largely increased amount at Depot Harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Goderich harbour improvement, $70,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to complete improvements which have been undertaken in the harbour at Goderich. It is to renew a superstructure 111 feet in length on the old original part of the north pier, which is much decayed, clearing the entrance channel of drifted sand, completing repairs to south pier, and the construction of the breakwater. The total probable cost of these works will be $99,000. This is under contract.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman state the total expenditure on Goderich harbour up to the present time ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $767,617.

Mr. INGRAM. I suppose the hon. gentleman has no idea as to the trade being done there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand there is a large grain trade there ; it is one of the important ports of the lake.

Grand Bend breakwater—pier, &c., $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete a breakwater being built under contract at Grand Bend ; the amount of the contract is $21,388. This will complete.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When was the contract let ?

Mr. BRODEUR. March 26th, 1904.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was there not one let before that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that was the first contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is in my own riding and I was there last year. The work was not being carried on. I asked a question early in the session and was given to understand that the contract had been abandoned. I was anxious to know whether you had let another contract. I see you have spent $8,400, and I would like to know where that money was spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That was the estimated expenditure, but it was not expended. The chief engineer informs me that it is not likely the contract will be abandoned.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much of the work is completed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not know.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has any of it been done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no late report, as a matter of fact.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is any work going on ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Could you give an idea of the nature of the work that is being carried on.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the work that is being done now is dredging.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it being done by contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is part of the contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. When was the work to be completed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract should be completed June 30, 1905, but I would be surprised if it was completed at that time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The contract, as I understand from the reply to my question early in the session, was not under way at all and no work was being carried on. I would naturally think he would know whether the work was being carried on or not.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the information now given to me by the officers of the department. But we will look into the matter more closely and see how it stands.

Mr. INGRAM. The $21,000 includes the building of a wharf at Trenton?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. That work was given out in March, 1904, to be completed in 1895, and no work has been done yet although I think we have spent about $298.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that when the contract was awarded, this being a very exposed part of the coast, the contractor could not get his material before it was too late in the season to begin.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I realize the importance of this work, and am anxious to see it carried on as rapidly as possible. But I am a little afraid there has been some carelessness since the time is about expired and nothing practical has been done.

Mr. BRODEUR. All the necessary means will be taken to have the work carried on.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements to, $20,000.

Mr. BARKER. You took $15,000 last year, how much of that was spent?

Mr. BRODEUR. $14,594.24.

Mr. BARKER. Of this $20,000 asked for this year will any portion of that under any circumstances whatever be applied upon works for which a special vote is taken?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this is for other works. The Auditor General will not permit, where there is a special vote, that we should take anything out of this vote.

Mr. BLAIN. On this general item for dredging harbours, rivers and bridges, I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the Port Credit harbour on Lake Ontario. We have had several promises from the government in respect of that. It is a harbour that should receive some expenditure upon it. There is a small amount of ship-building done. It has a large and important starch factory, and recently a large brickmaking establishment is operating. The surrounding country is rich in agricultural products, fruit growing, &c., and there is a considerable production of building stone which is sent into Toronto. A good many bricks are also sent into Toronto and a great many more could be sent in by boat, if a small sum of money was spent upon the harbour. Some years ago the department sent an engineer, who made a report, and the acting Minister of Public Works of that day stated that as soon as a dredge was available it would be sent up to do some dredging in that harbour. That promise was repeated from year to year, and I have a promise this year from the Minister of Public Works that something would be done. A part of the year has already gone by and I have not heard anything about a dredge. I would like very much to hear the minister state that something will be spent on that harbour. I am sure the policy of the government will not be to overlook altogether those counties that are not now supporting the government, surely the minister will not apply that stern rule to the province of Ontario. I hope he will look into this question and see if it is not possible this season to send a dredge up there to dredge out a harbour, which is an immediate public necessity. I may add that it is a harbour where a large amount of coal will be brought in on Lake Ontario to supply the farmers of that section, as it is done at other harbours along the north shore of Lake Ontario. A large petition has been presented to the government containing the names of many supporters of the hon. gentleman, and I am sure the minister is neglecting his own friends when he fails to give attention to this matter. I hope the old excuse, that ought to be worn out by this time, that no dredge is available, will not be heard this year, and that the minister will see to it that a small amount, a reasonable amount, of money will be expended there in order that the residents of that village and of that southern section of Toronto township may have such an outlet for their products as is necessary in this growing time.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know anything about the merits of this case which has been brought to our attention, but I have no doubt that the facts which have been presented by the hon. member will receive careful attention at the hands of the Minister of Public Works when he arrives, and I will call his attention to the remarks of the hon. gentleman.

Haileybury (Lake Temiskaming)—wharf, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for building an enlargement of the outer section of the wharf by adding a block of 100 feet by 20 feet.

Hamilton—harbour improvements, $30,000.

Mr. BARKER. This is a revote of $30,000; why was that not spent last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Nothing was done, because there was some question of the purchase of a wharf or of the city giving a wharf.

Mr. BARKER. I think the engineer is mistaken if he says that is the reason the work was not begun last year. That is a new excuse. This money was voted a year ago, and was the subject of a lively discussion in the press up to the month of November when the elections came off. We had about once a week the statement that $30,000 was going to be expended for this work in Hamilton and about every five or ten days an officer of the government would come up and there would be a discussion with the municipal body. This would be heralded through the press. Then, later on, Major Grey would come up with plans. This went on and on until the elections were over and that was the last of it. It began again this spring and we were told that the government would go on when the city bought a wharf. That was not contemplated last year. I am not objecting to the money. If we got ten times as much we would not be getting in proportion to other places. Localities in the neighbourhood of the hon. minister's constituency and other places get far more than Hamilton. I repeat that I am not objecting to the money, but I want to know why the promise was not kept. There were most faithful promises made week after week all that summer that this work would be begun. We all knew what it meant; the government wanted to get a Liberal in for

West Hamilton. West Hamilton has delivered the goods and the city wants the money. Usually the government pays the money and does not get the goods, but this time the city of Hamilton has delivered the goods. Now pay for them.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This work in question is not in West Hamilton but in the constituency of my hon. friend for East Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. But, it was used for the whole city.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You got the benefit of it. The reason the government did not go on with it last summer was this: It was intended to build a slip about 200 feet in length, but they found when they came to ask for tenders that they would be encroaching on a wharf property adjoining and that they would be held up for damages. The question resolved itself into this: It would be a great saving to the city and it would give them a much greater frontage if they bought the adjoining wharf. They have done that and they can now start their sheet piling right from the wharf now in existence and save 250 or 225 feet of work. We will have a very much better work and it will be better for the city in every way and give them a more complete property. I may say in regard to the plans that were brought to Hamilton last year that they were brought in good faith.

Mr. BARKER. How do you know?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It was a great disappointment that the work was not gone on with last year, but it was in the interest of the city of Hamilton that the work was delayed until this year.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman say that the city of Hamilton requested the delay in the interest of the city?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Unquestionably it is.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman means to assert that?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I mean to say that the delay has been in the interest of the city of Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. That is not the question. I asked the hon. gentleman if the delay was at the request of the city?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I say that it is in the interest of the city, most decidedly and as far as benefiting West Hamilton is concerned my hon. friend is very much mistaken. It was in East Hamilton and he got the benefit of it. He stated at the polls that it was perfectly absurd to expend $30,000, that the amount should be ten times as much and that the government was not doing justice to Hamilton.

Mr. BARKER. I said a few minutes ago. If we got ten times as much we would not get what we deserve. Does the hon. gentleman dispute that? What I say is this and the hon. gentleman knows it: The government professed to be expending $30,000 last year in Hamilton but it was for the purpose of influencing the election, and it was used as he knows by the Liberal paper in Hamilton for the purpose of influencing the election. It was so used deliberately and openly a very few weeks before the election, and we had a government engineer there with plans to show that the work was going on immediately. It was all bosh; they never intended to go on with the work then, but they held it over until this spring, and when the work was to be gone on with this spring they wanted the city to buy the wharf.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am satisfied the government acted in good faith.

Mr. BARKER. How do you know the government acted in good faith?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I know they did. I know it was in the interest of the city of Hamilton and the hon. gentleman knows very well that had that work gone on perhaps it would have been worse for himself.

Mr. BARKER. Do you mean that I would have lost some votes?

Kincardine harbour—repairs to piers and dredging, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is proposed to apply that sum as follows: Widening and deepening the entrance to Kincardine harbour, $1,500. More or less filling takes place in the spring freshets. Second, repairs, $1,000.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to ask the hon. minister when he expects the dredge will be at Kincardine harbour. It is very important that the dredging should be done.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract has been let for dredging and it is expected that the work will go on immediately.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that a year ago the government engineer was there and recommended that the pier be extended further out into the lake to keep the wash from bringing the sand into the entrance.

Mr. BRODEUR. This question is under consideration.

Mr. BLAND. Some four or five years ago or probably more there was an undertaking instituted by the government—I do not know whether the present government or the former government—to construct a dam across the river 40 or 80 rods farther up. The river comes down, runs through the harbour and brings the wash down in the spring of the year and it is from there that most of the sediment is deposited in the harbour. It is believed by the people of the district that this would be a good move, and I would like to ask the minister if it has ever been contemplated since?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the diversion of the river has never been contemplated.

Mr. BLAND. It was not the diversion of the river but the building of a dam.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it has never been considered by the department. The officers will note it.

Mr. BLAND. It was a few years ago, but I do not know by what government.

Lake Temiskaming—wharfs, $3,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to cover the cost of completing a wharf commenced at Dawson's Point to provide landing and shipping accommodation. This will complete the work.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. We have already voted a sum for the Haileybury wharf. At what point is this wharf to be constructed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. At Dawson's Point.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Where is Dawson's Point ?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the Ontario side.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Where on the lake is it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand it is at the head of the lake. It is between Wabbey's bay and the head of Lake Temiskaming.

Mr. BARKER. Why do you say 'wharfs' ? Are you building several ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a mistake ; it should be 'wharf.' We are only building one because we could not build many with this sum.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. $3,000.

Mr. INGRAM. How far is that from Haileybury ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About 4 miles.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. Is is near New Liskeard ?

Mr. McCOOL. New Liskeard is between Haileybury and Dawson's Point and about 4 miles from Haileybury. Haileybury is in a deep bay and Dawson's Point is the point beyond that. I suppose it is about 4 miles from New Liskeard. Going around the bay it would be about 8 miles from Haileybury, but straight across it would be about 4 miles.

Mr. BLAIN. What business is done here ? I suppose this is an important place and that there is no provision for business.

Mr. BRODEUR. The country is being opened up and there is a very large exportation of lumber and agricultural products on Lake Temiskaming.

Little Current—improvement on Northern steamboat channel in Georgian bay, $50,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract and the total cost will be $190,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What will be necessary next year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $75,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Can the minister give any idea as to the number of vessels that will use this channel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the highway for all the boats passing through the north channel, and is a very important place.

Mr. BARR. Who has the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Boone, at $2.60 per cubic yard ; it is all rock.

Mr. INGRAM. Where did the demand come from for this large expenditure ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The municipality of Manitowaning, Victoria Harbour Lumber Company, the mayor of Little Current, the Liberal Association of Little Current, the Collingwood Board of Trade.

Mr. BARKER. Has the contract for the whole work been let to this contractor ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Only for the present work ; it can be stopped at any moment.

Matchedash bay—improvement of channel between Fesserton and Wabashene, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The contractor is Mr. Prendergast, the lowest tender.

Mr. INGRAM. We should like to know more about this vote.

Mr. BRODEUR. The work is to secure 11 feet at low water on the Georgian bay for a minimum width of 100 feet ; the depth now available being only 7½ feet.

Mr. INGRAM. Who made the demand for this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a petition in the department of the 8th of April, 1904, from the residents of the townships and a number of villages in the vicinity.

Meaford harbour—improvements, $66,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to make provision for building a new pier at the north side of the harbour, and dredging in front of the pile work. It is under contract and the contractors are Kastner and Porter of Wiarton. The contract price is $59,800.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total estimated cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $74,000, including dredging.

Midland harbour—improvements, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked for dredging slips and $7,000 pile wharfs in Midland harbour, and making most urgent repairs to the approaches to these wharfs. The estimated cost is $7,000.

Mr. BARKER. Was the $20,000 voted last year all spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, mostly in dredging.

Mr. BARR. Who has the contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. A. Macdonald.

Newcastle—repairs to pier, $3,300.

Mr. BRODEUR. The total cost will be $3,300.

Mr. BLAIN. When will it be completed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will be done by day labour during this season.

Oliphant wharf, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. I move that this item be struck out ; the work has been done.

Mr. INGRAM. How does it come that it appears in the estimates ?

Mr. BRODEUR. When these estimates were prepared in January last we did not think the work would be done during the present fiscal year but it has been done.

Ottawa—wharf at foot of Rideau canal, $5,000.

Mr. BARR. What about this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The Ottawa Improvement Commission is about to do some work which may have an effect on this wharf, and it has been delayed in order that we may know what the Ottawa Improvement Commission may do.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How is it that you did not know about that before you prepared this estimate ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The intention of the department is to combine plans with those of the Improvement Commission.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I suppose when this estimate was prepared the department was expected to do all the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is expected that the work will be done by the department, but we will combine the plans of the Improvement Commission and those of the government.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What change do you expect to be made ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is very hard to know at present, because we are awaiting the decision of the Improvement Commission in order to make our plans.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is that going to increase the expense of the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; it is simply to combine the plans.

Owen Sound harbour—dredging and pile protection works, &c., $10,000.

Mr. BARR. Who is doing this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. E. F. Bowman.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is in Mr. Bowman's district, I understand ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BARR. Is the work done by contract, or is it at so much per cubic yard ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is at 15 cents per cubic yard for clay, sand, gravel and boulders.

Mr. BARR. Will this finish the work in Owen Sound ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; I am informed that some more dredging will have to be done.

Mr. BARR. Then this is not a contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is like all the dredging contracts, at so much per yard for the season.

Mr. HENDERSON. I suppose, as a matter of fact, this is a sort of hardy annual ? It comes up every year.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the total expenditure up to date on the Owen Sound harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $379,000 up to the 31st of December, 1904. Prior to confederation $13,000 was expended.

Mr. BARR. Can the hon. gentleman give us any idea of how much it will yet take to complete the Owen Sound harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as the piers and wharfs are concerned, everything is finished now ; but there is always some dredging to be done.

Parry Sound wharf, $8,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract. The vote is to make provision for the construction of a pile wharf, 30 feet wide and 500 feet long, on the north side of Parry Sound harbour. The amount of the contract is $8,935. The total cost is estimated to be $9,800.

Petewawa wharf, $4,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for completing a pile wharf, with a view to affording sufficient accommodation for steamers plying between Pembroke and Des Joachims. The total estimated cost is $6,000.

Pembroke wharf, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract. The contractors are Messrs. Poupore & Company. This wharf is at the foot of Albert street, which leads to the market square and the centre of the town. It is 1,720 feet long, and will reach a depth of 10 feet at low water on the Ottawa river.

Penetanguishene—dredging and other improvements, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for dredging in the main channel in order to meet present requirements, and also for repairing the reformatory lighthouse pier. The total cost will be $32,000. The dredging is under contract to the Owen Sound Dredging Company, the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BARR. What are the names of the people in that company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We do not have the names of the shareholders.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Do not the hon. gentleman's officers know ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BARR. Is this the same company that has the Owen Sound dredging ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Point Edward—dredging, $17,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract. It is for the dredging of a channel of a minimum width of 200 feet to a depth of 21 feet, extending for a distance of about 3,000 feet. The contract has been awarded to the Sarnia Bay Lumber Company, the lowest tenderer.

Mr. INGRAM. Where is that dredging done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Near the Grand Trunk Railway freight sheds, and a new grain elevator to the south of those sheds in a southerly direction to deep water. This is to remove the shoals from the sides of the channel.

Port Burwell—harbour improvements, $50,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to construct the following works, which are recommended by the chief engineer : A substructure of ballasted woodwork and a superstructure of concrete, to protect effectually the entrance to the harbour formed by the Dominion government at Port Burwell at an expenditure of $220,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is the chief engineer of the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Lafleur. Mr. Friel is the engineer at the work.

Mr. INGRAM. There is no change in the engineer at the works ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Port Bruce—wharf, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimated cost is $11,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that intended for dredging purposes ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There will certainly be some dredging to it.

Mr. INGRAM. Will that be taken out of the $11,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Port Dover—harbour improvements, $5,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for completing the renewals and repairs commenced in 1904-5 at Port Dover piers.

Mr. MACDONELL. Has any successor been appointed to the late Major Gray, engineer in charge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, Mr. Pink, who was resident engineer in London, has been transferred to there.

Port Hope—repairs to piers and dredging, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the estimated cost of the repairs necessary to the harbour works. The total estimated cost is $4,913.

Port Stanley—harbour improvements, $70,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for carrying out the works during the fiscal year on the two breakwaters, let by contract, in order to afford protection and greater accommodation and facilities called for by the present and prospective large increase of traffic at that port, particularly the landing of large quantities of coal from the United States for consumption in western Ontario. Total probable cost $115,000.

River Otonabee—dredging at Peterborough, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is done by the government dredge.

Mr. BARKER. Are the $1,000 voted last year spent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Rondeau harbour—improvements, $70,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for carrying on the work during the fiscal year 1905-6 on the breakwater at Rondeau. The construction work on the breakwater is to be let by contract ; and there will be day labour on the repairs as well which are required on the entrance to the piers. Total cost estimated $111,000.

Sarnia—dredging, $10,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract to the Sarnia Bay Lumber Company at 17 cents per yard.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the company which is dredging at Point Edward ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. How much will the dredge earn per day at that price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That dredge will do about 1,000 yards per day and earn $170.

Mr. BARKER. Is this the company which has a lumber yard where the works are being done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is probably the same company.

Mr. BARKER. Did not this lumber company get work done by Mr. Boone at the expense of the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. The engineer does not know.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Boone had the work at Sarnia at $12 an hour. Are you quite sure he has nothing to do with the work at this point ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are ; it is not he.

Saugeen—improvements at mouth, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to carry out the works necessary to afford safe landing and shelter for shipping. It will require $9,750 to complete.

Mr. BLAND. I was talking to Mr. Bowman the other day and he told me the channel had changed.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was awarded to Mr. Bowman.

Mr. BLAND. What is the price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Twenty-five cents per cubic yard. It is hard pan.

Spanish river—dredging, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a revote. We could not do anything last year because we could not find any dredge to do the work.

Mr. BARKER. What is the depth at Spanish river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not more than five feet and we shall make it nine or ten feet.

Mr. BARKER. That will mean a very deep dredging. I thought that Spanish river was really not a harbour at all and you are constructing a harbour where there is none.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are dredging the channel. There is a shoal there.

Thessalon—breakwater, $8,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the works in connection with the breakwater and pier. It is under contract. The amount of the contract is $19,000, and the contractors are Boyle Bros., of Sault Ste. Marie.

Thornbury—dredging, $6,750.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is under contract to H. W. Prendergast at 14 cents per yard. It is clay and sand.

Toronto harbour—eastern entrance, $28,000.

Mr. MACDONELL. I have to call attention to a matter of considerable and immediate importance to the shipping interests at Toronto, and I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here. I refer to the inadequacy of the alarms or fog signals or bell buoys at the eastern piers, and the entrance to Toronto harbour. The fog-horn instead of being, as marine men claim it should be, on the southeastern extremity of the pier, that is out in the lake is far inland, practically in very nearly the centre of Toronto bay. The fogs of the month of June are upon us and there is a serious menace to navigation at Toronto, because of what I have mentioned. The matter was brought to the attention of the House about this time last year by the late member for West Toronto (Mr. E. F. Clarke) who spoke on the matter in the House on June 13, 1904, and explained the condition that existed from the fogs. That condition exists to-day because of the fogs prevalent on the north shore of Lake Ontario at this season of the year. On June 15 of last year the government's attention was again called to the matter by the late member for West Toronto and the Minister of Marine in answer to Mr. Clarke's question admitted that complaints had been received by the department because of the insufficient equipment of bell buoys and bells at the eastern gap at Toronto. Complaints he said had been received from the following navigation companies : Lake Ontario, Richelieu and Ontario, Niagara and St. Catharines and Niagara Navigation Company. As was pointed out on that occasion, numbers of excursion parties, composed principally of women and children, are carried on the vessels of these lines at this season, and the absence of proper fog signals certainly was an absolute menace to life and property. The minister then promised he would rectify the matter, and said :

> Before the receipt of these complaints the department had already taken steps to establish a powerful fog alarm operated by compressed air at this place, and it is expected that the same will be in operation this summer.

That was last summer, but nothing has yet been done. The matter is one of urgency, and I call the attention of the minister to it, and urgently appeal to him that something ought to be done at once to have a fog horn placed in proper position. It must not be overlooked that these piers extend far into the lake on one side and into the bay on the other, affording a very narrow channel for this entire distance and it is almost impossible to make this channel in foggy weather unless there are proper lights and signal equipments. It is a matter of importance to the marine men of Toronto and along the north shore of Lake Ontario as well as to the people of Toronto. It would not involve much expense but simply a rearranging of the fog signals which are necessary for the protection of life and property.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows that this matter does not come under the Department of Public Works, but under Marine and Fisheries. The Department of Public Works is simply looking after the construction of wharfs and harbours ; the

equipment referred to appertains to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I shall certainly call the attention of the Minister of Marine to these facts.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I wish to speak of the expenditure for the eastern entrance to the harbour.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will explain what it is. It is proposed to apply this amount in driving sheet piles 25 feet long along the north end of the eastern pier at the eastern entrance of the harbour for a length of 1,400 feet. The estimated cost will be $28,000.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Has the contract been let?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, the contract has not been let.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Can the minister say when it will be let? The work is urgently needed. Tenders were called for in November.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not for this work. No tenders have been called for because the money was not voted.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. You do not always wait for that to award the contract?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have to wait until we have the money from the House.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. It is not always the custom I understand?

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes, it is.

Toronto harbour—extension of island breakwater, $60,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision towards the protection of the lake shore of the island at Toronto harbour by extending the present breakwater in a westerly direction, 1,500 feet. Two rows of sheet piles will be driven 8 feet apart from 6 feet to 18 feet, the tops remaining 6 feet above water level. I cannot give the estimated cost because we are calling for tenders now.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. If I am correctly informed tenders for this work were called for and received, and after having been held by the department for some considerable time were returned to the tenderers without any explanation for their return and without any contract being awarded. The same thing occurred in January. Tenders were again called for and after having been submitted to the department with the usual deposits, they were again returned without any contract being awarded and without any explanation. This work is urgently needed and I would like to have some statement from the minister as to the reason why tenders were called for on these two occasions and returned without the work being awarded.

Mr. BRODEUR. The specifications call for steel piles. I understand the tenders put in gave different qualities of piles which rendered it impossible for the department to judge which was the best or even the lowest tender, and so they had to return the cheques and tenders. We have called for new tenders.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Does that explanation cover both occasions?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I would again like to bring to the notice of the government the fact that although these estimates are brought down for this special work this does not attempt to cover the necessary work at Toronto harbour. These are works connected with the outskirts of the harbour, the breakwater and the island, but the real work of the harbour of the city of Toronto is being neglected and has been for many years past. That harbour is filling up rapidly from the sediment and deposit made by the Don river. That deposit and silt is coming down that river to an alarming extent each year, and is rapidly filling up the entire bay or what is called Toronto harbour. The government have had engineers from the department there, in fact recently, to endeavour to arrange some scheme by which that harbour could be protected. The harbour is filling up according to the estimates of the government's own engineers, at the rate of about five acres of silt to a depth of about 10 feet every year. The result is that about one half of Toronto harbour to-day is not navigable. Only the parts that remain navigable are those that are taken over at the expense of the harbour commissioners and the City of Toronto, who dredge at their own expense the various piers where steamboats and vessels land. I hope the government will see fit to make some appropriation in the estimates for the work of dredging the harbour proper, and also for diverting the course of the River Don. I would ask the minister to see if something cannot be done with regard to this matter, and to make an appropriation in the supplementaries for that purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will be glad to call to the attention of the Minister of Public Works the remarks of my hon. friend with regard to Toronto harbour. But he must admit that a good deal of money has been expended on that harbour in late years.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The money has not been spent in Toronto harbour proper, but upon breakwaters. I would further point out that about four years ago the city spent about $100,000 on this particular work, on the distinct understanding with the then Minister of Public Works, that for all time thereafter the city of Toronto should be relieved of any further expenditure regarding this particular work, and

the government at that time took upon its own shoulders and took off the shoulders of the city, the work of maintaining for ever Toronto harbour, the breakwaters and approaches thereto. The city has done its share, and now we think the government should do their share. Toronto harbour is one of very great importance, practically the only harbour of refuge and shelter on the north side of Lake Ontario the whole way up. It is not only a matter of local interest, but of provincial interest. Toronto harbour is just as much a government harbour as that of Quebec or Halifax. The shipping is very extensive, and we think the city is entitled to more consideration than the government has given it, or than these estimates provide for. We hope that in the supplementaries some provision will be made for dredging the harbour proper. It is a work that must be done sooner or later.

Mr. BRODEUR. As regards the treatment of Toronto harbour, I do not think the hon. gentleman has any reason to blame the government. If I were to make a comparison between Toronto harbour and Montreal harbour—I do not see any appropriation for Montreal, but there is an appropriation of $88,000 voted this year for Toronto harbour.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Does the minister consider the freight sheds recently erected in Montreal harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not erected by this government, but by the city of Montreal, the government is not paying a cent for these sheds and all these improvements. But some years ago the government built a wharf down the river at a cost of $500,000 or $600,000.

Wiarton—dredging, $9,000.

Mr. BLAND. Where is the dredging to take place in that harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to dredge the harbour to a depth of 16 feet at low water between the town dock and the breakwater.

Mr. BLAND. Will the minister inform me whether any dredging is to be done at the new cement works that have been started there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not contemplated now.

Mr. BARR. Who has the contract for dredging ?

Mr. BRODEUR. E. F. Bowman.

Lake Dauphin—lowering of, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is called for by the resident engineer in Manitoba for the use of commerce, and for clearing the bed of the river of boulders, gravel, &c., below the entrance.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. How much has been spent on that work altogether ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From confederation to date the total amount spent there is $32,000.

Mr. STAPLES. When was this work begun ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Four or five years ago.

Mr. STAPLES. I understand that a petition has been sent down asking for some other improvements on Fairford river.

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister does not remember having received a petition.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it would be well to know the nature of that petition before this item is passed. I would like to have the item stand over.

Mr. BRODEUR. The petition has no connection with the Fairford river.

Mr. STAPLES. I think it has a good deal to do with the place where this dredge is working and the railway.

Mr. BRODEUR. There will be something in the supplementary estimates for further improvements in Manitoba, and we will then have the information.

Mr. BURROWS. I am perhaps more familiar with this locality than the minister. Unfortunately there is only one dredge that has been employed on Lake Manitoba for the last four years, on different parts of the lake, principally at the Fairford river. The whole of Lake Manitoba is in my district, and I am confronted with this difficulty, that there is only one dredge on the lake, although dredging requires to be done at different points. I have been pressing the department myself to have works undertaken in other places. My hon. friend from Macdonald is interested in Oak Point, but the difficulty is that the department has not sufficient equipment to do all this work at one time. I do not think the work at Oak Point is as necessary as it is at certain other places on the lake, but I can quite understand the hon. gentleman raising the objection he does, because this is in his own constituency. While I am on my feet I just wish to ask the hon. acting Minister of Public Works to see that the dredging work which has been started on Lake Manitoba is continued as vigorously as possible, because it is beyond the power of one dredge to carry out all the work that is needed at the present time. The difficulty is that each locality asks that its work shall be done first.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Was there not a new dredge purchased a year or two ago ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; there was a dredge purchased, but it was purchased more than two years ago. I may say in regard to what my hon. friend (Mr. Burrows) has said, that the department is considering now the question of providing further equipment for

Lake Manitoba. I do not think it can be done this year, but the government is seriously considering the question.

Mr. STAPLES. I had occasion last fall to go up to Lake St. Francis, and there was a dredge working there a mile or two from Lake Manitoba. It was landed there last winter.

Mr. BURROWS. That was on Lake St. Francis ?

Mr. STAPLES. It was only a short distance from St. Laurent. I know that the people sent a petition to the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. When ?

Mr. STAPLES. Since this session began. That petition is in connection with this particular piece of work that I spoke of. I might also ask the hon. acting Minister of Public Works what has been done re certain claims that the people are making up there for damages occasioned to certain property by work done by the department ? I have received several letters from Mr. M. J. Mulverhill asking for compensation in connection with this particular piece of work.

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister is not very sure, but he thinks these claims for damages have been referred to the engineer for consideration and report.

Mr. STAPLES. I know they have been referred to the engineer several times, but still the claim is being made.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer informs me that he is now considering the question of these claims.

Mr. STAPLES. When may I expect an answer as to what is going to be done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably when the supplementary estimates are brought down he will have completed his report, and the minister will be in a position to give the hon. gentleman the information.

Mr. TAYLOR. And when the supplementary estimates come down the hon. gentleman will be able to give some information about the petition ?

Mr. BRODEUR. These claims are now engaging the attention of the chief engineer and the department, and we will probably be in a position when the supplementary estimates come down to give the necessary information and findings.

Mr. INGRAM. Have the department purchased a tug in connection with this work yet ? Representations have been made, I understand, that it was necessary to have a staunch tug to handle this dredge.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; we have purchased a tug.

Mr. INGRAM. Where was it built, and from whom was it purchased ?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BURROWS. The tug which was bought by the government was one which had been used on Lake Manitoba for a series of years, a tug called the 'Carberry,' and operated by the quarry company. This quarry company went out of existence and they sold the tug, I think, at a cheap rate to the government. The government bought the tug instead of building a new one.

Mr. INGRAM. For what price ?

Mr. BURROWS. I could not say the price.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed the price was $9,500.

Mr. INGRAM. Then it must have been a pretty staunch tug.

Mr. BURROWS. It is a good tug.

Lake Dauphin—lowering of, $2,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a revote.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This is an item that has appeared for several years. Has there been any expenditure thus far ; and if so, how much ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; in 1902-3 there was an expenditure of $470, and, in 1903-4, an expenditure of $224.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the government received any letters or petitions protesting against the damage resulting to the settlers in that neighbourhood because of this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The officers are not aware of any complaints.

Lake St. Francis outlet—construction of guide piers and dredging, $6,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to provide for the dredging of the channel through the basin excavated at the inner end of Lake St. Francis outlet.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it under contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; it is being done by the government dredge.

Mr. INGRAM. Is this the same dredge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Quarry channel at Narrows, Lake Manitoba—dredging approach to landing and harbour, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for improving the approach to the landing and harbour of Quarry Channel, at the Narrows, Lake Manitoba.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has there been any expenditure ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The resident engineer states that owing to the fact that the dredge 'Manitoba' was fully employed on Lake St. Francis, it was found impossible to touch the work at Quarry Channel during the first six months of the fiscal year, nor can it be done during the remainder of the fiscal year.

Selkirk—extension of wharf, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is called for by the resident engineer to provide for repairs.

Mr. INGRAM. There has been some money expended on this already ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; we built the wharf, and there has been an expenditure of some $17,713.

Mr. TAYLOR. By contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; these are repairs.

Mr. INGRAM. By day's work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Wharf on Lake Winnipeg at Gimli—repairs, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to provide for building an additional wing, 100 feet in length by 20 feet wide, at the outer end of the government wharf at Gimli, Lake Winnipeg.

White Mud river—dredging at mouth of, $1,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to be expended in widening and deepening the channel through the bar in Lake Manitoba, at the mouth of White Mud river.

Winnipegosis—dredging channel at the mouth of the Mossy river, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked for to continue the work of dredging a channel 6 feet deep at low water on Lake Winnipegosis, at the mouth of the Mossy river.

Northwest Territories—harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $5,000.

Mr. INGRAM. How much of this vote was spent last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,151.06.

British Columbia—Anderson and Kennedy lakes—clearing outlets, $2,500.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this complete the work?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is supposed to.

Chilliwack—wharf, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for accommodation of fishermen and landing facilities for two lines of railway steamers. This is a new work estimated to cost $3,000.

Columbia river—general improvements, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for diverting the channel of the Columbia river to prevent further erosion of the banks, estimated cost $15,000.

Columbia river—removal of obstructions above Revelstoke, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. For removal of dangerous rocks and boulders on the 50 mile stretch between Revelstoke and Deadman's rapids. The work is to be done by day labour.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister know what wages are paid ; are they high in British Columbia ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not very high.

Columbia river—improvements above Golden, $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total estimated cost of this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It will require about $10,000 more.

Columbia river—improvements below Golden, $3,000.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is expected to complete the work.

Columbia river below Revelstoke—improvement of navigation to Arrow Head, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to improve the Columbia river where it enters Arrow Head lake by constructing a wing dam. The object is to confine the waters to a narrow channel in order to give sufficient strength of current to remove the silt at the foot of the island and allow logs to pass at any state of the water. It is done by day labour.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there an inspector on the work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a local inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. What is he paid ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we pay $125 per month.

Mr. BLAIN. What proportion of the total expenditure will the inspecting cost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We generally add 10 per cent to the cost of the work, but it never comes to that.

Fraser river—improvements of ship channel, protection works, &c., $25,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for maintaining, renewing and strengthening present works for the improvement of the ship channel and the protection of the banks from erosion ; also for wharfs and other incidental works in connection with this important highway of navigation.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is doing this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have an inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. Who recommends the appointment of these inspectors ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose it is the member for the county.

Mr. BLAIN. Have they any special qualifications for this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They must have some experience.

Mr. BLAIN. Who is the inspector here ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. J. Gourlay.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $3,000.

Mr. INGRAM. How much of this vote was expended last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,575 to the 1st of January.

Langly—wharf and protection of river bank, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for protection work required for the safety of this wharf and the erection thereon of a warehouse, and also to prevent the erosion by the river.

Mr. BLAIN. What are you erecting a warehouse for ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a shed to put the freight in.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is for the accommodation of the farmers along there.

North Thompson river—improvements, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the removal of obstructions to navigation in the river.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this a new work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. We had a vote last year of $5,000, which was expended.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the river navigable ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the traffic on that river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are now two steamboats plying on both branches of the river.

Salmon river—removal of driftwood and other obstructions, $1,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to complete the work ?

Mr. HENDERSON. This is not for the purpose of promoting navigation, but rather for the purpose of enabling mill owners to float logs. Is that the usual policy of the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. Not only navigable rivers, but other rivers are under the control of the federal parliament. It has been the policy of the department for many years to do this kind of work in British Columbia, and also in Quebec.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think some of the men engaged in the lumber business in Nova Scotia will be glad to know of that policy, because they have been doing this work themselves at their own expense.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some of the lumbermen of Ontario will also be glad to know that they can have the rivers cleaned out for them, so that they can float their logs down.

Victoria harbour—dredging and removal of rocks, &c., $25,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required for continuing the work of deepening the inner harbour to a uniform depth of 17 feet.

Mr. BLAIN. Is this done by contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, by the government dredge.

Mr. BLAIN. What does it cost per day to operate a dredge in British Columbia ?

Mr. BRODEUR. About $125.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total cost of this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The total amount expended in the harbour so far has been $330,000. This is simply to carry on the dredging of the harbour which is required every year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this to continue for ever ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We shall have to continue it for several years to come.

Mr. BLAIN. Does any of the removed material come back or is new material removed every year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. New material is removed every year.

Williams Head quarantine station—improvements, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is required to complete the renewal of 7½ miles of service pipe. 4½ miles of it is already placed. This is done by day's work.

Harbours and rivers—generally, $8,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the usual vote. The amount expended last year was $8,547.

Dredging—dredge vessel repairs, $75,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for defraying the cost of the general repairs required to all machinery, dredges, tugs, scows and barges of the government in the different provinces in the Dominion, namely : the maritime provinces, $25,000 ; Quebec and Ontario, $29,800 ; Manitoba, $7,000 ; British Columbia, $10,000 ; and unforeseen expenses, $2,800.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the life of a dredge that works every year ?

Mr BRODEUR. We have a dredge in British Columbia which has been in existence about twenty years. It is getting old, but it is still giving good service.

Mr. BLAIN. How much would be expended on it every year for repairs ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no figures of the cost of the repairs for each dredge.

New dredge and scows for Prince Edward Island, $40,000.

Mr. BLAIN. Give us some information on this.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the construction of a steel dredge that will carry a two-cubic yards steel dipper hoisted by a single wire rope from the main engine, and will be able to dredge from 6 feet to 28 feet deep. It is intended to work in both fresh and salt water. It has been made by contract, the amount of the contract being $49,550.

New dredging plant—Ontario and Quebec, $65,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to provide new dredging plant in Ontario and Quebec called for by the chief acting engineer, namely: New dredge to replace the dredge 'Challenge'; new hull for dredges No. 6 and 'Nipissing'; new tug for dredge 'Nipissing,' new tug; new hull and boiler for tug 'Sensation'; two sets of swinging engines; two pull backs; new locomotive boiler, and unforeseen expenses.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why were those new scows and other implements required? What became of the former ones?

Mr. BRODEUR. The former ones were too old.

New dredging plant—Manitoba, including self-propelling snag boat.. .. ..$10,000
New tug for dredge, Manitoba.. 10,500
$20,500

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the construction and purchase of the following new dredging plant to be operated in the province of Manitoba namely: A properly equipped self-propelling snag boat for work in Assiniboine and Red rivers; a staunch tug to accompany the newly acquired dipper dredge in Manitoba, which is operating on the lake of the same name.

Mr. INGRAM. How much is that to cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. The estimated cost is $25,500.

Mr. INGRAM. Will that mean any additional boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. A tug and snag boat.

Mr. INGRAM. Who made the boats?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not made yet.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why not ask for sufficient money at once?

Mr. BRODEUR. The contract for the snag boat has been given to the Polson Iron Works, and the chief engineer thinks the price is $29,000. The contract has been given since the estimates were prepared.

Mr. HENDERSON. How are you going to pay for all this plant when you only ask $25,500?

Mr. BRODEUR. There was money voted last year.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has any portion been paid?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we pay only on delivery.

Mr. HENDERSON. That vote will lapse the 1st July.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is provided in the contract that some amounts may be paid on progress estimates, and a part of the estimate for the current year will be paid.

Mr. BARKER. Provided some work be done?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

New dredging plant—British Columbia, including new snag boat to replace 'Sampson,' and new dredge to replace 'Mudlark,' also an additional dipper dredge, &c., $150,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make special provision for the following dredging plant urgently needed in British Columbia. Amount of contract for the construction of a new snag boat to replace the old worn out 'Sampson,' $22,500; amount of contract for the construction of a tug with steel hull to attend the dredge to be built to replace the dilapidated worn out 'Mudlark,' $24,750; two new dredges, one hydraulic, $120,000 and one dipper, $70,000; four new hopper scows, 300 cubic yards capacity, $32,000; new snag boat for Skeena river, $25,000; to cover unforeseen expenses, inspection, &c., $5,750.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who is building this plant?

Mr. BRODEUR. William Turpin of Victoria is building the two first items under contract.

New dredging plant generally, $150,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is proposed to apply during the fiscal year this money in the construction of new plant urgently needed to meet the exigencies of the government dredging service throughout the Dominion.

Mr. WILMOT. With regard to the new dredging done, I would like to refer to the dredging being done in the harbour of St. John. I understand it requires a special dredge and would like to know what kind of a dredge is required.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is nothing decided as to that yet, but the matter is under consideration.

Dredging—Maritime provinces, $155,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is required to operate during the fiscal year the government dredging plant of the maritime provinces, namely, the 'St. Lawrence,' the 'Canada,' the 'New Dominion,' the 'Prince Edward,' the 'George McKenzie,' the 'Cape Breton,' the 'New Brunswick,' tug 'Critic,' tug 'Roma,' 'W. S. Fielding,' new sand pump dredge, hire of tugs for long tows, &c.

Dredging—Quebec and Ontario, $150,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the working expenses of the dredging plant and stone lifters, the property of the Dominion government, and operated by the Department of Public Works, and to pay for work to be done by dredging plant owned by private individuals. Working expenses of dredge 'International,' tugs and scows; dredges 'Progress,' 'No. 6,' 'Challenge,' Nipissing,' 'Lake Nipissing,' 'Ontario,' 'Queen,' 'St. Louis,' 'Richelieu,' 'Sir Richard,' 'Nithsdale,' tugs 'Montmorency' and 'Nora.'

Dredging—Manitoba, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to cover working expenses of the dredge 'Winnipeg,' tug 'Sir Hector,' dredge 'Manitoba' and other attendant vessels employed in Manitoba, especially in the Red river at the mouth of Lake Winnipeg, and also dredging required on Lake Manitoba.

Dredging—British Columbia, $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is required to provide for working expenses of the dredging plant owned by the department in British Columbia which consists of the dredge 'King Edward,' the snag boat 'Sampson' and dredge 'Mudlark,' the tug 'Princess' and the dredge 'Nakusp' with attendant vessels.

St. Maurice district—improvements to boom works to facilitate the floating and storage of logs, &c., $40,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for heavy repairs, improvements and new works required, in addition to ordinary repairs provided under the head of maintenance, so as to establish facilities for the descent of timber on the St. Maurice, required by the extensive pulp mills and other large manufacturing establishments.

Mr. HENDERSON. We were informed by the right hon. the First Minister the other night that he thought the time was close at hand when the employment of cullers by the government to measure timber could be dispensed with. It seems to me this is a kindred question. I think the time has arrived when our lumbermen who are engaged in a profitable business, could do without this increased expenditure from year to year by the government in the way of improving facilities for the purpose of floating and storing their logs. We might as well pass votes to furnish horses and ploughs for farmers to do their work as to furnish booms and slides for a lumberman to get his logs down. I do not see the difference; I think there is as much in one case as in another.

Mr. LANCASTER. He is a richer man.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly as my hon. friend suggests the lumberman is a rich man, a man of wealth and influence and in that way he can command a little more attention, but it does seem to me that the government are simply adopting the policy that was adopted 30 or 40 years ago when the lumbering industry was not so profitable as it is to-day. There was a time when it was necessary for the government to do something to aid in getting out timber and logs, but now that logs and timber are practically worth five times as much as they were 25 years ago, perhaps more than that, I will undertake to say more than five times as much, and it does not cost any more to take a log down the river, I do not see why we should continue to foster this infant industry. It is a species of protection to which I would think the minister would object very much. He is opposed to granting a little protection to a man engaged in manufacturing the wool produced on Canadian farms; he insists on opening the door and allowing foreign blankets to come in and monopolize the markets of this country. He has no regard for the farmer who wants to sell his wool, but when a poor lumberman whose product has increased in value five times what it was 25 or 30 years ago, wants a river cleaned out, or booms and slides prepared, he is ready to bring down his estimate for $40,000 on a single river in order to allow a poor lumberman to get his logs out. There is a great deal about this that will not bear inspection, and a great deal that will bear very strong criticism. I must protest against this and I hope the minister will take it into consideration and see if it is a vote that the government can really justify. I assume they have put it into the estimates without much serious consideration simply because there was a similar vote last year and the year before, without considering the changed conditions in the country. We are told it is a growing time, values have increased, and lumber has become worth five times as much as before without increased cost of production, but the government have gone on increasing the assistance to the rich lumberman when he has actually made his fortune out of the increased price of the timber. I think instead of putting slides and booms in we ought to put a duty on timber so that the government could recoup the country for what they have expended in bygone years in the construction of slides and booms. This is one instances where the finances of the country can be served and guarded. It is a vote for which I can see no use and is one of those things that get into the estimates and remain there, I fear, without due consideration or thought as to their necessity.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I may rely upon the information given to me by the chief engineer I do not think this is a bad investment because we have just received a report to the effect that the slides and booms on the River St. Maurice are giving 3 per cent on the money invested. These in-

vestments have been made many years ago and my friend perhaps thought no revenue accrued to the government. There is no money expended properly speaking, because the money was invested many years ago, and now gives a revenue of 3 per cent. I do not think he can complain. If we left the works there the lumbermen might not keep them up and we would lose our money.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the minister give a statement of the money expended in the St. Maurice district in the construction of slides and booms since confederation? I doubt very much if we are getting 3 per cent on the investment or even one-third of one per cent.

Mr. BRODEUR. These works were begun in 1851, and for keeping in repairs and for construction from 1851 to June 30, 1867, they cost $269,000, and for staff and repairs from 1855 to 1867, $118,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. From 1867?

Mr. BRODEUR. The total construction was $1,430,850.

Mr. HENDERSON. What revenue did you derive from them last year?

Mr. BRODEUR. The gross revenue so far has been $458,015.50. We received last year 1902-3 $29,232 and the estimated revenue for the next year will be $42,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. I think that the hon. member for Halton has been making wild statements. I understood him to say that lumber is worth five times what it was a few years ago.

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend, I think from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston), was making a wise statement; I did not catch it.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I would not mind characterizing it as a wild statement.

Mr. HENDERSON. I said a wise statement. What did the hon. gentleman understand me to say, because I think he did not repeat me correctly?

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Kennedy) understood you to say that lumber had increased in value five times in recent years.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman did not quote my words, I made no such statement as that.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. I did not say you did.

Mr. HENDERSON. I said 25 or 30 years ago, and I will undertake to say there is a great deal of lumber worth to-day five times as much.

Mr. KENNEDY. I have been 37 years in business, and the price of lumber has never increased to that extent.

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman may be correct, where he lives, I am speaking of Ontario and Quebec. I am satisfied that in the province of Ontario, 25 or 30 years ago, you could buy good lumber for about one-fifth of what you pay for it to-day. Lumber which was practically unsaleable then brings a good price now. I think my statement was not far afield. It may be that in British Columbia where they had no facilities 30 years ago for cutting lumber except the old fashioned whip-saw, lumber was costly; but now, with their large mills and improved machinery, the cost has been much reduced. Now, let us see whether we are getting three per cent on this money because I want to see how profitable this investment is, and whether the government ought not to consider the propriety of changing their policy. Has the minister made a calculation as to how much three per cent on $1,430,850 would amount to?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not made the calculation.

Mr. HENDERSON. He will hardly find he is getting three per cent on the money.

Mr. BRODEUR. If we get $42,000 next year, it will be three per cent.

Mr. HENDERSON. You only got $29,332 last year. Is there going to be a bigger run of logs? Bear in mind that the capital is being increased. I am merely inquiring whether we are making a profitable investment of the people's money. I think honestly that we are not bound to keep up those works to the extent that we have been doing in the past.

Mr. BRODEUR. But what can we do with those works?

Mr. HENDERSON. Allow somebody else to keep them up.

Mr. BRODEUR. No one else will keep them up.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then they are not required. Why should we keep up expensive works that even those engaged in the lumber industry do not require? I leave the matter to the minister and his colleagues to consider seriously.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that you lose money by reason of some people not paying their dues?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so. I am informed by the deputy that some years ago we lost money, but now the department is more strict in collecting the dues.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—AUTONOMY BILL AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. MONK. I would like to give notice that when the House goes again into Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 69) I will

move as an addition to clause 2 of the Bill, the following paragraph :

Either the English or the French language may be used by any person in the debates of the legislative assembly of the province and in the proceedings of the courts, and both these languages shall be used in the records and journals of such assembly, and all laws made by the legislature shall be printed in both languages : provided, however, that the said legislative assembly may by law or otherwise regulate its proceedings and the manner of recording and publishing the same and the regulations so made shall be embodied in a proclamation which shall be forthwith made and published by the Lieutenant Governor in conformity of the law and thereafter shall have full force and effect.

What business will be taken up to-morrow ?

Mr. FIELDING. We will proceed with the estimates of the Public Works Department, to be followed by those of the Interior if time permits.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We are not ready to go on with the estimates for a few moments, and in the meantime we will take some Bills.

Progress reported.

INSPECTION AND SALE OF SEEDS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 7) respecting the inspection and sale of seeds.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. These amendments are merely verbal. The first one is that before 'ergot of rye' the words are inserted 'and from the sclerotia known as'; the second amendment is to leave out the word 'screenings' and insert the words 'not absolutely clean.'

Amendments read the first and second times, and agreed to.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS ACT—AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 132) to amend the Government Railways Act.—Mr. Emmerson.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What Bill is this ?

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is the amendment to the Railway Act which provides running rights for the Intercolonial Railway over the Grand Trunk Railway from Montreal to Coteau, and over the Canada Atlantic Railway from Coteau junction to Parry Sound.

When this Bill was up for consideration before, it was suggested that possibly a claim might be made against the government for the right that we are now taking to run over the Canada Atlantic, without reference to the fact whether we used that right or not. It was suggested that that point ought to be made absolutely clear. I therefore move to reconsider section 5, and to amend it by adding the following proviso :

Provided that no compensation shall be payable for such running powers unless and until the same are actually exercised, and then only for such exercise.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest the words 'so far as they may be excused' instead of the words 'for such exercise.'

Amendment agreed to, and Bill reported as amended.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the amendment which has been moved by the Minister of Justice answers the objections which were raised on this side of the House.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That was the intention.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think it does fully answer the purpose, and that the amendment is an important one.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Justice mentioned the other evening on the motion to adjourn that he proposed to make some statement with regard to the Kentville rifle range. I do not think that has yet been made.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thought I ought to wait for the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and the Minister of Militia to be present, because I want to refer to the matter from the point of view of the Department of Justice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the Minister of Justice would have no objection to sending me a copy of his statement if it is prepared.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not at all.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Supply.

Ottawa city—bridges over the Rideau river, the slides and the Rideau canal and approaches thereto—ordinary repairs, $7,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to provide for the usual necessary repairs to the bridges of the city of Ottawa and the approaches thereto, the maintenance of which was assumed by the government under authority of an Order in Council passed in 1885. This is the usual sum.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What are the bridges?

Mr. BRODEUR. The union bridge between Ottawa and Hull, the bridge over the timber slides at the Chaudiere, the Maria street bridge, Sapper's bridge, the Dufferin bridge and approaches thereto, and the maintenance of Wellington street between Bank and the Dufferin bridge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nature of the repairs?

Mr. BRODEUR. The ordinary maintenance of these bridges.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was spent last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $7,101.37; divided as follows : Chaudiere bridges, $2,553.53 ; St. Patrick streeet, $60.48; Wellington street, Dufferin and Sapper's bridges, $4,783.43 ; hardware, stone, lumber and cement, $253.93

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. One would suppose that after the bridges were put in thoroughly first-class condition, so large an amount would not be necessary yearly for repairs. I am speaking, of course, without any special knowledge of the subject, but merely from the impression I would have with respect to such a matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the officers of the department that this is generally the sum that has to be expended every year on these works.

Ottawa city—Dufferin and Sapper's bridges over the Rideau canal, Hull slides and Union bridge and roadway approaches, repairs, additions, &c., $11,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is asked to make provision for continuing the works of alteration and addition to Dufferin and Sapper's bridges, the roadway, approaches, and sidewalks, the estimate being submitted by the chief engineer. The amount expended last year was $7,000.

Bryson bridge—reconstruction of bridge and approaches, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is towards the work of reconstruction and repairs of bridge over the North Channel of the Ottawa. The work will be done on condition that the Quebec government and the municipalities interested will maintain the bridge at their sole expense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that agreement expressed in some document or is it a mere understanding ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work will not be let unless the municipalities and the provincial government undertake to maintain it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It would be desirable to have that agreement expressed formally in a document or communication, so that there will be no question hereafter as to the obligation.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the intention. Nothing will be done unless that agreement is made.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the government responsible for the repairs of all these bridges should any accident occur ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, that is not the policy of the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But it might be the policy of the courts.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the question has been before the courts and that the position taken by the department was sustained.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government is liable by statute for the negligence of its employees on a public work. The question would be whether this is a public work in the meaning of the statute. That statute has not been repealed, so far as I am aware.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was decided three years ago in the case of McHugh and the Queen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does that depart from any previous line or decision ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. What bridge in the vicinity of Ottawa is known as the Aberdeen bridge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the bridge under the control of the Improvement Commission and not under the government. I think it is the bridge which goes to Rideau Hall. There are three of these bridges, and one of them is called the Aberdeen bridge.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understood that this bridge is not properly lighted and is a menace to the travelling public. As a contributor to the Ottawa Improvement Commission, could not the government bring some pressure upon that commission to cause the bridge to be properly lighted. Perhaps I was mistaken in speaking of the Aberdeen bridge. The bridge I mean is the Alexandra bridge.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a Canadian Pacific Railway bridge. It was built by a private corporation which was operating the Ottawa, Gatineau and Pontiac Railway and the Pacific Junction Railway. Afterwards those two roads and the bridge itself

were transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. HENDERSON. The bridge I refer to is the bridge from Nepean Point, which was constructed by a private corporation, but to the cost of which the parliament of Canada contributed very considerably, and I think also the city of Ottawa. Could the government not urge the people in charge to make that bridge perfectly safe by having it properly lighted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a matter which does not pertain to the government at all, because it is entirely under the control of the Canadian Pacific Railway, subject to the regulations of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HENDERSON. But it is not purely a railway bridge. It has carriage drives and walks for pedestrians, so that the railway practically does not make use of the entire bridge. It is for the protection of pedestrians and others, who have occasion to cross during the night, that I appeal for better lighting ; and as the government has put a very large sum into that bridge, it should have some control, if not over the railway portion of the bridge at least over the portion which accommodates the general public. The government is sufficiently interested to ask those in charge to have it properly lighted and made suitable for the purposes for which the government intended it when it granted a large sum of money in aid of its construction.

Mr. BRODEUR. The bridge is not at all under the control of the government. The government voted the usual subsidy for its construction, but the accommodation for pedestrians and vehicles was one of the conditions exacted by the city of Ottawa, and it would be for the city of Ottawa to see that the pedestrian and carriage ways are properly lighted. I have no objection, however, to present to the Canadian Pacific Railway authorities the criticism of my hon. friend.

Battle river bridge at Battleford—new concrete substructure and protection of approaches with close piling, $13,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the reconstruction of the new southern abutment. The work is under contract. The amount of the contract for placing the bridge in serviceable condition is $38,426, and we add 10 per cent, or say $4,574 for superintendence and contingencies, making a total of $43,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this an old bridge that you are re-modelling, or are you erecting a new concrete substructure ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to replace the old, decayed timber with concrete.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the repair of an old bridge, or the demolition of a bridge and the construction of a new one ?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. BRODEUR. The demolition of the existing substructure and replacing it with a concrete substructure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The contract has been let ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, to John Foley, of Ottawa, after tenders publicly called for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it intended that this bridge shall be maintained by the Dominion, or will it pass into the control of one of the new provinces ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is intended that the new province in which it is situated shall maintain the bridge.

Mr. BERGERON. I often hear it stated, in the course of ministerial explanations in supply, that a certain work is under contract for a certain amount and 10 per cent is added, apparently for supervision. What does that mean ?

Mr. BRODEUR. When a work is decided upon, an estimate is made of the cost, an allowance of 10 per cent being made for superintendence and contingencies. Then tenders are called for. In this particular case the tenders had been called for and a contract has been made, and the 10 per cent for superintendence and contingencies is calculated on the contract price. But this 10 per cent does not form part of the contract ;—it is work to be done by the department in seeing to it that the work of the contractor is properly carried on. This is not paid for by the contractor but by the department.

Mr. BERGERON. So, when a contract is for $40,000, that means that the public must pay $44,000 ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Do contingencies and superintendence really cost 10 per cent ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not always, but that is added in order that there may be enough to carry on the work.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In public buildings constructed by the Department of Public Works is the same allowance made ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understand that private individuals get this work done for 5 per cent, including preparation of the plans and supervision of the work.

Mr. BRODEUR. In these public works the item of contingencies and superintendence usually costs less than 10 per cent, but my hon. friend (Mr. Uriah Wilson) will see that it is better to estimate 10 per cent than to be obliged to come back to parliament for a vote of a few dollars to make up for a short estimate.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But I do not see why this item should cost double in the case of a public work than what is costs in the

case of a work done for private parties. And I should think that large public works should cost a smaller percentage for superintendence and contingencies than a smaller works do. I should think it would be better for the department to estimate nearer the actual cost and not ask parliament for more money than is necessary. I know of one building for which the architect asked only 5 per cent for drawing plans and looking after the work. And in another case the charge was only 2½ per cent.

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot dispute the facts within my hon. friend's (Mr. Uriah Wilson's) knowledge. But I will call his attention to the fact that the fees ordinarily charged by architects in the supervision of works is 7½ per cent.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. For drawing the plans ?

Mr. BRODEUR. For drawing the plans, making specifications and supervising the work. But this does not include travelling expenses for such a work as this, and 2½ per cent does not seem to be excessive to provide for that, especially when the work is at some distance from the home of the resident engineer.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. My information is that 5 per cent is the ordinary charge made by architects for this work of making plans and supervising work, and I should think that for a great public work, the percentage should be even less. I can understand that something would depend upon where the work is to be done, as it would be more difficult to oversee works at a distance. But, as I understand it, the Public Works Department have on every job of this kind a clerk of works, an officer who seems to be an ornamental addition to the staff. A public building was constructed in a riding near my own, and the clerk of works got $1,500 for overseeing, and there was an architect besides. This, it seems to me, is a sheer waste of money and ought not to be continued.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I had not supposed that the ordinary fee of an architect was so large as the minister states. I have not had very much experience, but I was under the impression that the fee for supervision, including the preparation of plans, was not more than 5 per cent.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that it is 7½ per cent, for drawing the plans, making the specifications and supervising the work—that is the ordinary tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has it always been so high ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy minister informs me that Mr. Ewart, the chief architect has always told him that it was 7½ per cent—that is, 2½ per cent for supervision and 5 per cent for drawing the plans and making specifications.

Mr. BARKER. I have had something to do with works within a few years and have never known more than 5 per cent to be charged by an architect for preparing plans and specifications, and supervision; and it is very frequently done at 4 per cent, though I admit that 5 per cent is the usual charge. I know that in general specifications it is quite usual to allow 10 per cent for architect's work and contingencies, that is, to cover any possible errors and oversight; but I never knew that more than 5 per cent was taken from an architect's fees.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the board of works not an architect in the department who is capable of undertaking this work ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are officers in the department here, but they are not supposed to go and attend to the execution of the work itself. In the case under consideration, for instance, it would be impossible to send a man from here to Battleford to supervise the work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that the architect's fees on the public library being erected in Ottawa are 5 per cent for plans and superintendence, 2½ per cent for the preparation of the plans, and 2½ per cent for superintendence. I am so informed, I have no personal knowledge. If that is so, it is certainly not in accordance with what is understood to be the practice of the department, and it might be worth while for the minister to make some inquiries and find out whether or not there is some misapprehension.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt that 5 per cent is charged in some cases. Doctors charge some people higher than they do others, and the same with lawyers. But I was speaking of the tariff of fees charged by architects, which I am informed, is 7½ per cent. But I will call the minister's attention to that.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is it the custom of the department to have a clerk of works, and a local architect besides to supervise the erection of public buildings ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a resident engineer who is supposed to look after the execution of a work; besides, there is a local inspector who is there every day. The resident engineer has a certain district under his supervision in which he has to look over the construction of all public works. But we have to employ the services of a local inspector in each place.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In this case, I presume, it is the local official of the department who has a certain district, to look after. But is it not the custom to have a local architect as well ? I have a case in my mind where there was a local architect and a clerk of works, and I fail to see the need of a clerk of works there at all. The local architect is paid to look after it, and

he should suffice if he gives proper attention to his duties. I am afraid that the government take advantage of these occasions to give local friends a job.

Mr. BRODEUR. According to my information, the department finds it necessary to have a resident engineer to direct the work generally. He has under his charge all the works in his district, possibly ten or twenty. Besides, he has occasionally to draw plans and make reports to the department. Moreover, we require to have on the ground a man to supervise the work from day to day.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems I have not made myself clear to the minister. The gentleman he is talking about has a certain district to look after. I asked if there was a local architect in each place to look after a building in course of erection, besides the clerk of works.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we have no local architect in each place.

Mr. BERGERON. Who is the resident engineer at Battleford ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Paul Paradis, who lives at Calgary, 300 or 400 miles away. He has charge of all the public works in the Northwest Territories, including colonization roads.

Mr, BERGERON. How much do you pay this supervisor of works ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From $2.50 a day to $3, according to the local prices.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What qualifications has he ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He should be a competent man for the class of work he has to supervise.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the minister always succeed in getting men who know something about the business ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It sometimes happens that we do not obtain the most competent men.

Mr. BERGERON. Then do you have some one else to supervise the local officer, to see whether he does his work well ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The resident engineer. He goes and visits all these works occasionally, once a month or twice a month.

Mr. BERGERON. Is there not a danger that he may become too friendly with the contractor ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the law governs those cases.

Shellmouth bridge over Assiniboine river, $10,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the erection of a new bridge at Shellmouth in the province of Manitoba. No work has been done yet, the plans are being prepared.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is an ordinary bridge over the river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. There is an old wooden bridge built in 1887, which is now in a dilapidated condition and beyond repair.

Mr. BERGERON. Should not that be done by the local government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is an interprovincial bridge between the province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Dominion traffic bridges throughout Canada, including approaches, $5,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to know what these bridges are referred to in this item, whether in the Northwest Territories or elsewhere.

Mr. BRODEUR. The bridges under the control of the government in Ontario and Quebec are : Des Joachims bridge, Ottawa river ; Moisie Post Road, north shore St. Lawrence ; Ottawa, Maria street (Laurier) bridge ; Chaudière bridges ; Sappers' and Dufferin bridges ; Portage du Fort bridge, Ottawa river ; York bridge, Grand river. And in the Northwest Territories : Battleford bridge, Battle river ; Edmonton bridge, Saskatchewan river ; Calgary bridge, Bow river ; Lethbridge, Belly river; Macleod bridge, Old Man's river.

Mr. BARKER. What bridge have you on the Grand river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. At York.

Mr. BARKER. Why do you build across the Grand river ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that the river was dammed at Dunnville by the Department of Railways and Canals. This bridge has been considered as being part of that work.

Mr. HERRON. What is the nature of the repairs on the Belly river bridge ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The department has no information that any repairs will be needed this year. I was simply giving the names of the bridges to which these sums can be applied in case of necessity.

Mr. HERRON. The three bridges referred to are all practically new steel bridges.

Mr. BRODEUR. They require some painting, and I think it is important that these steel bridges should be painted occasionally. This is to provide for any works that are needed.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I am still in the dark as to the principles governing the action of the government in this matter—what streams shall be built over by the government. I asked the policy of the government in reference to this the other night, and the best answer that I got was their

predecessors used to do it. I think there ought to be some definite policy as to what rivers you should build over and for what reasons. It certainly is not because they are navigable rivers, because I know navigable rivers over which the municipalities have to maintain the bridges. I cannot understand why in certain localities you build bridges and in others you do not.

Mr. BRODEUR. These are interprovincial bridges and bridges in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I refer to ones that are not interprovincial.

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases these rivers are under the control of the Dominion government.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are not all navigable streams under the control of the Dominion government?

Mr. BRODEUR. The municipalities have a certain control over rivers which are entirely in one province, but when we come to build them over interprovincial rivers the rule is different.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose if there has been any system in the past it is that the Dominion government build interprovincial bridges, and besides that has constructed bridges in the Northwest Territories, because there is not a sufficient sum placed at the disposal of the territorial government for that purpose. These bridges were built by the Dominion government because that portion of the country was in a territorial condition. There will be a modification of that no doubt now that the new provinces are established. My friend (Mr. Uriah Wilson) desires to know whether, apart from these two principles upon which the government has been proceeding, any other bridges have been constructed partly or wholly by the government; and if so, on what principle the government has acted in assisting in the building of any bridges that do not fall within the two categories to which I have referred.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no other bridges except the ones I have mentioned in the Territories or those who are interprovincial. Besides these there might be some other bridges which are necessitated by works of the Dominion government, as the bridges over canals. These bridges have to be kept up by the Dominion government, because they have been necessitated by the work of the government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I remember one instance that came within my own observation where the government had altered the course of a stream by works connected with the Rideau canal, making necessary a very much larger and more expensive bridge than would have been required if the stream had been left in its old position. Apart from that, is there any other principle?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Colonization roads—Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, $25,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is proposed to be used towards opening or improving colonization roads for the purpose of enabling settlers to take lands which they otherwise could not reach. A road is to be opened up and improved from a point near Sprague, on the southern boundary line of Manitoba, a few miles north on the line followed by incoming immigrants; one between Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg; one from a point on the Prince Albert branch of the Canadian Northern Railway, west of Erwood; and one is to be constructed from the head of Lesser Slave lake to the Peace river. The latter is the most expensive. The total estimated cost of these works will be $25,000.

Mr. INGRAM. Why is not the usual practice carried out of handing the money over to the territorial government and allowing them to spend it? That is what the minister agreed to do last year, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief engineer does not remember such a promise being made. Take the case of Athabaska; I do not think the territorial government has jurisdiction over Athabaska. I think it is entirely under the control of the federal government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the government to continue building colonization roads in these Territories after they become provinces?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not after they are erected into provinces. Then they will have to padle their own canoe.

Mr. INGRAM. Last year the objection was that if the government has any money to expend in an improvement of this kind, they should hand the money over to the Northwest Territories government as they do with other moneys, and that was understood at that time.

Mr. HERRON. One of the bridges referred to in this estimate was built in the last two years by the Northwest government. The money is supplied from here to the Northwest government. That applies also to the bridge at Lethbridge, which, I suppose, comes under the same heading.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether that would be advisable with respect to all of these, although, of course, there would be a change as soon as these provinces are erected. I do not know whether it would be advisable when the parliament votes money for a special work that this money should be spent by a body not under the

control of this government. In my opinion, it would be very much better for this parliament to control the expenditure of its own money, especially when a particular work is mentioned in the vote, as in this case. In my opinion, it would be against the principle of responsible government should we hand this money over to be expended by a government over which this parliament has no control.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is any question of responsible government about it. Suppose you increased the provincial subsidy by $20,000 and let the province deal with its own roads, there would be no violation of any principle of responsible government. The minister says that when the new provinces have been established there will be no further grant for colonization roads, but if that be so, why is it that you apply part of this grant to the province of Manitoba? The difficulty is that the government by retaining control of the lands which ought to be the subject of provincial legislation, is led into expenditure of this kind. The building of colonization or other roads is a purely local work which ought to be carried on by the provincial government. If assistance is to be given it will be better to make a grant to the province for that purpose, because it seems beyond question that the provincial authorities would be in a better position to judge of the best mode in which to expend this money than would be the department at Ottawa. Is the minister still of opinion that aid to colonization roads in the Northwest Territories will cease after the new provinces are established, or will it be continued as in the case of Manitoba?

Mr. BRODEUR. The information in the notes before me shows that in the province of Manitoba two sums of $5,000 each were expended, and this expenditure was for preparing roads to enable immigrants to enter the country. It would seem that this expenditure was on account of promoting immigration, rather than for the purpose of building colonization roads in the general sense of the word.

Mr. HENDERSON. When we discussed this vote last year, my recollection is that the Minister of the Interior promised this side of the House, that so far as the province of Manitoba was concerned, any part of this money which was expended within the province would be handed over to the provincial government. It is the duty of the local government to provide roads and bridges within the province, and the Manitoba government would be in a far better position to see that even $5,000 was properly expended on roads than would this government at Ottawa, 1,500 miles away. Even if the expenditure is to assist immigrants to get into certain sections of the province, the provincial government is at least just as interested in that matter as this parliament could be. If we are going to construct colonization roads in Manitoba let the local government do the work and regulate the expenditure, and let the same thing be done in the case of the new provinces. I believe the minister would be perfectly justified in handing this money over to the province, especially as he has said that this vote is not to be continued after the new provinces are created.

Mr. BRODEUR. My own personal opinion is that it would not be advisable to give to a province the control of this expenditure.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. On their own roads.

Mr. BRODEUR. On our own roads. This money was expended for the special purpose of enabling us to sell Dominion lands, and why should we hand it over to the local governments over which this parliament has no control? For my part I do not agree in the view that we should hand money over to those who are not responsible to the Dominion parliament or to the people of the country. The provinces may be perfectly reliable, but they are not responsible to this parliament for the expenditures.

Mr. HENDERSON. Judging by the sarcastic smile which crosses the minister's face, he is not very strongly impressed with his own argument. Is there any reason to believe that the Manitoba government would make any more unwise expenditure of this money than they do of the large subsidy which we hand over to them or of any other moneys which they get for the purposes of government? Surely we can trust them with the expenditure of this small sum of money to improve their own roads. On what authority does this government go on to the highways of Manitoba and construct roads? That is a duty assigned to the provincial government, and I question if we have any constitutional right to expend money on the highways of Manitoba.

I am perfectly willing that the grant should be made, but it should be expended through the proper channel. The construction of colonization roads has been a standing grievance for a long time in the province of Ontario, and we all know there what it meant. It has been used for a great many years for election purposes, and I have no hesitation in saying that this grant of $5,000 is to be used along the same line. That was brought out in the debate last year. My impression is that there is more politics than construction of public roads in the whole grant, and that is a good reason why the work should be put into the hands of an honest government. I think the minister should divest himself of all suspicion of wrong-doing by agreeing to hand it over to the provincial government, whose duty

it is to see that these roads are constructed and maintained; but, as we want to see that immigrants are provided with roads to go into these different sections, we might supplement the work of the provincial government with a grant of $5,000. Then we shall not have one set of men constructing one portion of a road and another set another portion. Who is going to maintain these roads after they are constructed? In years to come the Dominion government may stop this grant, and then what is to become of this road which was constructed and is practically owned by the Dominion government? Let the work be done by the provincial government, or by the municipal authorities under the control of the provincial government, who are interested, every man down to the pathmaster on the highway, in seeing that a dollar's worth of value is obtained for every dollar of expenditure. Men fifteen hundred miles away have not the same interest. I think all the arguments are in favour of handing the money over to the province of Manitoba, and letting the local authorities spend it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The proportion of the grant for Manitoba is about $5,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That is a very meagre sum.

Mr. BRODEUR. One of these roads is to facilitate the travelling of settlers from Minnesota into Canada where it is now hard to travel. The road between Lake Winnipeg and Lake Manitoba is to enable settlers to get into that country. These are the only two sums required for Manitoba. I suppose the Manitoba government are looking after the roads in the province, but it is necessary to expend $5,000 for these two roads to carry out the immigration policy of the government.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think the minister gave the true reason why this grant should be made. It is very clear that it should be made, if made at all, because we own the land. That shows the folly of continuing to hold the lands instead of handling them over to the provinces. We have to bring in immigration, and in order to do so, we have to make roads. If this is the policy of the government, we ought to control the roads everywhere. I think the proper course would have been to give the lands to the provinces and let them take care of them. I think the people of those provinces are as able to take care of the immigrants as we are. It looks as if you were spending a great deal too much money belonging to the Dominion of Canada, in view of the fact that the older provinces have not so much interest in keeping the lands and building the roads as in giving the lands to the provincial authorities to use them as they see fit.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Whose constituencies are on both sides of the roads which are being built?

Mr. BRODEUR. I could not tell.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to draw the attention of the minister to the fact that we have in the Northwest what is known as a bridge gang, consisting of an engineer and a gang of men who go all over the country repairing bridges. I think we would get very much better value for our money if we handed it over to the Northwest government to spend and to see that the bridges were properly repaired. That is the way to have the work done well and cheaply, as these men are on the ground. I would like the minister to take that into consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What amount has been expended in Manitoba up to date for colonization roads by this government?

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy thinks we have spent about $25,000.

Mr. INGRAM. This is an entirely new departure in the spending of money. Never until last year was this idea carried out.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I think it has always been the policy of the government to look after that work.

Mr. INGRAM. I have a statement here of the Minister of the Interior that it was a new departure altogether.

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me that three or four years ago, $20,000 or $25,000 was spent at Athabasca Landing, on the Peace river.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) asked the government whether they intended to keep in repair these roads which they are building. Would they not be compelled to keep them in repair?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose the provincial or municipal authorities would look after that, as they do in the older provinces.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This road in Manitoba from the boundary line connects, I suppose, with the Canadian Northern or the Canadian Pacific?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend knows the locality better than I do. I could not say exactly with what roads it connects but I believe it must connect with some other road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under the English law, which is in force in Manitoba, a public body constructing a public work is responsible for its maintenance, and no other evidence is required except evidence as to construction. It would be well to have a more definite idea as to how matters are going to work out in that regard. We have a statute in this country which imposes lia-

bility upon the government for the negligence of its employees upon public works. You are constructing these roads as public works, and by that very fact you are imposing upon yourselves the duty of maintenance and the responsibility for maintenance, in the absence of some arrangement by which the provincial government or the municipality will take over that duty. That particular consideration is worthy of attention by the government before they spend very much money in this way. You may be undertaking a greater responsibility than you have any idea of at present. I did not gather from the minister any answer to the question which I put him a moment ago and which was this. He said it was not proposed to continue the construction of colonization roads in the Territories because we are now organizing them into provinces, and that obligation will devolve upon the provinces. But we have not followed that policy in Manitoba. Is the hon. minister able to state what the future policy of the government will be in that regard? Do you propose to construct colonization roads in the Territories or leave that matter to the new provincial government? In the latter case, you should carry out a similar policy in Manitoba.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that the policy of the department will be not to build any more colonization roads in the Northwest Territories which are to be erected into provinces. As to the maintenance, I suppose the contention of the hon. gentleman regarding our liability is correct. But it must be remembered that those roads are being built in sections of country which have no population to-day. But in the ordinary course of events they will become populated and form municipal organizations, and then, if there be any doubt as to the liability of the government, the government will have the option of either closing the roads or handing them over to the municipal authorities.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The principle to which I allude is one that applies to public bodies, but whether it would have the same application to the Crown is another question, because sometimes different principles prevail with regard to the Crown.

Mr. BRODEUR. The deputy informs me that the government has never been condemned to pay.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. As the government have expended $25,000 in the last year or two in the province of Manitoba on colonization roads, would not the province of Ontario be justified in asking them to do as much for that province?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not the owners of lands in the province of Ontario but we are in Manitoba, and consequently in the latter province it may be necessary that we should open some colonization road in order to sell our lands. Suppose the provincial government were not in a position to make those improvements, and it was necessary they should be made in order to sell our lands, would it not be good policy for us to make them?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That hardly seems consistent with what the hon. minister has just said, namely, that he proposes to discontinue building colonization roads in the Territories.

Mr. BRODEUR. It might happen in some cases that we would have to do it. This is a very small item so far as Manitoba is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the principle upon which you are proceeding is that because you own the land you must provide roads, it will be difficult to carry out the policy mentioned a moment ago, namely, that you will cease building these roads when the new provinces are established. You will still own the land, and if any necessity to build roads exists now, that necessity will continue.

Mr. BRODEUR. It may exist in some particular cases. Suppose we had an application for the opening up of a section of the country and the provincial government refused to build these roads, would it not be good policy for this government to do that work in order to sell its lands?

Mr. INGRAM. Then we are to assume that the local government of the Territories have refused to spend money on their roads?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but the same thing may happen there as happens every day in the other provinces. In the province of Quebec, sometimes settlers ask for colonization roads and their request is refused for one reason or another, and no doubt the same thing happens in Ontario. Suppose that settlers told us they were willing to settle on certain government lands provided we built them a road, would it not be good policy to grant their request?

Mr. INGRAM. In that case all you need do is put an item in the estimates to be expended in a certain way and let the local government spend it in that way. That however would not suit this government because it wants to control the expenditure for reasons of its own.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is good policy that we should control our own expenditure.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman were the owner of lands and the lands adjoining belonged to some body else, surely if he were offered money to improve the lands alongside his own, it would be in his own interest to spend the money on that object and thus increase the value of his

own property. What would apply to an individual would equally apply to a local government.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would not be in favour of voting money to be spent by a local government. I think we had better keep the control of our own expenditure. Even if the local government were the best in the world, we have always recognized the principle that we should keep control of our own expenditure and not hand over the money to be expended by any other body. Some allusion has been made to the fact that we are giving subsidies to the provinces. But if we do, it is because we are bound to do so by the Confederation Act. Over these moneys we have no control. But there is no reason why, if certain works become necessary in our own interest, we should not expend the money on them ourselves.

Mr. INGRAM. I do not see the force of the hon. gentleman's reasoning. This is an expenditure which is likely to be improperly used. The government is reserving the right to expend the money itself on colonization roads, and it may send the money in two or three different constituencies, under the patronage of gentlemen who are more interested in carrying elections than in improving their roads.

Mr. BRODEUR. If you discuss the question from that point of view, very well, but I am discussing it from the point of view of principle.

Mr. INGRAM. We had that principle in Ontario, and the settlers in new districts suffered because of the improper method in such expenditure by the local government. There may be the same thing here.

Mr. BRODEUR. All the greater reason why expenditure on colonization roads should be controlled by this government and this parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. Then, the hon. gentleman had better withdraw the subsidy he is giving to the local legislature in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a question of contract.

Mr. INGRAM. It is a question of degree in the hon. gentleman's mind. He thinks it is improper to entrust the government of the Northwest with an expenditure of $25,000, but that it is all right to entrust them with an expenditure of $1,000,000.

Mr. BARKER. I can assure the minister that the experience in the new districts in Ontario, as shown by the public accounts, was that, where the provincial government expended money on colonization roads, it frequently happened that more money was spent in paying the salary of the inspector of a bridge than was spent upon construction of the bridge itself.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not deny that money might be expended in a wholly useless way. But that makes all the stronger the argument in favour of our keeping control of our own expenditure. Why should we vote money for a provincial government to expend? Doing that, we have no control over the expenditure. This money should be spent under the supervision of our own officers. If anything is done wrong, these officers can be blamed and the government held responsible.

Mr. BARKER. The difficulty in Ontario was that votes such as this were often spent for political purposes. Here the government proposes to spend money at points fifteen hundred miles away from the point of supervision. But, if you leave it in the hands of the local government it would be properly expended for the benefit of the public.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly I was astray in my reference to the statement of the minister last year as to the Manitoba government being permitted to expend the Manitoba portion of this money. I find, on looking up the debate, that so determinedly opposed was the minister of the Interior of that time (Mr. Sifton) to allowing the province of Manitoba to expend this money that he struck the item out of the estimates. If his government could not expend the money in their own way for their own purposes, then he would not agree to its being spent at all. It seemed that this vote to construct roads was quite an unnecessary vote. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) practically admitted last year that it was unnecessary for road construction by asking to have it struck out and the item reduced from $25,000 to $20,000. Rather than allow the people of Manitoba to expend this sum of $5,000 in the improvement of their roads the hon. member for Brandon, then Minister of the Interior, in a trantrum, in a pet, moved that it should be struck out. I am not afraid that the minister (Mr. Brodeur) now in charge of these estimates will make such a suggestion. No doubt the minister will get the vote, but we think that he ought to concede to the people of Manitoba, who are more deeply interested than we are in the opening of that province, the right to expend this small sum. On going hastily over the debates of last year, I find that very strong arguments were advanced in favour of handing over this appropriation to Manitoba. And the Minister of the Interior of that time felt so keenly that he could not meet the argument, that rather than allow the committee to have its own way, he succeeded in having a motion carried to reduce the item and refuse anything for expenditure in Manitoba. That is a dog-in-the-manger way to proceed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the money was voted last year—so it would appear from the estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON. The motion made was that the item be reduced from $25,000 to $20,000 and that 'Manitoba and' be struck out—leaving the vote $20,000 applicable exclusively to the Northwest Territories.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then, there is a mistake in the estimates.

Mr. HENDERSON. The result in the committee was as I have given it, as the hon. gentleman will see if he will refer to page 9048 of 'Hansard' of last year.

Mr. BURROWS. Was not that amendment introduced on the ground that certain objections were taken to the vote based on the contention that Manitoba did not require new roads and the minister (Mr. Sifton), rather than vote unnecessary money threw out that portion relating to Manitoba?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, the reason was that it was strongly urged in the committee that the Manitoba government should be allowed to expend the money.

Mr. BURROWS. I represent a constituency in Manitoba where the people look forward to expenditure on roads as an aid to immigration. There is a large district in the northern part of Manitoba that requires public roads, and I think it is necessary to expend a certain amount of money in opening up such a country, to be settled afterwards by the immigration department. This applies to Manitoba as to the Northwest Territories. I would like to see an appropriation for the construction of colonization roads in Manitoba.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have gone very rapidly over the debate to which I referred, and it seems quite clear that the vote was struck out practically because it was contended in the committee that the money should be expended for the improvement of roads by the province of Manitoba. The minister (Mr. Sifton) seemed desirous that it shall be spent not so much for making roads as for election purposes. He said that the Manitoba government must not have the expenditure of this money.

Mr. BURROWS. I don't blame him knowing that government as I do.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) agrees with the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), and that if he could not have the money spent for election purposes he would not have it spent at all. I have no doubt that is the view of the hon. gentleman, as a follower of the ex-Minister of the Interior. but the strong contention of the opposition was that, under the Dominion government the money would not be properly expended.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. BURROWS. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) tell me of a single case of a vote by this parliament of money to be expended by any province for immigration purposes?

Mr. HENDERSON. Can the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrows) state that his government has not voted money for the improvement of roads in New Brunswick?

Mr. BURROWS. For immigration purposes, I say.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not speaking of immigration, but of the improvement of roads. I believe we have on the records of this parliament a vote such as I speak of. I believe we have on the records of this parliament a vote of that kind. I have heard a reference made to it, so there would be a precedent for anything the government might do now, and a very good precedent. This matter was very fully discussed last year, from all standpoints.

Mr. BURROWS. On what page of 'Hansard'?

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman will find the debate commencing on page 9042 of last year's 'Hansard.' The whole tenor of the debate was the right of the province of Manitoba to expend this grant, the various reasons why it should be done by the province rather than by this government; and the pressure executed by the opposition was apparently so strong that the minister was unable to resist it, and refused to allow the item to pass at all, and had it struck out of the estimates. I do not want the matter to end that way this year. I would rather see it go through and let the Dominion government expend it rather than not have it expended at all, because I think the settlers there need the expenditures. But I do think it is hardly treating the province right, when they have road money given to them, to say that they shall not expend it on their own highways.

Mr. BURROWS. The hon. gentleman ought to be aware of the fact that when the Dominion government takes an appropriation to be expended in the immigration department, it is not the local government who has the handling of that money. I do not see by what argument the hon. gentleman can support a contrary theory. Why should not all the other provinces of the Dominion have an immigration department as well as Manitoba? This money comes out of the immigration vote, as I understand.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not at all, it is coming out of the item for roads and bridges.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand it is in the interest of immigrants. I may say that I live in a district in Manitoba that requires colonization roads more than in any other district, a northern district, a large portion of which is not yet opened up, and a portion

in which I would expect this money to be expended if anywhere ; yet I have no hesitation in saying that I would not vote for an appropriation to be handed over to the local government for that purpose.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman would rather have this government spend the money, because doubtless he would have control of the expenditures, or it would be expended by men whom he nominated. But I still stand by my contention, that the men whose duty it is to make roads and bridges in the province of Manitoba, whether they be the municipal councils or pathmasters, are the proper men to expend money of this kind, and I would rather have it left in their hands than that the patronage should be handed over to the member of the riding. In the province of Ontario it became a very serious matter to leave patronage of this kind for colonization roads in the hands of the member for the district. The consequences were ridiculous, the money was simply frittered away to the neglect of public works. I would not say that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) would be so neglectful of the interests of his own district ; but it is better not to put the danger in his way, there may be too much temptation.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to add to what my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has said, the opinion of the late representative of one of the Manitoba constituencies on this matter, which will be found in last year's 'Hansard,' page 8019 :

It seems to me that so far as Manitoba is concerned, the hon. minister has made the explanation very nicely. It is a rather unusual departure on the part of the government to commence building colonization roads in a province such as Manitoba, and I think the government are establishing a dangerous precedent when they begin colonization roads through an organized province. The information that has been given to me is that in three cases each one of these amounts is to be expended in a way that is going to be a benefit to the candidates of the government who are now in the field. The information I have is that there is a certain foreign vote in the localities which are to be traversed by these roads and that the object of spending the money is for the reason I have given. It is a most extraordinary departure to undertake to spend the money of this government in that way, and we ask that if you are going to spend money, spend it in some proper way.

He would hand it over to an organized government and let them expend it.

Mr. BURROWS. Who said that ?

Mr. INGRAM. That was Mr. Boyd.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Burrows) to say that he would oppose this government granting an appropriation towards building roads in the provinces ?

Mr. BURROWS. What I say is this : This is an appropriation by the Dominion government over which they have absolute control, and I would rather see it expended by the officers of the Department of the Interior than by the officials of the local government in Manitoba.

Telegraph lines—Maritime provinces—Mabou, Cheticamp, Meat Cove line—extension of Bay St. Lawrence, $3,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the minister tell us the total number of miles of telegraph lines which are owned by the Dominion government at the present time, giving a statement of the revenue and expenditure in connection therewith ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have 6,270 miles distributed as follows : In Gaspé, 28 miles; Anticosti, 226 miles ; Magdalen islands, 83½ miles ; Pelee Island, 25½ miles. All the rest are in the Northwest, British Columbia and the Yukon. The revenue for the year 1903-4 was $147,391.34 ; the expenditure was $327,917.65.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Can the minister state what the policy of the government is in regard to the development of this very important system of telegraph lines ? Is it proposed to extend that, and in what portions of the country ? We had some discussion as to this two years ago. It was then mentioned that there was a proposal to extend in the Gulf of St Lawrence eventually to make communication with the island of Cape Breton and with the land cables.

Mr. FIELDING. They have a line to Cape Breton.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Probably that has been completed since the discussion two years ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy of the department is to build lines where the ordinary telegraph companies would not like to establish lines, and where they are necessary for the development of trade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There has been a good deal of complaint in Prince Edward Island as to their lack of telegraph communication or rather as to the high charges they are compelled to pay.

Mr. BRODEUR. A new contract has been made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should like to have the particulars of that contract.

Mr. LEFURGEY. The particulars were brought down in answer to a question. I wish to ask the minister why the Canadian Pacific Railway was not a party to that agreement along with the Great Northwestern ? The Great Northwestern is the only line we can use to the island ; apparently there is no mutual arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. FIELDING. My recollection is that the agreement was made with the Anglo-American Company which is the owner of the cables between the mainland and the island. What the government did was to make an additional grant by way of inducing the company to give a more favourable rate. The grant was placed at $7,000. The company controlling the lines in Prince Edward Island agreed to make a lower rate and to give better facilities to the public in the way of office hours. These are the main features of the arrangement. I think the arrangement was made with the Anglo-American Company which happened to be in closer touch with the Great Northwestern than with the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LEFURGEY. I think that must be the case. Many points are reached by the Canadian Pacific Railway and not by the Great Northwestern. I was talking to some Canadian Pacific Railway officials and they can give no reason why a similar arrangement should not be made with their line for a lessening of their rates.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be a matter for the Anglo-American Company. The complaint was as to the double toll across the strait, and the Anglo-American Company being in closer touch with the Great Northwestern than with the Canadian Pacific Railway would be inclined to make the arrangement with their own connections. The difficulty I suppose would be in bringing about the co-operation of these two companies.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Might I suggest that the minister take this matter up and see if some such mutual arrangement cannot be made with the Canadian Pacific Railway ? I believe the Canadian Pacific Railway would not object to the same arrangement as is made with the Great Northwestern.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure that we can control that. I know the Canadian Pacific Railway was communicated with and offered every opportunity of offering terms to Prince Edward Island if they desired. An official of the department had communicated with representatives of the two companies, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Great Northwestern, but I think the Canadian Pacific Railway did not regard the business as very attractive to them.

Mr. LEFURGEY. Four or five years ago, Sir Louis Davies, when in the House, had an offer from the Canadian Pacific Railway practically the same, the 30 cent rate to Prince Edward Island with certain emoluments to be paid outside, which would practically be the same contract as they have with these people now. I only suggest we might have some mutual arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway now.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite sure if there was such an offer from the Canadian Pacific Railway four or five years ago, it would have been very gladly accepted. I cannot imagine that if the Canadian Pacific Railway made such an offier it would be refused, because we were very anxious to get better rates to Prince Edward Island. The Canadian Pacific Railway had no cable across to the island and their relations with the Anglo-American Company are not as close as those of the Great Northwestern.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If you are paying an additional subsidy why would it not be a proper thing to have the reduced rates apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway as well as the other companies ?

Mr. FIELDING. They certainly will apply so far as the cable rates are concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would think so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many lines of telegraph are there owned by the government in each of the provinces ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are in all 6,270 miles of telegraph line, distributed as follows : Quebec, Gaspé, 28 miles : Anticosti, 223 miles ; Magdalen Islands, 83 miles, and on the north shore about 1,300 miles ; 1,600 and odd miles in Quebec. In Ontario there are 25 miles ; in the Northwest about 800 miles ; in British Columbia from 700 to 800 miles ; in the Yukon nearly 2,000 miles ; in Nova Scotia between 300 and 400 miles, in New Brunswick about 80 miles.

Mr. FIELDING. I think this system began with the construction of telegraph lines in sections of the country which were placed at a disadvantage owing to their sparseness of population and isolated condition, so that for ordinary commercial reasons the telegraph companies were not disposed to establish lines there. The matter of affording communication in cases of shipwrecks had a good deal to do with the foundation of the system, the desire to get communication with distant points where vessels were in distress. Then the system was extended. For example when it came to the Yukon no ordinary company was willing to take up the business on commercial principles, and the government thought it important for national reasons that there should be a telegraph line. In some parts of the Northwest the same reasons existed. It would be difficult to lay down any principle governing the whole matter, but the system has grown up under these conditions. Telegraph lines were established where it was desirable, for many reasons, there should be communication and where the profit would not induce commercial companies to undertake the enterprise.

Telegraph lines—Quebec—mainland, north shore of the St. Lawrence, Bersimis to Godbout, land line, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to substitute a land line 83 miles in length for the present cable communication between Bersimis and Godbout. It is recommended by the government superintendent of telegraphs in order to prevent interruption of several months duration which has been experienced in the past.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What was the total deficit on all the government telegraph lines throughout the Dominion last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The revenue last year was $147,391.94 and the expenditure $327,917.65.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the total length of all telegraph lines in Canada ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot say, but I will make inquiries.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked the question with a view of getting the proportion of government owned lines to the entire mileage in Canada. In the same connection I would ask the minister whether there has been found any practical difficulty in the operation of the government lines. I quite understand that the government has selected portions of the country where such an enterprise would not be expected to pay commercially, and hence we have a deficit of about $180,000 a year. Have you been in the habit of making connections with private lines ; what has been the experience of the government generally operating its telegraph system ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the deputy minister that we experience no more difficulty in operating our lines than is experienced by private companies. The fact is that we lose money every year, but our telegraph system is not expected to pay. For instance the line on the north shore of the St. Lawrence is erected for the benefit of navigation. At first there was some difficulty in operating the Yukon line but lately it has been working fairly satisfactorily. As to the maritime provinces I am informed that no difficulty is experienced.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How do the rates charged on the government lines compare with rates charged by private companies ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The rates on government lines are higher because of the fact that the business is less.

Cable connection between Pelee Island and the mainland, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make repairs and to lay down a new cable between Pelee Island and the mainland. The total cost will be $6,000.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the old cable given out.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, it is of no use.

Kamloops—Lower Nicola line, $5,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is for the construction and equipment of a telephone line as recommended by the general superintendent. Sometimes it is found easier to have a telephone service than a telegraph service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these new lines ? I did not know there was any government ownership of telephones.

Mr. BRODEUR. Originally they were built for the telegraph service but it was found less expensive to use them as telephone lines and so long as they work satisfactorily they will be continued.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is there a special night service over the government lines ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is there a special night rate on any part of the government lines ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the government under consideration the purchasing of the profitable telegraph lines in Canada ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not in a position to give any information on that subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these the only telegraph lines which the government owns or are there others ?

Mr. BRODEUR. These are the only ones. They are built for telegraph service and are operated in this way for the convenience of the service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do they connect with the lines of any private company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. This one connects with the long-distance telegraph line of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They do not connect with the telephone lines of any private company ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. They may touch points where there are other lines, but there is no agreement.

Vancouver Island to Salt Spring Island—telephone line extension on Salt Spring Island, $1,050.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is to make provision for a further extension of this telephone line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason you are building these telephone lines ? Is the country sparsely settled, or are there important interests requiring them ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is simply to connect the island with the mainland. I understand that there are a certain number of persons on the island who have no means of telegraphic communication, and therefore this telephone service is provided.

Arbitrations and awards, including payments authorized, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does that mean ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote corresponds to a similar yearly grant made by parliament to the Department of Railways and Canals under the heading of miscellaneous. Previous to the subdivision of the Public Works Department in 1879 the annual grant for arbitrations and awards amounted to $10,000. In 1880 it was divided into two amounts of $5,000 each, one placed at the disposal of the Department of Railways and Canals, and the other left for the use of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was spent last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $1,480.12.

Surveys and inspections, $50,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for surveys and inspections to be made in connection with slides and booms, bridge work, and other services under the control of the Public Works Department. The estimate is as follows : maritime provinces, $12,000 ; Quebec, $16,000 ; Ontario, $13,000 ; Manitoba, $2,000 ; the Northwest Territories, $2,000 ; and British Columbia, $5,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are not these surveys and inspections made by officers of the department, and if so, why do you require this vote, outside of their salaries and travelling expenses ?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in case they require some assistance, in connection with these works, and for their travelling expenses when visiting the works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much was expended last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. $50,651.12.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much of that was expended in employing outside assistance ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not that information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The vote is couched in very general terms, and I should think we ought therefore to have definite information upon it. I do not pretend to understand very much the working of the departments, but it would seem to me to be a curious way to vote money for salaries—to put it in an item under the heading of surveys and inspections. I think salaries should be provided for under some other item.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is for extra work. It is not for salaries of officers of the department ; but sometimes some of the officers are required for extra work, and they are paid out of this vote.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I thought there was a certain amount charged to every public work for the officials in the department attending to it.

Mr. BRODEUR. That covers work for which appropriations are made ; but when applications are made for new works for which there are no appropriations, we have to provide for their inspection and survey.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How can you have the work if there is no appropriation for it?

Mr. BRODEUR. These expenses are made before the money is voted. Suppose that my hon. friend asks for a public work in his county. The department will have to send somebody to look into the matter and to make an inspection and survey. He makes the survey and reports how much it will cost. He submits the matter to the minister, the minister submits it to the government, and the government to the House. The cost of that inspection and survey comes out of this vote.

Surveys of head waters of Ottawa river and tributaries, with a view of devising a scheme for the regulation of the water levels of the upper regions of these streams, so as to afford increased facilities for navigation purpose, the descent of timber, &c., $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is called for by the chief engineer of the Public Works Department to make provision for defraying the probable expense of making surveys of the head waters of the Ottawa river and its tributaries, and for regulating the water levels of the upper reaches of these streams, so as to afford increased facilities for navigation, the descent of timber and the development of water power.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you mean the development of water-power by the goverment or by private individuals?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are the owners of the water-power on the Ottawa river. This is for the purpose of regulating the descent of the water. A report is being made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How long has the survey been going on?

Mr. BRODEUR. About a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When do you expect the report?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are some other points to be surveyed before the final report is put in. We expect the report during the course of the summer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is making the investigation?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Brophy, the engineer in charge.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Is this water-power to be utilized here?

Mr. BRODEUR. This is in order to regulate the water and get a larger revenue if possible and for navigation purposes also.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But you have water-power going to waste. Why should it be necessary to spend money to get more ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the water-power, excessive as it may appear, is not regular. Sometimes there is too much and sometimes not sufficient. This is in order to regulate the power because if the government undertook to lease a large quantity of water-power, it might be impossible at times to supply the quantity leased.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the minister say that at any time during the year there is a shortage of water-power on the Ottawa?

Mr. BRODEUR. So I am informed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the department had under consideration the putting in of plant to supply light to the buildings owned and controlled by the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time ago the department had a system of supplying the government buildings with light from government plant, but it did not work satisfactorily and the existing system is considered preferable.

Cement testing laboratory—improvements and equipment, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to cover the expense of procuring the latest and most approved appliances for testing the strength of cement.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many officials employed?

Mr. BRODEUR. Four.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the total cost of the works?

Mr. BRODEUR. $5,000.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a new departure?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, since we have been doing concrete work this testing and experimenting has been going on.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are you testing simply for the purposes of the government?

Mr. BRODEUR. For our own works.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No inspection of the manufacture of cement?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. INGRAM. The manufacturers of cement are very eager that inspection of cement imported into Canada should be made. Has any thing been done towards that end ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That would not fall under the control of the Public Works Department but would be a question for the department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman is Minister of Inland Revenue, and I would draw his attention to the importance of testing the cement imported from the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would suggest that as the manufacture of cement is one of our most important industries, the cement made in our own country should be tested for the benefit of the people.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are testing it now for the public benefit.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are these tests to be published?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they are simply made for the government.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. If you are making tests of the value of cement, they ought to be published. I have in my mind a building in a small town, built on cement bottom, at a cost of $20,000 or $30,000. It would be to the advantage of this country if we had the views of experts on the value of cement for that purpose.

Mr. BRODEUR. The policy of the department is simply to see that the cement used in these works is perfect cement. If we were to give certificates as to the quality of the cement sold by private industry, they could be used as an advertisement, and I do not see why the government should undertake to do that.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why should we not fix a standard and grades?

Mr. BRODEUR. We might fix a grade or a standard but that is another question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If it is necessary for the government to have four officials to take care of the cement used in their work, how much more important would it be that the people should know the quality of the cement they purchased and that a standard should be fixed.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a standard specification provided for in the contracts made with the government, but I do not know whether it would be advisable or not to provide for an inspection of the cement imported.

Mr. HENDERSON. It would be rather dangerous for the government to interfere with this industry by giving a certificate or opinion that a particular manufactured cement is superior to all others. No doubt the hon. minister is perfectly right in having a thorough test made of the cement being used in our public works. I think myself, from all we know about the business, we can make just as good cement in this country as anywhere for the purposes of our public works. We make in this country just as good a quality of cement as we can import. In bygone years we im-

ported too much cement. I am glad the government have adopted this plan, and think it would inure to the benefit of Canadian industry and result in more Canadian cement being used than hitherto. The minister will find that we can make in Canada a cement as good as can be obtained elsewhere.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is provided in all the contracts made by the Department of Public Works that we shall use only Canadian cement, and it is found by tests that it is just as good as any other cement.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. It is with great pleasure that I learn that the government have decided to put in their contracts that only Canadian cement shall be used. I know something about the cement industry in Canada, and I can affirm that we are manufacturing the best cement in the world to-day both in fineness and in strength. I am very much pleased to learn that the government have adopted the system of using Canadian cement only.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am 'delighted to know that we have another convert to the national policy. I am sure that the citizens of Hamilton will highly approve of what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Zimmerman) has said. For they are an industrial people and believe in Canadian manufacturers. What the hon. minister has said will go throughout the length and breadth of Canada and will most materially help Canadian industry. It will draw the attention of builders generally to the fact that in the opinion of the government by whom a thorough test has been made, Canadian cement is superior to the imported article. We join our new convert to the national policy in rejoicing that this statement has been made.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Many good statements are made on this side.

Mr. HENDERSON. And we are pleased to hear them all.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is any examination made of cement coming into Canada ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the minister believe that, in the present condition of our cement industry there should be such an inspection ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a broad question. If we were to inspect cement, I suppose we should be called upon to inspect all the other goods that come into Canada.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. minister has thought it wise, through the department of Inland Revenue of which he is the head, to inspect fruits and other goods.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is food inspection, and is carried on for the protection of the public health, and not to test the quality of goods coming into the country.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Mr. INGRAM. Canadian cement manufacturers find that American cement brought into Canada is not of the quality represented. This inferior quality of cement can be sold at cheap prices, and so it is the means of unfair competition with our manufacturers.

Mr. CHRISTIE. Do the government make a test of cement from different manufactories ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we simply test cement used in carrying out our work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe that this question of the importation of inferior cement is a very serious one to our manufacturers, as this competition undermines our cement business.

Mr. BRODEUR. Our tests have nothing to do with the inspection of cement, they are simply made in connection with the construction of public works.

Mr. CHRISTIE. But should not there be an examination of the cement sold by different manufacturers ? In my riding many farmers use quantities of cement, and sometimes they get a brand that gives very poor satisfaction. The farmer has no means of knowing the quality of the cement.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be a very serious thing for the government to undertake to declare whether a certain cement was good or not. It seems to me that it is better to leave that matter in the hands of the trade. If our cement is, as I am informed, equal or superior to that imported, I suppose our business men will buy from our own manufacturers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The suggestion, as I understood it, was along a little different line from that of the minister's remarks. The suggestion is that cement sold in Canada should bear a certain stamp indicative of its quality as a protection to the purchaser. If I were buying cement, for instance, I would be unable to distinguish between the good article and the bad. And farmers buying cement are apt to buy under a false impression as to quality. I do not know whether the suggestion can be carried out, but it seems to me that it would be only following in this matter the line we have taken in others. We have insisted, for example, on certain marks upon fruit packages. This is not for the public health, but to enable the purchaser to know what he is buying. That is the nature of the suggestion, and I think it might be worth consideration at least.

Mr. FIELDING. What reason can be urged for doing that in the case of cement that would not apply in the case of other articles ? It appears to broaden very greatly the field of public inspection. We do sometimes broaden that field, but I cannot see why this should be done in the case of cement more than in that of other articles

in regard to which one is apt to be deceived. It is supposed that in purchasing certain goods the purchaser will satisfy himself as to the quality.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the same argument might be made in regard to fruit.

Mr. FIELDING. That has something to do with the public health.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think that in that case we looked at it from that standpoint. The object was to so mark the package that the purchaser would know what quality of goods he was buying, or, in case of misrepresentation, to give him recourse against the seller or to impose a penalty upon the seller. I concede that there may be great difficulty in making a general application of this principle, but we certainly have made a start in the direction of its general application. All our legislation with regard to fruit is exactly along the line which has been suggested here to-day, and it may be desirable for parliament at some time to extend it.

Mr. MILLER. Our Canadian cement manufacturers have not only to compete with foreign competition but with an execss of home production. I would like to see any remedy adopted or any plan taken that would improve the condition of the manufacturers of Canadian cement. I would like to point out that the inspection of cements with the idea of grading them would be difficult, because of the fact that any Portland cement increases in strength as its age increases. Therefore you might inspect a product of one factory and compare it by testing with the product of another factory and come to incorrect conclusions because of a difference in the age of the products. It seems to me that any system of inspection or grading, to be of any value, would be very difficult, and not so simple as the inspection of most other products.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the strength increase with age or decrease ?

Mr. MILLER. Portland cement increases up to one year, or more than a year. And cement will keep on increasing in strength.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And decreases afterwards ?

Mr. MILLER. No, I do not think so.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) have brought to mind another article, illuminating oils, which are tested. Every barrel, practically every gallon, that is sent out has to be tested for public safety. Now is it not possible that we could have cement tested in the same manner, for public safety ? My hon. friend realizes the importance of the cement industry in our country, and how extensively it is being used among farmers and builders. Is it not reasonable to expect that justice would be more likely to be done people if a certain standard was placed on the barrel of cement, and the date on which it was placed ?

Mr. INGRAM. Some manufacturers, both Canadian and American, wish all barrels to be graded and stamped so that they may all be placed on the same level.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it is possible.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In the United States every barrel or package of cement is tested and the result is marked on the barrel. The manufacturer tests it himself. The contractor insists on having a certain strength and fineness in the cement employed in some particular work he is engaged on. Some works require a lower grade of cement than others, so that where the manufacturer tests the cement himself, he can furnish the contractor with the quality he requires.

National Art Gallery, Ottawa, including the purchase of paintings on the advice of a committee of artists, $7,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This item covers $540 for a caretaker, and $6,700 for the purchase of pictures. The gallery is on O'Connor street. This is an annual vote.

Chief Architect's office—salaries of architects, draughtsmen and clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $73,200.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to defray the salaries of architects and others whose services have to be retained from year to year in the construction, maintenance, repairs, heating and lighting of public buildings under the control of the federal government throughout the Dominion.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is a very large item. I notice the same item was voted last year. Can the minister tell me if that amount was expended last year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been a mistake in entering this item. I have information from the chief architect's office that when the estimates were prepared the amount asked for was $42,200. The present item should be reduced by $31,000.

Mr. INGRAM. The government are paying large amounts every year to different architects to draw up plans. I think all that work should be done by the department at headquarters.

Mr. BRODEUR. In some cases plans have to be drawn up outside, but most of that work is done here.

Mr. INGRAM. I can show the hon. gentleman in the Auditor General's Report several items that are paid to outsiders, which together would make up very large sums.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman must be mistaken.

Mr. INGRAM. I know in my own city a case where the superintendent of public works, who is an architect, performed work for which he received so much per day, and he went on extending the work for months and months. There are other instances where architects draw up plans, and as they get so much per day they stretch out the work for months.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the chief architect's salary, and the salaries of others ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The chief architect, Mr. Ewart, gets $3,500 ; Mr. Billings has $1,550, Mr. Routhier, $1,200 ; Mr. Marquette, $1,460 ; Mr. Lamb, $1,200. The average salary of the draughtsmen is between $900 and $1,100.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It seems to me it would be possible to get men to do that who would come under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are some officers there who can only receive $400 if we do not insert these words, and my hon. friend knows we cannot get draughtsmen, technical men, for that sum.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not sure but that the government is quite justified in employing young men who have not passed the civil service examination or entered the service in the regular way. Young men graduate from the School of Practical Science in Toronto, for instance, and it is a boon to these young men to be able to get an appointment in some way in the civil service until some permanent position turns up. I know some young men, I have one young man in my mind, who took this course and is employed by the government at a fair salary. He was considered a remarkably clever young man, and I was glad when he was given employment in the department ; and if he was worthy of it, I do not see why he should be required to pass the civil service examination for the work the government was giving him to do. It is encouraging to these young men, and I am not one of those who decidedly object to the employment of a young man simply because he has not passed the examination.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is precisely what the department is doing. These men have technical knowledge, and it is impossible to get them for the price paid under the Civil Service Act—$400 a year. We could get men, but not competent men.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It is not because they could not pass the examination, but because you cannot get them for the salary ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is because the salary provided is not sufficient.

Mr. HENDERSON. They could get more outside ; $900 to $1,100 is not very high.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Telegraph service—salaries of staff, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for the salaries of the staff of the government service at headquarters, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. INGRAM. How many are employed there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Four—Mr. Keeley, general superintendent ; Mr. R. Keeley, the clerk ; Mr. Parr and Mr. Hardcastle, the stenographer.

Temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were first employed after 1st July, 1882, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $44,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to pay such persons as are required from time to time in the Public Works Department to render clerical assistance of one kind and another, in the capacity of clerks, &c., as exigencies require, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. These are employed in the Public Works Department here.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many of them are there ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Sixty-four.

Mr. INGRAM. After this vote is passed we will hear no more of these temporary clerks. After this they will have to comply with the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; this is the usual vote which is taken. There are very few officers in the Public Works Department who are on the civil service list. Most of them are engaged in a temporary way.

Mr. INGRAM. In the departments generally there are many temporary clerks, some of whom have been there for eight or ten or twelve years. That is what I say should be done away with ; they should surely be made permanent, and so we would do away with necessity of coming down to parliament every year with grants 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' Let the Civil Service Act be complied with as nearly as possible, and do away with these votes.

Mr. BRODEUR. Take the accountants. My hon. friend knows very well that we cannot get accountants for $500 or $450, but the case is the same as with the previous item ; such technical knowledge is required of most of the employees in the department that we have to provide in this way.

Mr. INGRAM. Why not change the Civil Service Act to meet this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. And get the names on the civil service list—a good suggestion.

Mr. INGRAM. A lot of fraud can be perpetrated under this scheme, and it is abused.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice the promoter of this Bill is not here. I do not think we can go on with these Bills without the promoter. If we are to pursue that course how will we get members to attend the House. If members wish to have legislation put through they must be present.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think the objection is well taken because according to the rule if the member who is in charge of the Bill, or whose name appears on the back of it is not present some other member may move in his name. I do not think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am not rising to a point of order ; I am reasoning the matter. I take the ground that members should be here. We sit here day after day almost without a quorum and members have put their names on the back of Bills as a guarantee of their genuineness. Then they go away and remain at home, they do not come here to attend to their legislation and a few members who do attend are expected to assume the responsibility of putting that legislation through. So long as we continue doing that we will find that members will absent themselves. They get their matters put through whether they are here or not, and I think it is time the House took a stand and said no Bill should be proceeded with at any stage in the House unless the member who has charge of it is present to vouch for its bona fides. This Bill is reported as amended ; we have not the printed amendments before us and we want somebody here to explain.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I can give all the explanations or they can be given by anybody who was present in the committee.

Mr. HENDERSON. The Minister of Justice is very kind, but that does not get over the difficulty that he has only half a quorum behind him. I think the minister should join with us in adopting some measure that will act as an incentive to members to be present at the sittings of the House to attend to the legislation. I raise the question not as a point of order but as something that should guide us with a view to having the affairs of the House conducted—I shall not say with propriety because we do that at all times—but in a proper way. A member in charge of a Bill asks the House to put through a certain measure and he ought to be here to explain any clauses of it and to show by his presence that he has sufficient interest in the Bill to ask the House to put it through. I appeal to the House to endorse me on this question because I think it is the proper stand to take. I do not ask you to rule, I am not aware that there is any rule to prevent the Bill going on but I think as a matter of policy the House should say : We will allow the Bill to stand until the member is present.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the best policy at this stage of the session is to expedite the Bills and get on so that we will get home at some time between this and December.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What do you think of the importance of a Bill when the promoter is not here ? The Minister of Justice says that this Bill was discussed in committee, but it does seem to me that when the promoter of the Bill has not enough interest in it to be present the legislation in his judgment cannot be very important. I certainly think the House should sustain the position taken by the member for Halton (Mr. Henderson).

Mr. INGRAM. It has come to this in this House now that if a few members who are in the habit of attending regularly were to vacate their seats for a few hours we would have no session, and I think the privileges accorded to members are being abused to the fullest extent. It is a disgrace and a shame and if members who are occupying seats in this House cannot attend sometimes they had better resign and let others take their seats who will attend. It is certainly going beyond all decency to say the least. There are members who would like to take an hour off but who are compelled to sit here day after day because the other members will not attend.

House went into committee on the Bill.

On the preamble,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The blank spaces in the printed Bill are filled in with the words 'the mortgage dated the 10th day of June.'

Mr. HENDERSON. Is that the only amendment in the Bill ? It is 'reported as amended.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The Bill itself is very short but the schedules are very long, and perhaps if the leader of the opposition would permit me I would hand over a report sent to the government by Mr. Shepley, of Toronto, who acted for the government in connection with the preparation of these documents.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Very well.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have no desire to oppose the Bill in any shape or form. I was present at the Railway Committee

when it came up and I am quite in accord with the Bill and am simply rising to make the statement so that I shall not be misunderstood. I simply hold that we have a right not to have these Bills proceeded with in the absence of the members who father them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are very few members behind my hon. friend; I think honours are even in that respect.

Mr. INGRAM. We are not charging the government any more than members on our own side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think if this report, which is of some length, is to be of any service the Bill should stand over until Monday.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course if my hon. friend wishes it to stand it is no use proceeding, but I understand it is a matter of some importance that this Bill should be expedited.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I simply said if it was to be of any service to me.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps we might take up one or two of the other Bills and in the meantime my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) could read the report and if after reading it thinks the Bill should stand I am quite agreeable.

Progress reported.

RELIEF OF GEORGE PEARSON.

House in committee on Bill (No. 153) for the relief of Geo. Pearson.—Mr. Calvert.

On the preamble.

Mr. BERGERON. These divorce Bills that come from the Senate are always brought in a very long time after the evidence has been sent over to this House. They should be brought down a day or two after the evidence is submitted so that we would remember the evidence. If I remember rightly the evidence in this case has been down for over a month; there are three or four of these Bills and members have these cases mixed in their minds.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me that this has been before the House for some weeks. I was under the impression it had passed long ago until I noticed it on the order paper. I do not know where the delay occurred but the Bill was presented two weeks ago.

Mr. BERGERON. I always vote against these Bills, but I want to say, as a matter of public morality, that I believe many divorces should not be granted, for which there is no cause. In very few of these cases, from the evidence I have read, should divorces be granted, even from the point of view of those who are in favour of divorces; and by granting divorces for such trifling reasons, we are encouraging people to come and get divorces. At the same time, there is injustice in the matter, because people who have a good deal of money can get divorces, while poor people, who may have stronger reasons for getting divorces, cannot get them. That seems to be an anomaly, and I call the attention of the government to it.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed, on division.

RELIEF OF ARTHUR HOWE HERSEY.

Mr. CALVERT moved that the House go into Committee on Bill (No. 167) for the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course, it is no use for me to raise the objection to this Bill which I did in regard to the first Bill; but during the past week or ten days I have noticed that Bills have been allowed to stand under similar conditions. I had a conversation with the solicitor of the respondent this afternoon, and he was very anxious that this Bill should not be pressed through the committee stage to-night. He opposed the Bill in the Senate, and intended to oppose it before the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons; but, unfortunately, the notice of the meeting failed to reach him. He desires to have another opportunity of dealing with the case before the Private Bills Committee, and he would like to have the Bill referred back for further consideration. I am not going into the merits of the case, because I do not profess to be familiar with it; I have not even read the evidence. But I am told this is a case in which there is no direct evidence of actual adultery; it is a very special case, and on that account the solicitor is anxious to be heard before the Private Bills Committee. If the House would entertain the proposition to-night to refer the Bill back to that committee, I would be glad to move it; but if the House will not entertain that proposition, I would ask hon. members to be good enough to allow it to stand at least until Monday, when the promoter will probably be here, and when my request to refer the Bill back to the committee can be considered.

Mr. CALVERT. The promoter of the Bill, Dr. Johnston, as most of the members are aware, has been ill for a week or ten days, and may not be here on Monday; but I do not know any reason why the Bill should not be allowed to stand.

Bill allowed to stand.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 172) for the relief of Philip Vibert.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 129) to amend an Act respecting certain Patents of William A. Damen.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 166) respecting certain Patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate D. R. Fraser and Company.—Mr. Talbot (Strathcona).

DOMINION ATLANTIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 106) respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Black.

Mr. BELCOURT. The amendments are merely verbal. The object is to make provisions of the Railway Act of 1903 applicable to this Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is to authorize the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company to acquire a local company and exercise its rights and privileges to the extent they are not inconsistent with our legislation.

Amendments read the second time and agreed to.

MANITOULIN AND NORTH SHORE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 114) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is merely a verbal amendment.

Amendment read the second time, and agreed to.

THE PACIFIC BANK.

Mr. GALLIHER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 175) respecting the Pacific Bank.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has this Bill been printed ?

Mr. GALLIHER. The fees for printing have been paid, but I am not sure that it has been printed.

Mr. HENDERSON. I presume it is the standard form of Bill ?

Mr. GALLIHER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The Banking and Commerce Committee will not sit for three or four days any way.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I gather from the memorandum that I find in my copy of the Bill that it was intended to have this report of Mr. Shepley printed and distributed. But, though it has been printed, apparently it has not been distributed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I got it printed. But, on inquiry of those responsible for the distribution, I am informed that it has not been distributed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps, in that case, we might let the Bill stand until Monday afternoon ;—unless there is some very important reason for dealing with it now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It was suggested to me that there were financial reasons why it should be put through ; but I am not in a position to press it, if there is any objection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the matter has been considered by counsel, and if there is any important reason why it should be gone on with, I would not ask that it should be allowed to stand. But I suppose that no great interest would suffer if it were not proceeded with at once.

Mr. FIELDING. I know that the company are exceedingly anxious to have the mortgage approved and that they attach importance to the Bill being gone on with. But I cannot give the reasons. They have been pressing for some time to have this transaction completed.

Mr. BERGERON. It has to go to the Senate and the Senate has adjourned for ten days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Its standing until Monday will not delay the action of parliament.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I stated in committee that the report would be distributed before the Bill was gone on with, and I have to stand to that.

Bill allowed to stand.

SUPPLY

House in Committee of Supply.

Public Works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous temporary clerical and other assistance, inclusive of services of all persons required who were first employed after 1st July, 1882, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $44,000.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (for the Minister of Public Works). I explained this item before six o'clock.

Mr. BERGERON. This is a very large sum of money.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the usual vote.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this for all the departments ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, for the Department of Public Works. My hon. friend knows that there are a number of officers with special technical knowledge whose salaries are paid out of this vote.

Public Works—chargeable to income—miscellaneous—for the purchase of technical books of reference and other publications, $500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the usual vote and is intended to provide for the payment for technical works for the use of engineers, architects and draughtsmen.

Mr. BERGERON. Does the department buy works to this value every year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Where are they kept ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Many of these are periodical publications and also technical works necessary for the use of officers of the department.

Mr. BERGERON. This is over $40 a month. If every department spends as much it would make a great sum.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know about the other departments.

Mr. BERGERON. Well, take the Department of Inland Revenue, of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) is the head. How about that department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We buy some books out of our general vote, but the amount we spend is small—no comparison with the expense of periodicals and books for the Public Works Department.

To provide for expenditure in connection with Transportation Commission, $15,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the remuneration of the commissioners, travelling expenses, salaries of two secretaries, and scientific and expert professional assistance necessary in connection with the commission's investigations.

Mr. BERGERON. This does not pay the salaries of the commissioners ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes ; the commissioners are paid $25 a day.

Mr. BERGERON. When they travel ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. When they do not travel they do not get anything ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. BERGERON. What have these gentlemen done ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They have made a couple of reports. But I must say that we have been somewhat unfortunate in connection with this commission. Sir Wm. Van Horne, who was first offered the chairmanship, was unable to accept the position. Then Mr. John Bertram, who was made chairman, suffered a lingering illness which resulted in his death. And Mr. Reford a member of the commission met with an accident which prevented him from taking part in the work of the commission.

Mr. BRODEUR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think I have heard everything the minister has now said three times already this session. Before we vote more money for this Transportation Commission, I must ask that some more definite statement be made as to what they have done, what they are doing, when they are likely to complete their labour and what the result of it all is expected to be. I have already brought the matter to the attention of the House on two different occasions and have asked that we be given something more than the vague statements which we have heard three times already and which amount to just nothing at all. This commission was constituted in 1903, and from that time to the present I do not know one single matter in which it has been of the slightest assistance to parliament, although during that interval we have dealt with many important matters in transportation. We have been voting money year after year, and we do not know whether the men sitting there are constituted as a commission at the present time, who are the members of it, what it is doing, or anything at all about it. I would like the minister to make a full, definite and clear statement as to these matters, about which I have asked twice already during the present session, or else let this item stand until the government is prepared to make that statement. I think the Minister of Inland Revenue will realize that I am not asking anything unreasonable.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to let the item stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And I trust the hon. gentleman will take what I have said as notice that we do expect a statement on this matter.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the leader of the opposition remembers that an interim report has been laid before the House some time ago, with regard to the port of St. John.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was an interim report with regard to some feature of one port.

Mr. BRODEUR. But he must admit that there have been many accidents. Lately the secretary of the commission became paralyzed. Some gentlemen who were appointed did not accept the position, and most of those who were appointed have either died or retired for one reason or another.

To cover balances of expenditures for works already authorized for which the appropriations may be insufficient, provided the amount for each work does not exceed $100, amounts shown opposite appropriations affected, $6,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the same amount as was voted last year, when the whole amount was expended. Suppose there is a public work for which the money voted was found to be insufficient, lacking $50 or $75, it may be ; and instead of coming to

parliament for a special vote to meet that balance, we take it out of this $6,000. Suppose there is an appropriation for $500 and it was found that the work cost $540; instead of coming to parliament to get a special vote for that $40 it is taken out of this vote.

Mr. BERGERON. It amounts to this, that the principle prevailing in the British parliament, that not a cent of money is to be spent without being voted by parliament for the special purpose, is violated in these instances. The amounts are small, but the principle is important. I notice many cases in which large amounts are asked for in the main estimates, which we have to supplement not only once but twice. This is the third supplementary estimate, if I may so call it, that we are voting for some work or other.

Mr. BRODEUR. We cannot well do otherwise. I see in the list some cases of 3 cents, 4 cents, 9 cents; certainly the hon. gentleman would not expect us to ask for votes to pay these balances.

Collection of slide and boom dues, including salaries of clerks, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. Among the clerks whose salaries are included, is Mr. Gagné, whose salary is $1,095, and he is referred to by the Civil Service Act exemption. The item also covers two boat men and travelling expenses and contingencies.

Mr. BERGERON. How much do we get from these slides and booms?

Mr. BRODEUR. We got last year $71,331.20 from the whole Dominion.

Mr. INGRAM. What was the total cost of the slides and booms, the cost of construction and so forth?

Mr. BRODEUR. We discussed that last night. There is the cost of construction, the cost of maintenance, and then the cost of the staff. This is for the staff. It includes one clerk at Ottawa, $1,095, two boat-men, $960; travelling expenses, $1,840; contingencies, $1,105. About the same amount every year.

To provide for paying the 'Upper Ottawa Improvement Company' allowances re logs passed through Chenaux Boom, 1905-6, $1,800.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is authorized by Order in Council of December 14, 1903, and is rendered necessary by the low water at certain seasons of the year.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister spoke of the Ottawa being very low. When is it very low, and at what points?

Mr. BRODEUR. Generally in September and October; the survey would tell the points, and I shall get that again.

Gatineau river—To pay Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson for use of their slides and booms at the Cascades, $600.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to pay Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson one year rental for the use of their slides and booms at the Cascades, as recommended by the superintending engineer of the Gatineau.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object?

Mr. BRODEUR. To obviate building slides and booms for ourselves, we pay a certain rental. We have booms below, and if we did not lease these then ours would be overcrowded.

Mr. BERGERON. Whose logs are going down in such great quantities?

Mr. BRODEUR. The logs of the lumber merchants.

Mr. BERGERON. Are we paid for the logs that go through our booms?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; and we are paid by Messrs. Gilmour & Hughson.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did we receive for that particular one?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is all in one item; we received last year from these booms in the Ottawa district $41,756.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand, the government has a series of booms and slides in the river, and where this particular boom or slide is situated they make use of it as if they owned it, and inasmuch as they get compensation for the use of all these slides and booms they pay this amount to certain persons whose work has done a certain part of the service. Is that it?

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The whole system leads in effect to the provision of a highway for bringing logs down, the utilizing of the river as a highway for the carriage of logs from the place where they are cut to the place of manufacture. I may be permitted to say that while this seems to be the practice in Ontario and Quebec, to a great extent in other provinces of Canada provision of this kind is made very largely by the lumbermen themselves. The cases are perhaps capable of being distinguished. Here the river runs up a much greater distance and is used by a very much greater number of persons. In the instance to which I refer in my own province, the individual stream was probably used by not more than two or three lumbermen, or in some cases by not more than one. It may be that apart from this work the lumbermen have to make provision for running their logs down the streams which lead into the Ottawa. The conditions perhaps may be equalized by the circumstance I have just mentioned, that upon streams running into the Ottawa these men have to make that provision

which is made by the lumbermen in the maritime provinces for bringing logs from the interior to the sea shore. I do not know how it is, unless there is some such condition as that. It seems to be a different policy in the different provinces.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that the policy with regard to those booms on some rivers in Ontario and Quebec is a very old policy, existing long before confederation. I think it was established by the government of the country when these rivers were being settled up, when timber came to be cut off the banks of these rivers, and it has all been carried on in that way. I am under the impression that in the Confederation Act there was some provision as to the maintenance of those slides and booms. If it was possible to give them over to the lumbermen, perhaps it would be good policy; I am not sure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There would probably be difficulty about doing that where a large number of lumbermen are using the one stream; it might lead to conflict and friction. I am not criticising the policy; I believe that in respect to a great industry such as the lumber industry of these two provinces, it is the proper thing to have a great highway, such as the Ottawa, put in such condition that it may be used to the full. I suppose that must be done; and, in addition to that, there is the circumstance that some compensation, probably not very adequate compensation, is received back from the lumbermen for the use of these slides.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have given the amount —$71,000. I was informed yesterday by the deputy minister that we get a return equal to 3 per cent on the money invested.

Mr. BERGERON. Do we pay $600 every year in this particular instance?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister give us the rates on each class of timber—square timber, dimension timber, cedar poles, railway ties, &c.?

Mr. BRODEUR. The rates are printed in a little book, of which I shall be glad to send a copy to my hon. friend. I have not the information before me.

Mr. HERRON. Is this the method of collecting royalty?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is simply a kind of a highway made in the river. My hon. friend will see at the Chaudière that it was necessary to build slides there to bring down the logs from the upper part of the Ottawa below the falls. These slides and booms were constructed many years ago to enable the lumbermen to carry on their business, and there is a certain amount every year for their maintenance. There is no royalty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Repairs and working expenses, harbours, docks and slides, $164,400.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is an increase of $10,300 here.

Mr. BRODEUR. The item is made up as follows: St. Maurice district, $38,000; Ottawa river, $25,000; Trent river, $2,400; Burlington channel, $2,000; River Yamaska, $900; River Le Lièvre, $800: Levis Graving Dock, $4,500; Kingston, $3,000; Esquimalt, $8,500; making a total for the staff of $85,100. The repairs and supplies amout to $79,300 and the increase of $10,300 is made up as follows: St. Maurice district repairs and improvements, $5,900; Burlington channel bridge, repairs and improvements, $1,700; River Yamaska, lock and dam, $500; Kingston Graving Dock, $500; Esquimalt Graving Dock, $700.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What was spent last year on the same works?

Mr. BRODEUR. For slides and booms, $75,362.25; for the graving docks, $33,884.53; for the bridge locks, $10,068.76.

Telegraph lines Prince Edward Island and the mainland, $7,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you mix up these items in the estimates in such a confused manner? You have telegraph lines in one place, and then slides and booms, and then something else and then telegraph lines again. It looks as if the items were thrown into a basket and the basket turned upside down.

Mr. BRODEUR. At one page of the estimates the items are for construction and maintenance and at the other page for collection of revenue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not say so in the estimates. I think I could make better estimates than these although I have had no practice.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why is there such a large increase in this vote?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is because of the contract we have made with the Anglo-American Company by which we give them $5,000 for a better service for the people of the island.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not understand why you should give the one company this $5,000 when you might perhaps have got a better service from the Canadian Pacific Railway for instance.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Anglo-American Company have a monopoly under an old contract and we have to deal with them.

Land and cable lines, lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces, including working expenses of vessels required for cable service, also maintenance of Marconi Wireless Telegraph at Belle Isle, $80,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This vote is called for by the general superintendent of telegraphs

to provide for the expenses of the lines in the lower St. Lawrence and maritime provinces and the Marconi system.

Telegraph line, Northwest Territories, $26,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is there an increase in this vote ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is in consequence of the line being extended and the greater expense for its operation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many operators are there on the line between Qu'Appelle and Edmonton ?

Mr. BRODEUR. J. S. Macdonald, Miss D. Johnston, A. Von Lindenburg, H. A. Macdonald, T. G. Clement, W. Salisbury, D. Noel, T. J. Callaghan, E. McCleneghan, H. McClenaghan, G. G. Mann, M. Therien, J. Carroll, A. K. Morrison, J. C. Gordon, E. A. Holmes, A. W. M. Campbell, T. J. McNamara.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does part of this line run along the Canadian Northern ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that both lines meet at a place called Humboldt.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Are you going to continue the government line to Edmonton ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. If the Canadian Northern is going to have a line to Edmonton, what is the object of the government continuing the line ?

Mr. BRODEUR. One is built for railway work. We have our line established, and I suppose it is better for us to maintain it.

Mr. INGRAM. I should judge that the government line will not pay. The railway will be able to operate its line for a commercial business, too.

Mr. BRODEUR. We expect that the line will pay.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. minister mean that he is going into competition with a private line ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No ; the line between Qu'Appelle and Edmonton is already built.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the two items of increase were due to extensions ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are for lines which have been built outside of the Qu'Appelle and Edmonton line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am afraid the hon. gentleman is violating one of the canons of the Postmaster General by competing with private enterprise. He was horrified with that idea with regard to railways. I suppose this opportunity has been selected to pass this item in his absence.

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose we cannot prevent railway companies building telegraph lines over their own territory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the principle might require you to cease operating yours.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the minister know anything about Mr. Macdonald having a house built for him, and about his having taken an active part in the last elections ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am sorry that I cannot gratify my hon. friend's desire for information on that subject.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have you not the money there for building the house ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is none.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the minister give us an idea of the number of messages, other than government messages, which have been sent over this line ?

Mr. BRODEUR. 12,000 in the Northwest, outside of government messages.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many government messages ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it is stated in the blue-book.

Mr. INGRAM. How does that compare with the previous year ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed that it is about the same.

Mr. INGRAM. Is it not a fact that this line runs through Indian reservations, and that there is very little local patronage ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Our telegraph lines are built in certain sections of the country which are not provided with telegraphic communication, and where private companies will not provide it. They develop trade and the country generally.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman looks at the map, he will see that the Canadian Northern line runs from Humboldt west through Edmonton. Therefore, it seems remarkable that the government should keep up their line to the same place. The statement of the hon. gentleman might apply very well where there is no private line ; but here you have two lines in a sparsely settled country, and I see no reason why the government should continue to keep their line up.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not see why the government should take it away. The line was constructed in 1883, long before the Canadian Northern was built. If the railway company is establishing a telegraph line along its railway we cannot prevent it.

Mr. INGRAM. The point I am making is this. Everybody knows that it requires a certain expenditure every year to keep up a telegraph line. When the Canadian Northern has a line through that section of country, why should the government keep up another ? The poles and wires might very

well be put where they would serve points which are not now served by any company.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think it would pay to transfer these poles and wires 200 or 300 miles away.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the government make a practice of building houses for the operators on this telegraph line ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Where there are no houses the department builds them.

Mr. INGRAM. Have you got the buildings that we erected last year ? Take the one in township 36, range 23 near Humboldt for one Mr. Macdonald.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will inquire and bring down the information.

Mr. INGRAM. Having the government line and the Canadian Northern line, why are you going to the extra expense of building houses on a line which cannot possibly, for years to come, make sufficient to pay running expenses. I think that the government should not go to that additional expense when the Northern is able to perform all the services required at present.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not familiar with the circumstances, but when I have the report, I shall be in a position to give all the information required. It may be necessary to build some houses in some particular places but I am not in a position to give information just now.

Mr. INGRAM. Would it not be better to let the item stand ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I will give the information when we are next in supply.

Telegraph lines, British Columbia, $20,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the working expenses of the British Columbia line during next year. The small increase is due to an additional line.

Telegraph lines, Yukon (Ashcroft—Dawson line and branches), $183,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to provide for the working expenses for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1906, namely, salary of operating staff, line repairs, travelling expenses, provisions, freight, packing charges, supplies, &c.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is the item on which the hon. minister promised to give the House how much more it cost the government than the return received, the cost of construction, the length of the line and so on.

Mr. BRODEUR. The length of the line is 2,252 miles. The cost of construction was about $700,000. Staff salaries, $109,169 for the main line ; $12,680 for the branch line. Rents, repairs, travelling expenses on the main line, $54,000 and on the branch line, $4,430. Revenue so far, since the 1st July, 1899, $555,019.19. Revenue during the last fiscal year, $126,991. That is for the whole of the line, 2,000 mile system, Yukon and branches. The deficit is about $40,000.

Mr. INGRAM. What number of messages in the Yukon district ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are not divided. I can only give the number sent on the line.

Mr. INGRAM. In your report, you give the average number of messages in Ontario, Quebec, the Northwest, British Columbia and the Yukon. The average number on all the Yukon lines was 42,000 for 1903-4.

Mr. BRODEUR. The exact number during the last fiscal year was 47,982. What is referred to in the report is the yearly average of messages, and I suppose it must cover a certain number of years.

Mr. INGRAM. How do the operating expenses compare with the receipts on the telegraph lines controlled by the government ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year the revenue was $147,000 and the expenditure $327,000.

Mr. INGRAM. That is a big deficit.

Mr. BRODEUR. It certainly is not a paying operation.

Mr. INGRAM. That shows the importance of cutting off non-paying lines where there is competition.

Mr. BRODEUR. If a corporation puts in a line and the government gives no return, it certainly would not be fair to the country to keep it in operation.

Public Works—collection of revenue—telegraph service generally, $3,500.

Mr. BRODEUR. This covers expenses in connection with Dominion Telegraph service : Printed blanks, form and stationery ; telegraph instruments and batteries; travelling expenses of staff at headquarters, and petty cash disbursements. The amount spent last year was $3,407.31.

Mr. INGRAM. Does that include the Pelee Island service ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the expenditure on that under that head was $182.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Referring again to the items for telegraph lines in the lower St. Lawrence and the maritime provinces, including the Marconi wireless, will the hon. minister please give us some explanation of what is being done with respect to the Marconi system ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not working that system generally. There are only two places where we have stations using the Marconi system. When the cable does not serve, the Marconi system is used.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman give me the information I asked for the

other night with reference to the reimbursements by the Dominion government to the government of Nova Scotia in connection with harbours ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have here a copy of the Order in Council which I will send to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. INGRAM. All I wish to know is whether these reimbursements were for expenditures since 1867, or before that time?

Mr. BRODEUR. Since 1867.

Mr. INGRAM. So, the statement of the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. McLennan) was not correct.

Public Works—chargeable to capital—harbours and rivers—transportation facilities—Georgian bay to Montreal, survey for waterway via French and Ottawa rivers, $157,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is to make provision for carrying on during the present year an exhaustive survey of this proposed canal route. Last year $250,000 was voted, and that amount, I understand, has been expended up to this date. The distance to be covered is about 430 miles. The survey was begun immediately after the vote was taken last year, and no time will be lost in completing the same. As the committee is aware, this survey has been asked by all the interests affected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. To what interests does the hon. minister refer ?

Mr. BRODEUR. All the counties bordering on the line of the proposed canal. These have urged the construction of the canal ; but, before undertaking the work ; it was found necessary to make a thorough survey.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the survey entered upon in pursuance of a policy to construct the work, or was it to determine whether it would be wise to adopt that policy ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We must assume that, if the cost is not too great, it will be for the government to consider whether the work should be carried on or not. It has been represented that the work could be done for a relatively small amount. The survey will let us know, whether the work is feasible and what it will cost, and also whether development caused by the work will warrant the expenditure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it expected that the work will be completed ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The work is being carried on under the direction of the chief engineer of Public Works, Mr. Lafleur.

Mr. BERGERON. And who has charge under him.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is Mr. St. Laurent, engineer in charge, and Mr. Genest, engineer in charge. Then there are three district engineers, Mr. Chapleau, Mr. Rainboth, and Mr. Coutlee. We have three parties in each district.

Mr. BERGERON. When do you expect to finish ?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the month of September. The parties have been at work since August last. The total amount of $250,000 has been expended.

Mr. BERGERON. Is this the same scheme which was launched some years ago by Mr. McLeod Stewart, of Ottawa ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Stewart's scheme, I think, only contemplated a 12-foot canal ; but the surveys now going on contemplate depths ranging from 12 to 21 feet.

Mr. BERGERON. Who decided on making the change from a 12-foot proposition to a 21-foot proposition ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been no change made, but the government has decided to have a thorough survey. Representations have been made to the government that a 12-foot canal would be useless, and that if we want a serviceable work we had better contemplate a 21-foot channel.

Mr. BERGERON. Who proposed that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not a proposition, it is only to get the necessary information to find out how much such a work will cost, whether it is feasible and whether the traffic would warrant the expenditure.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not think the hon. gentleman understands my question. The first scheme, so far as I remember, was for a 12-foot canal. The hon. minister says now that information is asked for as to the probable cost of a 21-foot channel. Now, who is the man, or who is the party, who has suggested that change from a 12 to a 21-foot canal ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know that any persons have been asking for a change, but we have decided to make a survey for a 21-foot channel to see whether such a work can be done or not. The government came to this decision last year. There were petitions and delegations from all the counties interested asking the government to make the survey.

Mr. BERGERON. Why was not Mr. Stewart's scheme accepted ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because the information was not sufficient. Moreover, it is claimed, with apparent reason, that if we decided to build a canal in that part of the country, it should be large enough to accommodate vessels drawing 21 feet of water. We already have our canal system in the southern part of the province, and what is the use of building a canal in the north only accommodating vessels of the same size ? I must say also that the surveys which have already been made were not, properly speak-

ing, surveys, but simply examinations. Before undertaking a work of that magnitude we must have ample information, and the only way to obtain it is to send engineers to study carefully the feasibility and the probable cost, not only for a 12-foot channel, but even for a 21-foot channel, which would allow lake boats to pass through from Duluth and Chicago direct to Montreal, and even to Europe.

Mr. BERGERON. I have an object in putting my question, and it is this: Mr. Stewart's scheme, I think, contemplated a company building the canal at their own expense, they were only asking the government to guarantee so much upon their bonds. It was looked upon at the time as a very feasible scheme, as it contemplated only a 12-foot canal. There are already a great many reports in the Department of Public Works concerning the route to be traversed, reports made twenty-five or thirty years ago. They may not be as accurate as the reports we are getting now, but they were sufficient to enable Mr. Stewart to organize a company. I would like to know who changed this scheme from a 12-foot canal to a 21-foot. A 12-foot canal, or a 14-foot canal, could have been built, but the moment the government try to build a 21-foot canal they will meet with opposition, and they might as well stop all their expenditures at once, because such a canal will never be built. I know, as a matter of fact, that very strong opposition will be offered to any such expenditure. I know, as a matter of fact, that if the government seriously undertake to make a 21-foot canal, it will not be carried through, and the money we are spending now will have been wasted in so far as it contemplates a 21-foot canal. I will give one reason for saying so. If the government undertake to build a canal of 21 feet from the Georgian bay down to Montreal it will involve an immense amount of money, it will be a matter of from $100,000,000 to $150,000,000, whereas Mr. McLeod Stewart's scheme could have been accomplished for $25,000,000. My hon. friend knows enough to understand that the larger scheme will meet with strong opposition; I need not tell him from what quarter it will come. But when it is known that vessels loaded with wheat can start from Fort William or Port Arthur and go straight to Liverpool, strong opposition will be offered. I need not say any more than that, the hon. gentleman understands what I mean. There will be such an opposition that the canal will never be built, and therefore we are spending money uselessly, except in so far as the information we may acquire will be useful for a 12-foot canal. A 12-foot canal may be built, but a 21-foot canal never.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think my hon. friend should criticise this appropriation. Suppose the canal were not built at present, or in the near future; the important information which will be obtained will be of great use to future generations. My hon. friend knows that some years ago explorations were made in relation to a proposed change in some of the canals. Our existing canals were not built until many years after they were first begun. Take, for example, the Soulanges canal, with which the hon. gentleman is very familiar; it was pending for many years, the government made surveys many years ago and spent large sums of money in preliminary work. We do not know whether this canal will be built, perhaps it will be found to be too expensive or not sufficiently profitable.

Mr. BERGERON. It would become a matter of expense and no government would ask parliament to spend $150,000,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. The only question now is whether it is desirable to spend that sum of money to collect that information. Some people will say that if they survey a 14-foot canal we will have information as to the cost and will be then in a position to discuss the advisability of building a canal.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the engineers collecting information as to how much it would cost for a 12, 14, or 21-foot canal?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. When they were making these surveys it was just as well to have them determine the cost for a canal of the different depths. This is to collect the information and then the government will have to decide whether the work will be built or not.

Mr. BERGERON. And this will complete the expenditure in connection with the surveys?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. The surveys would cost $250,000.

Mr. BRODEUR. More than that. We have spent this year $250,000 and are asking $150,000.

Mr. BERGERON. That will be over $400,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. $400,000 in round numbers.

Mr. BERGERON. How can you spend that in a year?

Mr. BRODEUR. Salaries and supplies for the large staff required. The monthly pay list is $18,000 and then there are the supplies.

Mr. BERGERON. There is a revote of $50,000?

Mr. BRODEUR. When the estimates were made up in January, it was thought we would not spend the $250,000, but they work in the winter just as well as in summer, so they spent the whole amount. There is no revote properly speaking.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What do you take up on Monday? The Prime Minister told me that the Alberta Bill was coming up on Monday.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As far as the Alberta Bill is concerned, if it is quite agreeable to the leader of the opposition to have it brought down on Tuesday that would be more satisfactory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You are not going on on Monday.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thought we would take the Autonomy Bill, that part of it, which has reference to the distribution of seats.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood informally and privately from the Prime Minister that you proposed proceeding with the Autonomy Bill on Monday and he expected the House to get through with it next week.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. After the conversation with my hon. friend the leader of the opposition occurred, it was found that it would be more convenient to take it up on Tuesday.

Mr. FIELDING. In that case we will proceed on Monday with the estimates and there may be some public Bills which we will take up first.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The report of the committee on immigration only came down yesterday and we have not had time to investigate it. It would be more convenient not to take up the immigration estimates on Monday.

Mr. FIELDING. I think perhaps it could be arranged to deal with other interior estimates, keeping that for a little later. In any case if it should be taken up in my hon. friend's absence there will be an opportunity on the suplementary estimates for him to speak.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I would prefer to speak on the main estimates.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is possible we will postpone the item.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I do not think there ought to be any difficulty whatever about postponing.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, June 19, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 177) respecting certain patents of David Thomas Owen.—Mr. A. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 178) respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—Mr. A. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 179) respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. A. Lavergne.

Bill (No. 180) further to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the city of Ottawa.—Mr. Fielding.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 181) to amend the Bank Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill has already been mentioned to the House. By our present Bank Act the number of the directors of a bank is limited to be not less than five nor more than ten. With the growth of our banking institutions, as respects both the amount of their capital and the wider field which they are constantly occupying, the limitation of ten directors has been found inconvenient, and already a Bill has been introduced into the other branch of parliament for the purpose of allowing one of the banks to enlarge the number of its directors and also to appoint an honorary president. We think it desirable that our banking legislation should, as far as possible, be general; and, as the object of the Bill is one to which no reasonable objection could be had, we prefer to deal with it by a general Bill. We therefore propose in this amendment to strike out the limit of not more than ten, leaving the bank free to have, not less than five, but otherwise as many directors as time and experience may show to be necessary. We find that both in England and the United States many banks have very large boards of directors. As a number of our banks are increasing their capital and enlarging the field of their operations, we propose to make this amendment in a general Bill rather than to make special provisions applicable to the varying conditions of different banks.

Mr. SPROULE. You do not fix any limit to the number?

Mr. FIELDING. Not otherwise than that there must be not less than five. We think there is safety to the public interest in having a large board.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

AMERICANIZATION OF CANADIAN TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are procdeeded with, I wish to call the attention of the government to a matter of some urgency. I will do so as briefly as possible, and, to put myself in order, will conclude in the usual way. I desire to point out to the government what, to the mind of many,

is an impending danger to the Canadian telegraph system in the Americanizing of a portion of that system in violation of the provisions of the Alien Labour Act. I refer more particularly to the Americanizing of the Great Northwestern telegraph system. Members of this House will remember that about twenty years ago that system, as it exists to-day, was composed of the Montreal Telegraph Company, the Dominion Telegraphe Company and a company called the Mutual Union Company, of less extent than the other two, but still of some importance. The systems as they existed then attracted the attention of American capitalists and the Western Union Telegraph Company, having acquired, as I am informed, complete control of the Dominion Telegraph Company, established a company called the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company ; and that company absorbed the then existing companies—the old Montreal Telegraph Company, the Dominion Telegraph Company and the Mutual Union Telegraph Company. I need not acquaint the House with the details of the arrangements that were then made. It is sufficient to say that a certain dividend satisfactory to the shareholders of these respective companies was granted to them, and the new company entered into operations of the lines of the old companies and has operated them ever since. Not much attention was paid at the time to this transformation ; but within the last two or three years the attention of American capitalists interested in the amalgamation has been directed anew to Canada, and they have undertaken to completely Americanize the system, and in so doing, as I am informed credibly, they are violating every day and intend to violate still more the provisions of the Alien Labour Act. Some notice of this was taken in the public press some time ago. In one of the papers I find this paragraph :

> Great Northwestern telegraph changes. Mr. S. B. McMichael, of Minneapolis, a son of the general manager of the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, is now located at Montreal. In connection with his presence there are said to be several changes pending as a result of his investigation and report. Already a new chief operator and chief accountant have been installed. Changes are also said to be impending in the Quebec office.

In another newspaper appears a telegram, under date of May 26, as follows :

> A Telegraphic Shake-up.
>
> Montreal office of the Great Northwestern loses two of its chiefs—Will Americans be imported ?
>
> From our own correspondent.
>
> Montreal, May 26.—The shake-up which has been predicted in the Great Nortwestern Telegraph Company here, owing to the Western Union, which leases the lines, becoming active in the management, has come. Mr. Thomas Rodgers, who has been an official of the company for many years and has held the post of chief operator, has been dismissed. He will be succeeded by a telegraph man from the United States, and it is stated that Mr. Rodgers, who is looked upon as a very competent man, will be taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph Company. The former chief accountant, W. J. S. McCormack, left the service of the Great Northwestern some weeks ago, and now occupies a berth with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is stated that other changes will follow, including the withdrawal of Manager Powell, of the Montreal office.

The facts, as far as they have been ascertained,—and they have been communicated to me by reliable people—are as follows : The first president and the general manager, I think, since the creation of the Great Northwestern Telegraph Company, was Mr. H. P. Dwight, of Toronto—a gentleman who, I believe, initiated the telegraph system in Canada, and has always been considered a very competent man. Not long ago the American interests appointed Mr. I McMichael, of Minneapolis, general manager in place of Mr. Dwight, and Mr. McMichael came here and assumed the duties of his office. From my information, Mr. McMichael's services were secured in the city of Minneapolis as general manager here, and he came here for the purpose of carrying through the changes to which I am now adverting. Mr. L. S. Humes, of St. Paul, Minneapolis, was afterwards appointed general superintendent at Toronto. A little later on, Mr. S. B. McMichael, son of Mr. I. McMichael, general manager, of the city of Chicago, was appointed superintendent at Toronto, and entered upon the duties of his office. I believe the attention of the Department of Labour was drawn to these changes, and Mr. S. B. McMichael was for some reason or another—supposed to be on account of illness—withdrawn from the service of the company temporarily, and a report was made to the Department of Labour that Mr. McMichael, of Toronto, was the superintendent of the company there But the report failed to indicate that his services had been engaged in the city of Chicago and he had been brought to Toronto to fill that position. Another appointment of recent date is that of Mr. F. R. Carney, of Chicago, Illinois, who was appointed manager at Ottawa to replace Mr. Bethune, to whom a retiring allowance was given on account of his long services. Mr. Carney is in office here, and his services were secured at Chicago by the American interest. Mr. Callahan, of Chicago, was named cashier at Montreal to replace Mr. W. J. S. McCormick and the services of Mr. Callahan were also secured in Chicago. Several other minor appointments of the same nature as those I have just mentioned were also made, and I was informed in Montreal, where the company has a large number of minor employees, that a plan is in contemplation of importing from Boston and other points in the United States, line men and other men to replace those at present labouring for

the company in Montreal and the surrounding districts. Under these circumstances, I deem it my duty to call the attention of the government to this matter. I question whether it is in our interests as Canadians that the service of that important system should be entirely placed in the hands of aliens. Here in Ottawa, I presume, the government itself has considerable relations with both telegraph systems, and I think it is important that this system should be controlled by Canadians. I think it is the duty of the government, through the Department of Labour, or by any other prompt course it may see fit to adopt, to see whether the law is being violated in the way I have indicated, and if so, to bring to this state of things a prompt remedy. According to the decision given a day or two ago, I believe, by Mr. Justice Anglin in Toronto, in the case of the Père Marquette employees, it might be necessary, if that decision be well founded, that the government should make some change in the law as it exists. Personally I regret that hostile legislation of this kind should be in force between the two countries, but it was begun in the United States; and as long as an alien labour law is in force there, and enforced very severely against Canadians, it is the duty of the government to protect labour in our own country. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend stated at the beginning of his remarks that the present telegraph company, of which he complains, was incorporated by this parliament some twenty years ago. This company then absorbed two or three Canadian companies, and at the time it was understood that a large number of American capitalists were going into the organization. I forget at the moment the terms of the Act, but it was well known at the time that this incorporation of the Northwestern Telegraph Company was going to bring a large proportion of American capital into the country. We did not, I believe, then take the precaution that we have taken of late years of providing that there should be on the board of directors a certain proportion of British subjects.

Mr. MONK. I think my right hon. friend is mistaken. I think there was at that time a provision in the law that the majority of the directors should be Canadian. In fact I know of only two Americans on the board, Mr. I. McMichael himself and Mr. B. Brooks. The others are Canadians. Mr. Hugh M. Baird, Mr. Adam Brown, Mr. W. C. Matthews and Mr. James Hedley and the late Hon. Mr. McDougall were the Canadian directors. But I do not think the board has sat at all with regard to any of these changes. I am informed it was never consulted and that the changes were carried out entirely by the American interests, irrespective of what the Canadian directors might do or think.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. Perhaps the board may be Canadian. There is no provision in the Act of incorporation, so far as I know, providing that there should be a certain number of British subjects. That may or may not be the case. If it is the case, I am happy to say I was under a misapprehension. But in that case, the Act to which my hon. friend objects would not have been committed by a Canadian board or sheltered by their authority.

Mr. MONK. As I am informed, they are not consulted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If they are not consulted then, it is to be presumed, that the facts are somewhat different from what my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) has understood them to be. My information—the little I have on the subject—goes to show that these men are practically transfers of Canadians from one position to another and that my hon. friend is under a misapprehension. My information just received, is that these changes have not been to the detriment of Canadians, except in one case. I am informed that Mr. Rogers, whom my hon. friend has just named was replaced, not by an American, but by a Canadian by the name of Graham. I understand that the same is true of all the others except in one case. In that case an American has superseded an old man named Bethune, who has been pensioned for life. But while this is my information, still, on the complaint of my hon. friend, we are called upon to look into the matter. I cannot say, of course, what our decision is to be. We had an Alien Labour law up to three days ago; it is a question whether we have it now. In the opinion of one judge the law is ultra vires.

Mr. FOSTER. And, there is no appeal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not sure as to that. All this matter has to be looked into. At present, we do not know whether we have an Alien Labour law or not. Of course, I think we have it yet: Not because I am in love with that kind of legislation; it is not a thing to be generally approved. But our action in passing it was an action in self defence. In order to reach a decision as to what we shall do, we must have the best information and advice on the subject whether the Alien Labour Law is in force or not.

Mr. MONK. I merely wish to say to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that there can be no doubt about the facts——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are disputed.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt about Mr. McMichael having come to this country and the position of general manager having been taken from Mr. Dwight. There is no doubt whatever about Mr. Hughes or about Mr.

S. B. McMichael, or about Mr. Carney, manager in Ottawa having replaced Mr. Bethune. The information that my right hon. friend has is the information, as I am informed, given to the Department of Labour. But that information is incorrect. So far as my information goes, there is no doubt whatever that these gentlemen were engaged in the United States and came here for the purpose of filling these positions. They are under contract; they are in violation of the Alien Labour law. And if an inquiry is made, my right hon. friend will find that my statement of the facts is absolutely correct. Before further changes are made, I think that, as the Department of Labour costs us pretty dear, and as this is essentially within its functions, the matter ought to be looked into immediately to prevent Canadians losing their positions merely because of the fact that they are Canadians.

Motion (Mr. Monk) to adjourn, negatived.

HALF BREED SCRIP.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I gave notice to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) that I would bring up a question in connection with half-breed scrip.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I have here a further instalment of the papers on that subject which I will lay on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. When, on a former occasion I spoke on this question of scrip, I had to do so largely from hearsay, having no papers before me except a small memorandum. Since that time the Minister of the Interior has been good enough to bring down the first instalment of the papers. And although those that I asked for are not all down, I think it would be well to make a statement to the House and for the information of the government—and I ask the attention of the government to it—on the facts as shown in the papers so far as we have had laid before us. I want to say in the first place——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would not my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) wait until the House is voted into Committee of Supply?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I would rather deal with it now, if my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not object. The whole question arises, as the House knows, on a change of policy made on the 13th of August, 1904, by an Order in Council passed on that day, the policy changed having been one thoroughly understood by parliament, and to the extent that no adverse vote was registered against it—acquiesced in by parliament. The policy was with reference to claims to scrip by half-breeds who, after 1885, had left this country and gone to the United States of America, and had, it is presumed, taken residence on Indian reservations there, availing themselves of the privileges granted by the United States to men of part Indian blood. The last commission appointed on this subject was that of Mr. McKenna. That commission reported on the 31st of May, 1901. And that report and the minister's report accompanying it, formed an Order in Council approving of the different recommendations which were made. Of these recommendations I wish to refer only to two. No. 6 of these recommendations is as follows:

> Inasmuch as those persons of mixed blood in Canada who participated in the benefits of band life on Indian reservations are excluded from receiving said scrip, I have taken the position that half-breeds who have left Canada and taken up their residence on Indian reservations in the United States and participate in the benefits of Indian life there, as well as half-breed children admitted to United States Indian schools, be likewise excluded.

And the last recommendation is:

> In order to avoid the disputes on the question which was raised, I would suggest the desirability of making it clear that it is understood that in the case of money scrip no powers of attorney are to be accepted or acted upon, and that in cases in which the half-breed asks for land scrip the commissioner has no authority to accept or act upon any assignment of power of attorney.

The matter went on from 1901 to 1904, when, on the 13th of August, an Order in Council was passed traversing the order which approved of section 6, and, in short removing that disability and making it possible for the claims of that class of half-breeds who had left the Northwest and gone to the United States to again receive consideration. In that Order in Council of the 13th of August, 1904, it was reiterated that personal attendance was a requisite of the location of the land by the half-breed who was the grantee in the case.

That brings me in short to the position in which we found it when we undertook the discussion of this question the other day, and it is with that preliminary which sets out the conditions of the controversy that I rest the case so far as the policy is concerned in that regard, and come down to what is revealed in the present papers. This matter lay in that way until January, 1904, with this exception, that there was a petition in July, 1903, from these half-breeds of Turtle Mountain who are the interested parties in the case, asking that their case should be reviewed, and complaining that their rights were withheld from them wrongly by Mr. McKenna, and against what had been the idea of the government as shown in the Orders in Council appointing the commission. That was in July, 1903. Then there was also a presentation of the case made by a barrister of Winnipeg, by the name of Chaffey, who picked out one particular case, elaborated it, thereon made his appeal to the minister and

sent it into him about the latter part of 1903. That appeal was considered by the minister, was commended as an able document, but the writer of the same was informed that the government could not traverse its action and would not reverse its decision. That was in December, 1903. So that the petition of July, 1903, from the Turtle Mountain half-breeds and the presentation of the case by the barrister of Winnipeg, in December, 1903, were both considered, both refused by the government as contrary to their adopted policy. That brings us to the first of 1904. Now suddenly in August, 1904, the Order in Council to which I have referred was passed, that policy was reversed, a new policy was promulgated, and no notice was given of that new policy from the 13th of August until the latter part of October, when it appeared in the official gazette. These are not the most popular of notices, and as a matter of fact the interested parties, whether they were the half-breeds of Turtle Mountain, or whether they were barristers or brokers who had been interested in the claims of these same half-breeds, did not know that anything had taken place as a reversal of the policy until nearly the 1st of January, 1905, and some of them not fully until March 2, 1905.

What had been going on in the meantime? A party by the name of McDonald, of the city of Winnipeg, one of a firm of three, had in some way or other become acquainted with what was proposed or with what had been actually carried out. So far as these papers go, no notice was given to McDonald of the Order in Council until October 6th, although it was passed on August 13th. But McDonald's position was so different from that of all the others that though neither he, if we presume that to be a fact, received any intimation until October 6th, and none of the others received full information until the beginning of the following year. Mr. McDonald, by prescience, intuition or otherwise, knew that something was going to take place, and in July and August of the year in which the Order in Council was passed, Mr. McDonald visited the half-breeds in North Dakota and undertook a certain work amongst them which will be better detailed hereafter. He pursued that work assiduously up till the time and after the time of the passing of the Order in Council, and with such good success that before the 1st day of January, 1905, when some of his competitors and others interested in the business found out that something was going on, a large number of scrip was already in Mr. McDonald's hands. Fifty-five had been issued in the month of November, 1904, ninety-three in all had been issued before the end of 1904, of the whole number of 136 issued altogether, of which fifteen have not yet been sent to their destination. So you may practically say that before any others interested, whom the department knew well were interested, from months and years of communication, from tens and scores and hundreds of applications and assignments filed by them in the department from time to time, and up to the very end of 1903, practically all the scrip which had been allowed by Mr. Coté was in the hands of Mr. McDonald before any of his competitors or others interested in the matter found out what was going on.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a scoop.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it was fortunate for Mr. McDonald. Mr. McDonald seemed to have worked for that end. I do not find fault with him in that respect. He commenced in January, 1904, by getting an opinion from Mr. Ewart, and later from Mr. Wilson, both barristers in the city of Winnipeg, in respect of these particular half-breeds. These letters and information he transferrerd to the department. I am not going to make a long story of this, but in the end Mr. Wilson advised him to try and get the department to reverse their policy, and above all to try and get the department to do away with the necessity of personal location. On July 2nd, Mr. McDonald preferred his request to the department asking for a reversal of the policy, and asking that the personal location attendance should be dispensed with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Reversal as to what?

Mr. FOSTER. Reversal of the policy of the department under the Order in Council of January 6, 1901, in which they approve of Mr. McKenna's disallowance of the claims of that class of the half-breeds who had left the Northwest after 1885, and had taken up their residence and participated in Indian reservations on the south side of the line. On July 2nd, he asked for the reversal and on July 14, the government said: We will consider it, that is the department said it because I notice that the department appears largely to have been the government. Then, between July 2nd or July 14th and October 6th, from these papers we are asked to believe that no correspondence took place between Mr. McDonald, in Winnipeg, and the department here, at least none has been brought down and I assume there was none. But, if there was none, it is not presumable that there was no communication, and so, on August 13, 1904, an Order in Council was passed. On October 3rd, Mr. Sifton, at that time the minister, instructs Mr. Smart of the Order in Council which was passed and I think it is well that these instructions should be upon the records. They are in the form of a memorandum.

October 3rd, 1904.

Mr. Smart.

Attached is an Order in Council authorizing me to deal with scrip claims which for certain rea-

sons were disallowed by Mr. McKenna. Under this order I nominate Mr. N. O. Coté to investigate. I do not desire that for the present at least, he shall hold any sittings in the west, but that he shall receive the evidence in writing as it is filed before him here and report to me.

I call attention to the phrase 'and report to me.'

You will see that the order contemplates dealing with the applications which were made before Mr. McKenna in one way or another.

That is not accurate. The Order in Council contemplated only those which were disallowed by Mr. McKenna, and for one reason and for one reason only—residence and participation in the United States.

Mr. Coté may proceed to examine the evidence as soon as the claims are filed in the department.

On the 18th October, fifteen days thereafter, Mr. Smart issued his instructions to Mr. Coté :

Ottawa, 18th October, 1904.

Memorandum, Mr. N. O. Coté.

With regard to the half-breed claims that you are about to investigate, it is desired that you should examine the evidence taken before Mr. McKenna, and in all cases where it is sufficient to prove the claims, pass them at once and issue the scrip.

The instructions to Mr. Smart from the minister were for Mr. Coté to examine them 'and report to me.' Mr. Smart varies that by saying to Mr. Coté :

Where it is sufficient to prove the claims, pass them at once and issue the scrip. In other cases you can consider the affidavit evidence presented, and, where it is sufficient, act upon it and issue the scrip.

I call attention to the fact that the deputy minister of the department absolutely varied the instructions of his minister, and varied them so that the minister, instead of receiving a report and seeing the scrip before it was issued and to know why it was issued, the scrip was issued threafter, as a matter of course, on Mr. Coté's requisition to the accountant, and signed by the deputy minister.

Now, the next correspondence I find is on November 11th, when the department writes to Mr. Macdonald, telling him that they have received his letter of 10th ultimo inclosing 114 orders for delivery of certain half-breed scrip :

I am directed to inclose herewith for your information a list of the claims which have been reconsidered up to date under the Order in Council of 13th August, 1904, with the decision arrived in each case. Where the scrip has not already been sent to the claimants in your care, it will be issued in due course and transmitted in accordance with the orders filed, provided such orders are found satisfactory. Each case will be dealt with in the usual way, but where powers of attorney were filed here, or with Mr. McKenna, prior to the orders handed in by you, the cases affected by it will have to be held in abeyance for the present.

Mr. FOSTER.

That is on November 11th. Under the minister's Order in Council it was declared that prior assignments in the case of such scrip were the assignments which would be recognized. It was then said that in such cases :

They will have to be held in abeyance for the present.

Why ? I do not know, but there is a very instructive commentary on that. On November 11th they would have to be reserved in abeyance for the present, but on December 17th, an Order in Council was passed rescinding that part of the provisions of the Order in Council about prior assignments that was to be observed and be binding on the government. Before Mr. Chaffey, who had spent thousands of dollars in arranging the preliminaries of these claims and had made his deposits and filed his assignments and powers of attorney before the department, knew what was going on that Order in Council of December 17th was passed and the ground that he had on account of his prior assignments was cut from under his feet. The order was deliberately changed.

In the future correspondence in relation to any of these claims, one claim only will be dealt with in each letter, which is the usual practice of the department, but, while this has been departed from on this occasion in order to advise you in a general way what progress has been made so far in the investigation of the claims which were disallowed by Mr. McKenna on the ground of the residence of the claimants residing in the United States.

Now, this letter from Mr. Macdonald, with its 114 orders for delivery, does not appear in the correspondence. I have made a note of that, and I would like the hon. minister to bring it down, so that we may see what Mr. Macdonald said in that regard. About this time Mr. Chaffey appears—on November 2nd—and he says in his letter o: November 2nd that he :

Noticed by the press some time ago that an Order in Council had been passed in regard to some of the Northwest half-breeds living on American reservations.

He drew up a test case, he made his plea to the minister, and he was turned down by the minister. Mr. Chaffey asks in his letter for a copy of the Order in Council and a statement as to what had really been done in the case. In reply to his letter he gets a copy of the Order in Council of 13th August, which is the first time Mr. Chaffey gets his hands upon the order of the minister passed in Council. On November 25th some other peculiar instructions were given to Mr. Coté by the deputy minister. The deputy minister of that date writes :

Memorandum, Mr. N. O. Coté.

Would you please let me know how many cases you have of names given to you by which there were former powers of attorney or assignment. I am to advise you that no cases are to

be dealt with except those whose names have been given to you or which have been dealt with.

Which have been dealt with by Mr. McKenna. That was the only class of cases that was covered by the Order in Council. But it appears here that the names of cases have been given in some instances, and that therefore we have two classes of cases with which Mr. Coté was told to deal.

I am to advise you that no cases are to be dealt with except those whose names have been given to you or which have been dealt with. On consideration there appears to be no reason why documentary evidence should not be accepted quite as readily as any oral evidence, as the investigation for a few names means a very enormous expense.

Now what I want to know from the department is what were those other names, other cases than those rejected by Mr. McKenna, which were covered by the Order in Council and with which he was to deal. I want to know who gave him those names and I want a list of them. I have made a memorandum of that and I will ask the minister to be kind enough to give it to me.

On December 9, a letter goes from the department again to Macdonald, and they send to Mr. Macdonald a very urgent and I must say a very friendly letter indeed. I think it worth while to read some of it :

Ottawa, December 9, 1904.

With reference to the several orders for the delivery of half-breed scrip which you have filed in this department from persons who appeared before the half-breed commission and whose claims were rejected upon preliminary hearing, I am directed to inform you that before any of such claims may be reconsidered under the Order in Council of 13th August, 1904, it will be necessary to furnish the department with the usual evidence in support of such claims.

See the date, December 9. Before the 9th of December some fifty of the assignments had been actually put in the pocket of Mr. Macdonald himself.

A supply of 200 forms of applications is being forwarded to your address by express, and great care should be taken in getting all the questions therein accurately answered by the applicant in each case before a person duly qualified to take solemn declarations or sworn statements. . . . The same kind of evidence will also be required in respect to the claims of the brothers or sisters of persons who appeared before Mr. McKenna——

Both of these latter were actually shut out by the Order in Council.

—but in addition it should be explained in these cases why the claimants did not appear before him at the sittings of the commission for the purpose of submitting their evidence.

As it is desirable that all these claims should be finally disposed of without unnecessary delay, I am to request that the necessary evidence may be obtained and filed here as soon as possible.

To say the least that is a friendly letter ; no such letter was sent to Mr. Chaffey or any other one of the dozen others deeply involved and monetarily involved in the prosecution of these same claims on behalf of the half-breeds of whose interest the department had absolute knowledge and had had for months and in some cases for years.

On January 11, the competitors of Mr. Macdonald began to waken up. Short, Cross and Biggar sent in from Edmonton, a locality not unknown, to the present Minister of the Interior. Messrs. Short, Cross and Bigger want to know what is up. They are answered and a copy of the Order in Council is sent to them. On January 14, Chaffey again writes and up to that date he does not know who the commissioner is before whom to prosecute his claims. On January 14, 1905, Chaffey asks for the name of the acting commissioner and is given it. On March 2, Mr. Chaffey comes to the front. He has got his information, he has found out that he is far behind in the race and he goes to the commissioner, very commendably, not in a rage, but putting it just fairly before the department that he expects that they have some principle upon which they act and that they recognize fair play; his is a plea for fair-play.

On March 2nd, he sends in another letter. I shall not read it all, but shall give briefly the points in it. Mr. Chaffey states that Mr. R. C. Macdonald and himself among others were purchasing scrip in the year 1901 and bought claims from half-breeds who had been resident in the Territories but fled to the United States in 1885, after the rebellion. Both they and others were on the same track. He says :

I filed assignments of some of these claims in the early part of 1901 in the department, and received an acknowledgment of same. As the claims had not been proved they were left on file. They were not refused. Mr. R. C. Macdonald and myself exchanged lists of the half-breed scrips we had bought, so that we should not conflict or meddle with the claims each had bought.

And thereby hangs, later on, a tale.

I do not know the date, but I believe it was in the forepart of the year 1901 that Mr. Commissioner McKenna refused to accept these assignments. . . . We simply accommodated ourselves to the new practice. . . . The assignments I now refer to were obtained under the old practice.

And he claimed that the practice was that the assigments were recognized by the department and that the prior assignment was the assignment each had recourse to.

In the case of those half-breeds who had gone to the United States . . . I was the first to dispute the legality of such decision, and as far as I know the only one. In or about the end of 1903, I prepared an appeal to the minister from this decision, as I recollect in the case of J. L. Faquant as a test case on this point. I spent much time upon it, and went into the law and

cases bearing on it pretty thoroughly. I informed Mr. R. C. Macdonald of what I was doing and he urged me on in the matter. I received a reply that the minister was impressed by my argument, but could not see his way to reverse the decision of Mr. McKenna. Near the time of the last Dominion election I heard that an Order in Council had been passed dealing with the matter. I wrote for a copy of same November 3rd last making some of the statements made here. . . . I received from the department a copy of the Order in Council of 13th August, 1904, reversing Mr. McKenna's decision.

The language and statements in it were so familiar that it would appear to have been drawn from the appeal presented by me, before referred to.

The letter gives the Order in Council abandoning the original practice and recognizing an assignment of half-breed claims when filed in the department.

In December last, I presented my claims to the department under assignments of half-breeds, that had been filed in the early part of 1901 and under others which I then filed. The assignments were returned as not recognized by the department, and in many cases the scrip had been issued and consigned to the care of Mr. R. C. Macdonald.

He then filed a caution and made his point skilfully. He advanced five grounds and presented the whole thing asking that the notice of the claims be made effectual in the department and added :

And that a stay in those cases be granted until I may be advised what legal proceedings are necessary.

Well, Mr. Chaffey thought that that being a moderately reasonable letter, it would open the eyes of the department and his appeal to them for fair-play would be promptly acted upon, but it does not appear to have had that effect on the department. To make matters sure Mr. Chaffey sent in a new list of all his assignments from half-breeds so that at that time they got all of them from him, as they had the most of them before. On the 21st of March comes another very important letter from the department to the same Macdonald—no copy to any one else :

Ottawa, 21st March, 1905.

Gentlemen,—I am directed to inform you that it has been decided to allow scrip granted to half-breed residents of the United States under the Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, to be located in the name of the grantee thereof by the holder of such scrip without requiring the grantee to appear personally at the land agency to make his entry, but it will be necessary before presenting the scrip for location to have it endorsed by the department as having been issued under the said Order in Council. Such scrip should therefore be sent back to the department for endorsement, and after this has been done it will be returned to the person or persons by whom it may have been forwarded here, and the Agents of Dominion Lands will be instructed in regard to its location.

Mr. FOSTER.

The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the government and the House is that the regulation, invariable as a rule, in the department for the protection of the half-breed when he gets his land scrip, provides that he and he alone shall make the location, and that it shall not be made by any one who has or asserts that he has an assignment or power of attorney from him. That was a regulation of the department made by Order in Council, and that regulation is absolutely nullified. By another Order in Council ? No, Sir ; by a simple letter from the department issued on the 10th of March to all the land agents, telling them what ? That as a general policy they should allow the assignees to locate ? No, but telling them, so far as this ear-marked scrip was concerned which Macdonald had sent to the department and got endorsed, that they were to locate that through the assignee and without the presence of the grantee in the case. Now, I said that this was the invariable rule, I have it in numbers of Orders in Council ; and, to show that it is so, here is a case in point. In 1897, in the case of certain half-breed children's claims which had all been fixed up with the exception of may be two or three, the minister comes down with an Order in Council, and he says in effect this : Our invariable rule is, and by Order in Council, that the locator must be the half-breed who is the grantee ; but if that were insisted upon in these few cases which are now under review, it would make it almost impossible to have them arranged for and this matter cleared up. Therefore he recommends, with reference to these cases, that the assignee under certain precautions shall be allowed to locate for the original grantee. Under that recommendation—and I asked for the return—exactly two cases have been dealt with, showing that it was to clean up the fag end of a transaction, and that when the minister wanted to do that, he had to get the authority of an Order in Council, and was not allowed to do it by departmental authority. On March 29, 1905, another competitor turns up, and in an inquiring telegram wants to know if there is any change in the process of locating half-breed claims. He is told. On the 27th of March Macdonald sends in scrip notes for endorsement, according to the announcement which had been made to him, for 13,080 acres, and the department immediately endorses them and sends them back to Macdonald. On March 10 a circular to agents re this location is sent out, and I think I had better read that :

I am directed to inform you that it has been decided to allow scrip granted to half-breed residents of the United States under the Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, to be located in the name of the grantee thereof by the holder of such scrip without requiring the grantee to appear personally at the land agency to make his entry.

This concession on the part of the department applies to the scrip issued under the said Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, only, and

care should therefore be taken by you when application is made for the location of a scrip note by any other than the grantee himself, that such note bears on the back thereof the following endorsation in red ink:

Issued under Order in Council of 13th August, 1904.

Accountant of the Department of the Interior.

The endorsation will be signed by the accountant of the department if the note itself was signed by him, or by the acting accountant if it was signed by the latter, in order to enable you to compare the signature affixed to the endorsation with that on the note.

The applicant for location should make the application over his own signature, on behalf of the person named in the scrip note and subscribe to the usual declaration as to the land applied for being unoccupied and unimproved and in all respects comply with the rules and regulations governing the location of half-breed land scrip.

As heretofore, assignments of these locations executed prior to the date on which the land was entered for in the manner above indicated, will not be recognized by the department.

Macdonald has his assignment, and on the 10th of November he goes to a land office and puts it down, and says, I have this assignment from a certain half-breed. He makes the location. Any assignment made by that half-breed up to that very date is null and void under these instructions. Some one has to get behind Macdonald the red-hot moment he makes the location and gets the assignment, or no person can get an assignment. Well, that completely barred the way to further assignment, and put the land virtually into the hands of Macdonald himself. About this time Mr. Chaffey gets on his war paint and comes to the front in a very interesting way. He now pins his faith to Mr. Cory, and on April 15 writes to him this interesting letter, to which I bespeak the attention of the government:

Winnipeg, Man. April 15th, 1905.

Sir,—With reference to a few minutes conversation with you when I pointed out to you that the statement that half-breed assignments were never recognized is unfounded, as for ten years I received half-breed scrip up to the year 1901 or 1902 on assignments forwarded by me to the department, of which letter No. 2 herewith, is a proof.

Most of such case were money scrip, but at that time there was no distinction, as land scrip could also be transferred to the assignee.

It was an instance of land scrip so assigned to him, but I am inclined to think it was an isolated occurrence, and not a general rule.

The late regulation allowing the holder to locate, is similarly made for, or is in effect in the interest of Macdonald, as the half-breeds dealing wth him relied upon his statement that he would take them to locate, and such fact was an additional security to them.

What is the charge made by Mr. Chaffey? He says that Macdonald was enabled to get these assignments because he assured the half-breeds: You will be protected; I will take you to the land agent's office and have you select your own land.

There is also the fact that I first represented that the decision by Mr. McKenna in regard to the American cases was bad in law. I stated the matter at large, as a test case upon the point, but was turned down upon it.

That was in December, 1903. Six months later the whole thing was reversed:

I wrote the secretary on the 8th April last, referring to the declaration of Maxime Marion filed in his case, to the effect that Macdonald claimed to be the government commissioner for taking applications, that the papers signed were so signed on that assumption, and that they were applications, which is evidence of sufficient fraud to make them avoid.

Why? Because the half-breeds declared these turned out, not to be applications at all, but assignments of their scrip to Macdonald, and they so state over their own signatures and with affidavits.

I also then filed in his case the declaration of Genard Lallement to the effect that he was asked by Macdonald to make application but that he refused to sign anything or have anything to do with him whatever, and that he had dealt with me in the matter of his scrip, notwithstanding which this scrip is in the possession of Macdonald. This instance is still more glearing fraud on the party than the former case.

Neither of these letters is in these files. If they are in the department, they have not been brought down.

I instance the fact that Macdonald was on the ground on the 14th and 15th August last.

This Order in Council was passed on the 13th August.

At Turtle Mountain carrying on this work before it was possible for the half-breed or the public to have any knowledge of the policy of the department. You will thus see that every move of the department in this matter, whether premeditated or not makes no difference, has been in effect playing into the hands of Macdonald and to the detriment of all other parties connected with the matter.

All other parties. Small sympathy for a lot of brokers who are after scrip and trying to get it for the least they can—small sympathy for them if one gets ahead of the other; but the 'other parties' includes the half-breeds themselves. Why in the name of fair-play, if the government had come to a decision to allow those half-breeds to be reconsidered, was not notice given the half-breeds themselves? Why was no notice given to any friends of the half-breeds? Why was notice given only to Macdonald who went down there, as alleged by Mr. Chaffey, under those conditions and get these claims?

I am, to-day, sending a further declaration in the case of Ambroise Ouellette.

That is not brought down.

I hope in the course of a day or two to send a representative half-breed from Turtle

Mountain to the department to state the matter personally.

Does the minister know whether the half-breed ever turned up or will he kindly make a note of that and inquire of the department? It would be interesting to know if he is over there in one of the pigeon holes so that we may have him for examination.

I am sending, and have sent in the end of March, authorities from these various half-breeds instructing me to take such legal action as may be required to recover their scrip, copies of which have been sent to the department.

None of these has been brought down. I want to get hold of these.

I maintain this is sufficient ground on which to hold up these cases until such action be taken, or the matter be further examined by yourself.

Now follows an important sentence:

Over and above all, you are possessed with a knowledge of fraud on the part of Macdonald in reference to these and all cases, and you are the only head I know of at present of that department, and are therefore responsible for their action.

It is assumed that the department acts on principles of justice desiring to do justice to every one, and where temporary regulations stand in the way of justice, they should be put aside, by proceeding having this knowledge, the department aids a fraud.

I ask, then, that my request that nothing furthur be done in regard to the scrips or lands represented by them in question, be given effect to.

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) B. E. CHAFFEY.

This is Mr. Chaffey's letter of April 15. I do not know Mr. Chaffey, and I take his communications for what they are worth on the face of them. I presume, however, that he is a responsible man. Anyway he was ready on April 15; and he then charged absolute fraud and misrepresentation to the detriment of the half-breeds. The department have the charge. There is not a scintilla of evidence to show that they have ever concerned themselves in the least with reference to that charge on behalf of the half-breeds or gave any ear at all to the representations made by the half-breeds with reference to Macdonald's misrepresentations and alleged fraud. Mr. Chaffey says he spent thousands of dollars on these claims which he paid out to the half-breeds and that the department knew all about it. He filed his assignments there. Mr. Chaffey wanted his money as well as fair-play. He wanted to take all the profits to which he was entitled. He was determined to have them. This was on April 15. Then an intervention takes place and on April 20, an interesting telegram appears from the member from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole):

Issue no more scrip to Macdonald and hold transfer of lands to him until I return.

Mr. FOSTER.

What the department did I do not know. I imagine they issued no more; I imagine they held the transfers—but I cannot tell. Mr. Chaffey, on April 15, was determined to have his rights, and charged fraud and worse, but on the 25th Mr. Bole intervened and asked that proceedings be stayed until he could come to Ottawa, he then, being in Winnipeg. On May 22, after negotiations and correspondence, I find an assignment of all of Chaffey's rights, claims and interest to Macdonald. Some one told me when I heard that Chaffey was up in arms: No, this is off; they are settling with them. There is at least evidence that they have settled with him. Who else if any one has? However, there are the facts. Mr. Chaffey assigned all his rights, title and claim in that half-breed scrip to Macdonald and performed the vanishing act. That is not the end of it. A question arises here which I shall take up however, a little later. By this time the half-breeds themselves came to know something about it and so about the latter part of May the following petition comes in. In the meantime Mr. Macdonald went on and sent down scrip notes for endorsation for 15,000 acres more which he got, making in all 25,000 acres for which he had scrip. But about the 30th May—because the answer by the department is made on the 31st May and in it they say they have just received this—the following petition was received:

We, the undersigned half blood, Indian, formerly of the Northwest Territories, Canada, now of the county of Rolette, North Dakota, United States of America.

That one R. C. Macdonald from the year 1903 and subsequent thereto came among your petitioners and others induced your petitioners and others to believe that they had been harshly treated by Mr. McKenna's scrip commission, and that he the said Macdonald would on behalf of your petitioners and others bring suit against the Canadian government to compel the issuance by the government of the scrip to which your petitioners were entitled.

Subsequent thereto and from time to time, in person and by his agents, the said Macdonald induced the undersigned and others to believe that he had instituted such suit against the government and had been successful therein; that he, the said Macdonald, pretended that he was an officer of the Interior Department of the Dominion of Canada and that he was the only officer before whom your petitioners could appear and make application of the issuance of scrip to them, and that unless your petitioners and others appeared before the said Macdonald and executed and signed such papers as he requested they could not obtain the same. Relying upon and believing such statements and representations, and believing that we were applying for scrip to be issued and delivered to your petitioners and not otherwise, your petitioners, and others, signed all papers presented to them by the said Macdonald, which papers were represented to be only application papers, and to be used in procuring such scrip.

Further your petitioners sayeth that on or about the 26th day of April, A.D. 1905, the said

Macdonald again came among your petitioners, and others, and upon said day and subsequent thereto and for the first time informed your petitioners that said papers, believed by them as represented by him, to be only application papers, were in fact papers selling and assigning to the said Macdonald such scrip, and that your petitioners had no right, title or interest therein, that as the said Macdonald had expended thousands of dollars in such suit against the government, he was entitled to reimburse himself out of the value of such scrip, and that he would not pay your petitions and others more than about $200.

That those who refused to accept such sum for their scrip the said Macdonald threatened to have imprisoned, instituted suit in the lower courts of the said county of Rolettell, Dakota, United States of America, and threatened to deprive your petitioners of their scrip without any pay therefor, and further threatened to call upon the sheriff of said county to take those so refusing into custody, your petitioners being ignorant of the true facts and believing that the said Macdonald would do as he stated, and being placed in great fear, more particularly a great number of other half-blood Indians, surrendered their scrip to the said Macdonald, and received therefor only about $200.

Further your petitioners say that the said Macdonald has taken advantage of the uneducated condition of the undersigned and others and imposed upon them to their detriment and great irreparable loss in obtaining their signatures and getting in his possession his scrip, and that the said Macdonald refuses to pay more therefor than about $200, when your petitioners can sell the same on the open market for not less than $600.

Your petitioners further say that the said Macdonald first by pretense of affection and friendship for your petitioners and others ;

Second by deception and fraud ;

Lastly by threats and intimidating, has deceived and defrauded your petitioners and a great number of others out of their scrip, or is about to so defraud your petitioners and others out of their said scrip, as hereinbefore recited.

Wherefore, your petitioners pray that all such scrip obtained in the manner hereinbefore recited by the said Macdonald, in which your petitioners are interested may be withheld and not issued or delivered to the said Macdonald, but be sent to us to our address, and that which has been delivered, that patent may not issue thereon, until we are paid market price.

And further pray that your petitioners may be permitted to prove at such time and place as the hon. Minister of the Interior Department may fix, the allegations and statements obained in this petition, and thus we shall ever pray.

This petition was signed by fifty or more half-breeds in North Dakota. There was an answer to it, and I want to call the particular attention of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to that answer. It was written by the secretary of the department and is dated May 31st. Remember that we have seen that in the first place, on March 10th a letter was sent out by the department to the land agents saying that with reference to that scrip it was unnecessary for the grantees to appear in person, that the assignees could locate the land. Well, on May 31st, the secretary of the department, replying to the petition I have just read, says :—

Department of the Interior,
Ottawa, 31st May, 1905.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of a petition signed by you and others, which has just been received in the department, respecting the recent issue of scrip, and to say that such scrip was delivered in accordance with the claimants' written requests which had been previously filed in this department. I am to add that half-breed land scrip can only be located in the grantees' own names, and that assignments of the land upon which the scrip has been placed, executed prior to the date of the locations, are not recognized by the department ; but after location has been entered at the office of the Dominion lands, the half-breed in whose name the location was made, may, if of the full age of twenty-one years, assign such land, and upon the assignment being filed in this department together with an abstract of title showing that the land is unencumbered, a certificate from the registrar that there are no judgments or executions against the assignor, and the usual registration fee of $2 being remitted, if found satisfactory, such assignment may be registered in the department, in which case the patent would be issued in the assignee's name, otherwise the patent for the land entered for would be issued in the name of the person to whom the scrip was issued.

Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) P. G. KEYES,
Secretary.

Mr. Michel Desmarais,
St. John, North Dakota,
United States of America.

Now, Sir, I am fairly well educated, and I am accustomed to reading the English language—I suppose I have a little advantage in that respect over the half-breeds to whom that letter was sent. To me reading it over for the first, the second, the third time, it seemed to say to these half-breeds : None of your scrip land can be located unless you are there to locate it, and after it is located, then you may assign it under certain conditions. If it does not mean that, what does it mean ? Yet, after reading it for the fourth or fifth time, I can see that an argument could be made that that is not its meaning. At the same time, I do not think that one man out of five hundred would take any other meaning out of it than the one that I have given. Then, there is the petition from the mixed blood. Indians not exactly in the same language, but of the same tenor, except that it says that they had been robbed of their scrip receiving only $200, while they would be able to get $1,000 if they had the scrip themselves. And the same answer is given to them that is given to the others. And here endeth these papers, so far.

Now I have a word or two to say concerning what I have found in these papers. It may be that I should present some deductions with which some hon. gentlemen will not agree. In the first place, I note the remarkable change made by Mr. Smart, the deputy minister, in taking away from

the direct control of the minister that which the order of the minister had reserved to his direct control—that these should be examined by Mr. Coté and should be returned to him, the minister. The deputy said : Mr. Coté, examine these where you have the evidence, issue the scrip and send it at once. And the scrip, presumably, never entered the minister's office. I call the attention also to the admitted variation of the terms of the Order in Council confining it to the scrip which had been refused Mr. McKenna on account of residence and disallowed by him. The deputy minister, in the later communication I have read to the House says : You are only to look into two classes of scrip, one in which the name is given you, and the other the scrip which has been dealt with by Mr. McKenna. What does that mean ? At least it has a look of confusion ; and it does seem as if the work of the department was not in accordance with the Order in Council or the direct instructions of the minister. I will next call attention to the fact that Mr. Coté has not made any report as to how he dealt with that scrip or what evidence he took. Mr. McKenna disallowed two classes—or two kinds in one class. He disallowed all those who had gone to the United States, disallowing them partly on preliminary objection without evidence, and partly on evidence. That evidence the department might be presumed to have. But on what evidence did Mr. Coté adjudicate on the claims which had been disallowed on preliminary objections ? The widest limit is given to Mr. Coté—evidence under oath would be superior to documentary evidence ; still you need not go to the Northwest to hold an investigation, but take what you find, take what is given you.

You need not go to the Northwest to hold an investigation. Take what is given to you. What did he find ? By whom was it given ? We have no report from Mr. Coté. This country to-day has actually disposed of 25,000 acres of its choice lands to Mr. McDonald by the aid of this government, nor has the House any report from Mr. Coté as to the principle upon which he has made these issuances of scrip, neither has the government, nor the House, nor the country. Well, I say that Mr. Coté should have reported, and that report should have gone to his minister, and before the property was given away that minister should have taken that report to the Council, and his colleagues in the Council should have known what was going on, and the reason why 55 of those scrip, though the Order in Council is only issued on the 13th of August, and although it was promulgated in the 'Gazette' only on the 6th of October, 55 of this scrip were in the hands of McDonald before November, 1904, had passed away, and 93 of them were in his hands before the end of the year, and about 120 were in his hands before Mr. Chaffey, and Mr. Shortcross, and Mr. Bigger, or any one else interested had the least knowedge that the thing was going on, and before the half-breeds had the least intimation from the department whose wards they were, that there was any change made in their legal status in reference to these claims. The judgment falls, and falls rightly on the head of my right hon. friend. He invited his camp followers to loot the half-breeds. He shed tears over them in sympathy many years ago, he deified a rebel on their behalf, he condoned rebellion on their behalf ; yet he allows scrip to be issued broad and wide, giving this parliament and this country as his reason for it, when it is brought to his mind, that it is simple robbery of the rights of the half-breeds, by his go-betweens and followers, he says : We know that has taken place, but then we did our duty to the half-breeds. What invitation could be broader or more pressing to all his camp followers to camp on the trail of the half-breeds ; and when this benevolent government made what was supposed to be a payment for the rights of the half-breeds, they allowed their followers to steal it or buy it, or juggle it from them.

One thing more. Where does the member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) stand, if this version is correct ? Where does the government stand, if this version is correct ? The government was informed by Mr. Chaffey that the half-breeds were being robbed by fraud. Mr. Chaffey informed the member for Winnipeg that they were being robbed. Why should there be any compromise ? In the name of just dealing, if the government had a charge from a responsible man that this was being done by fraud, it should have held up the process until it had investigated the charge ; and I think the member for Winnipeg, if he busied himself, simply to get Mr. Chaffey a money consideration, with the allegation of fraud before him, was not a wise mediator. Above all things else, for a government to compromise a fraud is a wrong and unstatesmanlike thing. How much less is it than if, when they have responsible parties making a charge of fraud, they still go on and carry out the process and never investigate the charge as to whether there is fraud or not. How does the government stand with reference to fair-play ? Did Mr. Chaffey spend money in getting assignments of these claims ? Did other gentlemen, may be scores of them, of whom the department has knowledge—did they spend money in getting assignments of these claims thinking that the prior assignments should carry ? Was it a fact that five per cent, yes, three per cent of the officials thought the Order in Council was revoked, that the prior assignment stood. But that was revoked, and the whole thing was shovelled over into the lap of McDonald by virtue of the reversal, the taking away of that Order in Council as to the prior assignments. But more than that. What stood like a great rock in

the way of McDonald ? The fact that the half-breed himself had to go and locate. How could he get around that ? The 13th day of August, 1904, the government was firm as a rock, the half-breed himself must locate, it was for his own protection. Six months afterwards, without any notice to any of these men interested, that was taken away by departmental letter and not by Order in Council, and it was so made that McDonald got it all, and got it without there being the personal location which all time previously had been required.

Now as to the half-breeds themselves. In all this correspondence there is not one single line or letter of sympathy or help towards the half-breeds. Nobody in the department seems to care about the half-breeds ; many in the department seem to be running their legs off to make McDonald privy to what was going on. It is to the credit of the government that when they sent these half-breed commissions throughout the Northwest they made it an invariable rule that the commissioners should, in the case of money scrip, see that nobody got that money scrip from the half-breed who was the grantee unless he got the market price. If John Jones followed a half-breed and got his scrip, which was worth $200, for $50, followed him up to the commission until the time that the commission issued the money scrip, when the commissioner held that scrip in his hand he said to John Jones : What have you given this half-breed for his scrip ?—$50—You cannot get it, Sir, the current price is $150, and before that scrip goes out of my hands, under instructions from the government, I will see that this half-breed gets the current price—and John Jones had to come up and pay the current price. That was done in scores and hundreds of cases. When these 200 or more half-breeds applied they had no case, they were bowled out of court in spite of their petitions. Then, six months after the latest declaration of the policy of the government to Chaffey, the whole thing is reversed. But from the time it was reversed until every scrip had gone into McDonald's hands the department did not busy themselves in sympathy or in action to find what the half-breed had got for his scrip. It is alleged that McDonald went there and persuaded the half-breeds that they were signing papers to authorize him to institute a suit, when they were really signing the assignment of their scrip, and it is alleged in some quarters that he really got a quit claim signed in blank. Whether that be so or not I do not know, but there is the allegation of the half-breeds and up to that time no one in this department and no one in the right hon. gentleman's government had the least sympathy with the half-breed or the least thought as to whether the half-breed should be jilted or not. For whose benefit ? I have here the list. There it is. There is the list. There are all the scrip that are issued and out of the whole of it there are 126 which have gone to Mr. McDonald. He holds them all. How many has he located ? Three up to the date of this. There is a point I want to know something about. Every land agent has received authority to locate Mr. McDonald's scrip if it is endorsed. Mr. McDonald has had the endorsed scrip for months. Is that location going on now at the land offices, or has it been forbidden by the minister ? I think I would like to ask the hon. minister a question. Is that still going on ?

Mr. OLIVER. I will answer the hon. gentleman presently.

Mr. FOSTER. If the hon. minister will answer me now and say that the department has issued orders to prevent the location——

Mr. OLIVER. I will have to make an answer to the hon. member and I will answer him in the proper time.

Mr. FOSTER. It is simply as the hon. minister says. I do not know why the answer should not be given. What in the world is the reason which would induce the hon. minister to keep it for ten minutes or half an hour ? We will get it out. It has to come. However, Mr. Macdonald has the scrip, orders have been given to the agents to locate scrip but to locate no other half-breed scrip without the endorsement. This presumably is going on now in the Territories. What does it mean ? Twenty-five thousand acres of land for which Mr. Macdonald has paid not more than 80 cents an acre located, no doubt, in the most valuable parts of the country—25,000 acres of land in Macdonald's hands, put in his hands at 80 cents an acre, worth at least from $8 to $10 an acre. How much of it does the half-breed get ? He gets 80 cents an acre. How much does Macdonald get? He gets all over the 80 cents an acre less his expenses. Why this everlasting anxiety to help Macdonald ? Who is he ? What has he done ? Does this government in its administration of half-breed scrip exist for a man like Macdonald, or does it exist for the half-breed ? In Heaven's name why should there be $150,000 or $200,000 placed in the hands of Macdonald and only 80 cents per acre of that go into the hands of the half-breed whose it was and whose rights are tremblingly described by hon. gentlemen opposite as blood rights. Blood rights are not in it except to the extent of 80 cents an acre compared with Macdonald rights and with the difference between 80 cents and what he sells the land for in the end. That is where it is. There is no need to elaborate on it. I could say more than I have but I shall not say any more. I now leave this with the government and I want the government as soon as they possibly can and within reasonable time tell the House what they intend to do. I think something ought to be done. I think something ought to have been done

long ago by the department. I have alluded to the fact that correspondence is not here which should be here and which I am loth to think would be in the department and not brought down. But, if it is not there, I shall have to come back to this idea, which has been mooted more than once, that people do have access to that department to destroy papers upon facts which might be incriminating to themselves and that men who have been employees of that department have done so. Now, this matter will not rest here. After this presentment of it the government should take it into their consideration and make up their minds as to what they will do; and we on this side of the House will have to make up our minds as to what we will do. All I want is that a thorough investigation be made in the department as to this whole matter of scrip faithfully and honestly without fear of whom it may touch, and if that is done I am content whatever the outcome that results therefrom. But this that I have stated, with much more I might state, makes out a case that I think is a fairly strong one which this government, this House and, this parliament owe to themselves to probe to the very bottom and they also owe it to themselves to keep these lands from being located in Mr. Macdonald's name until the matter has been thorougly probed and examined.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The hon. member (Mr. Foster) has been hatching for quite a while and I think we will admit he has succeeded in bringing forth a very wobbly chicken.

Mr. FOSTER. Well that is a good way to answer it if you think it is the right way.

Mr. OLIVER. His complaint that all the papers are not before the House is a sample of the fairness with which he has approached this subject. He has asked for an immense number of papers. The department has been at work ever since he asked supplying him with these papers. When completed they come down in instalments as fast as we could get them and I submit it is absolutely unfair on his part to stand up and make the distinct complaint that the papers have not been brought down simply because we have been unable to bring them all down before this.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. minister will be fair enough to allow me to nail that where it should be nailed. There is a list of papers which purport to be complete. In the very letters which are in that list there are quotations from letters together with the dates of these letters and yet these letters are not there. The department should have made that complete. I supposed that was complete. If they did not make it complete they committed a grievous error in bringing it down until they had made it complete. I am not speaking at all of other branches for which the papers have not come down. I confine myself to this part of the case.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman complains that certain papers which are alluded to in these papers which are brought down have not been brought down. I do not know how far that theory is to be carried, because on that theory, we might be required to bring down at once the whole correspondence in regard to any simple question that might be asked. There are limitations, I presume, to the possibilities of giving information. Certainly, I am speaking for myself as the minister when I say that I honestly tried to give the hon. member the information he asked for. If he calls attention to some papers which he thinks should have been there and which are not there I am prepared to bring them down if they are in the department, but I submit it is absolutely unfair and it is of a piece with his whole argument to insinuate that these papers have not been brought down because of any fear on our part of a proper presentation of the case before the House. He said there was nothing to conceal. There is nothing to conceal. In the beginning of his remarks he assumed that there had been a departure from the policy of the government in regard to the scrip covered by the Order in Council of 13th August, and he also said there had been a departure in regard to the matter of the assignment of the scrip. The policy of the government in regard to half-breeds is that the half-breed who is entitled to the scrip shall get his scrip. That is the policy of the department and because that policy had not been carried out in the scrip issued of 1891 and 1892 it was subsequently decided that it should be carried out. There was no change of policy; there was a fulfilment of policy in regard to these matters. In regard to assignments, he has himself presented to the House ample evidence to show that it has not been the policy of the department to grant assignments since 1391 and that no such assignments have been granted; yet, although he quibbles on the word 'assignments,' twists and turns it around he puts in absolute evidence of the plain fact that there was no change of policy in regard to assignments and that there have been no assignment since 1901. Up to that time there was a policy of assignment and I believe it was in response to the criticism of this very hon. gentleman himself along with other things that that policy of assignments was abandoned so that the land scrip should be absolutely located by the half-breed, or in the name of the half-breed. and that there should be no assignment of land scrip. Now there is no assignment of land scrip; there has been no assignment of land scrip. The complaint of the hon. gentleman's friend Mr. Chaffey is because Mr. Chaffey was not allowed to have his assignments dealt with; he was dealt with just as everybody else is.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to keep my hon. friend right as far as I can. I never met Mr. Chaffey, I do not know him, I never wrote to him, I never received a letter from him. The minister may call him his friend if he likes, but he has no right to call him mine.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I must confess that I was misled, for whereas in his former speech he took up the time of the House and the country in deprecating the granting of the scrip to the half-breeds as an injustice to the public, on this occasion the greater part of his speech has been occupied with a discussion of the woes of Mr. Chaffey.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason being because I knew nothing of Mr. Chaffey's transaction or connection with the transaction until the minister brought down the papers. I found his case there, and finding it there I have a right to take it up.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member has a right and he certainly made the most of his right in regard to Mr. Chaffey.

Mr. FOSTER. Thank you.

Mr. OLIVER. I say in the first instance there has been no change in policy on the part of the department in regard to the issuing of scrip. The policy is to give the half-breed everything that is coming to him and there has been no change in the matter of assignments of scrip, so that practically all the trouble that is in the mind of my hon. friend in that regard does not exist. The right of these half-breeds to scrip was dealt with in the previous discussion. I think it is admitted that the half-breeds have a right to scrip and the demand has been made that the government should see that they get their right; the complaint that my hon. friend has made here that the government while making a pretense of giving them their rights is not going on and further protecting them and insuring that they shall get the full value of the scrip as issued is I think a complaint that comes with very ill grace from my hon. friend or his friends on that side of the House especially in view of the arguments advanced by him during the first discussion that the half-breed should not get the scrip at all, that it was gross injustice to the public at large and practically a robbery of the rights of the public that the rights of the half-breed should be recognized.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no recollection of arguing in that way. I argued that the half-breed should get what was coming to him in the way that would most benefit himself, and I pointed out to the Prime Minister that it was not given to him in the best manner if it were done in the way of scrip. I advocated the giving of the actual land to him, the gathering in of the half-breeds and teaching them to be farmers, &c., but I never argued as my hon. friend said.

Mr. OLIVER. I have some difficulty, I must admit, in following the hon. gentleman.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman should not follow me at such a distance; that is the trouble.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the suddenness with which my hon. friend rises is evidence that I am following him too closely. I would ask the hon. gentleman and the House what we are doing in this case unless it is giving the land to the half-breed. Every acre of land which my hon. friend has spoken of as belonging to Mr. Macdonald, 25,000 acres of land as he says, is located in the name of the half-breed.

Mr. FOSTER. If you are satisfied with the argument I am.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman thinks the half-breed is being defrauded by our insisting that the land shall be located as it has been in the name of the half-breed and that Mr. Macdonald or whoever he may be must get his transfer from the half-breed as the owner of the land and not from him as the owner of the scrip. I would like to know by what piece of legislation my hon. friend would provide that the half-breeds should never have the right to sell the land once he had located it. I am sure my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) understands the matter as I have stated it to the House, but I think the House at large did not gather that fact from the tenor of his remarks. In regard to Mr. Chaffey and Mr. Chaffey's plea on behalf of the half-breeds and his complaint that the government did not take action to protect the interest of the half-breeds on the representation of Mr. Chaffey let me read the last paragraph in Mr. Chaffey's letter to the department and then the House can judge what credit is due to the representations of Mr. Chaffey. He says :

> I therefore withdraw all claims whatever under and by virtue of said orders sent by me and withdraw all protests lodged by me against scrip being issued under orders filed with the department by said Macdonald to which he now has any claim or order.

He withdraws all protest against scrip being issued or orders filed by the department to Mr. Macdonald. Mr. Chaffey is certainly a very desirable man upon whose word the department and the government should base its policy, a gentleman who in his previous letters specifically alleged fraud, alleges robbery, makes all the allegations which my hon. friend has used with such effect to-day, and then withdraws them all as he does withdraw them. He is not the man upon whose representation this

government or this department could carry on its administration.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. We have to take the representations of others than Mr. Chaffey or others like Mr. Chaffey. The hon. gentleman has read a representation placed before the department by certain half-breeds resident in the Turtle Mountain district of the United States and these gentlemen allege fraud and misrepresentation against this man Macdonald. I may draw attention to the fact that from the day upon which this petition was received here, I would think that it is as fair to take the supposition which I take the opportunity of placing before the House as it is to accept the supposition which my hon. friend has placed before the House to-day, and that is that since the first discussion of the question in the House, when he very gingerly charged fraud and was told a specific charge would have to be made before action could be taken, that then, somebody, whether a friend or otherwise, hied himself to Turtle Mountain and got up this petition from the half-breeds and sent it in here.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend draw from that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I draw this that my hon. friend is very much more anxious to make an attack upon the government than he is to protect the interests of anybody, even the half-breeds or Mr. Chaffey.

Mr. FOSTER. How do you prove that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think we will discuss it any more. I think it is a case which only proves itself. However, I will just draw attention to this fact, that the friend of my hon. friend who gathered these names and prepared these petitions was not altogether careful in the signatures. An analysis of the signatures will show just how they stand. I find, on examination in the department, that one petition signed in the beginning by Michel Demarais, Frank Delorme and others is signed by 39 names, almost all of which are signed by a mark, and in the 39 only 4 are the names of those whose claims have been allowed. So that it comes to this, that a petition comes into the department in the terms read by the hon. member, with the names of 39 persons attached, all of whom by their signatures have stated that they are interested parties, whereas on examination it is found that only four out of the 39 are interested parties.

Mr. FOSTER. Might I draw my hon. friend's attention to the fact that you may divide those into two classes ? There is here in a memorandum the statement that a certain number of these claims have been allowed by Coté, a certain number disallowed, and a certain number reserved for further evidence. It may quite be that some of those claims are amongst those which were disallowed, which have been allowed by Côté, but which still stand as reserved cases.

Mr. OLIVER. The case is at any rate that we have received statements from half-breeds. We have not taken any notice of the representations made by Mr. Chaffee, and Mr. Chaffee's letter, I think, is a sufficient justification to the department for not doing so. But when these half-breeds, whose interests are not considered by the department, but whose interests the Prime Minister has given authority to his friends throughout the country to loot—when these gentlemen come to the department, even by the road by which they have come, and even in the small numbers in which they have come, then certainly it is necessary that action should be taken ; and I can answer the hon. member's question by stating that as soon as I returned from that little tour to which he alluded a few days ago, I found certain papers in the department, and took action upon those papers at once. Authorization has been given for the holding of a commission of inquiry into those cases on behalf of the half-breeds, and notification has been issued to the different land offices throughout the country to suspend action in regard to those cases until that investigation shall have been held. As the hon. member said, there is nothing in this to conceal. This department and this government have no interest but to see that the half-breeds get what is coming to them —that they get their blood right. Although it may cost some part of the public domain to give them their rights, we stand prepared to justify ourselves before the country, even against the very clever and I think somewhat doubtful arguments of my hon. friend, who would have us condemned in one part of the country for giving the land, and in another part of the country for not giving the half-breeds their rights. We stand prepared to give the half-breeds their rights, even at the expense of the public domain ; and we do not stand to protect any man, be his name R. C. Macdonald or anything else, in any trespass upon those rights. The action taken, the papers before the House, and further papers which will be brought down if the hon. gentleman desires them, are evidence I think sufficient on that point.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the statement which my hon. friend has made in reference to this transaction has had one good effect, at any rate. I called it a fraud before. The right hon. leader of the government took exception to that term, but I think it has been fully justified by the papers which have been brought down. What was the charge made by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) ? It was this : that some time ago a commission made certain inquiries into half-breed claims in the Northwest, and reported that certain half-breeds who resided in the United States and had become wards of that country, and

were receiving sums of money and land from it, were not entitled to the same benefits from this government as those who remained in Canada. The government, however, decided, on further consideration, that that policy perhaps ought not to be carried out; and an Order in Council was passed, changing it, and providing for granting to those half-breeds certain lands to which they would not otherwise be entitled. My hon. friend did not object to that change of policy; he simply stated the fact of the change. What he found fault with was that the promise of the government had not been carried out. That promise, which was made in this House, and on which the Order in Council was based, was this, that no half-breed would have the right to transfer his scrip to any other person whatever—that when he was granted the right to certain lands in the Northwest, he must locate those lands himself, after which he would have the right to transfer them or sell them to any other person. The half-breeds were not altogether in the position of wards of the government, otherwise the government might have prohibited them from transferring their lands for a certain number of years. I think perhaps that would have been a better course for the government to have taken. What my hon. friend objected to was that the change made by the Order in Council, although not known even to the half-breeds who were the beneficiaries under it, nor to others in the country, became known to a man in the Northwest of the name of Macdonald, who took advantage of it for the purpose, as is alleged by the half-breeds themselves, of obtaining by fraud their right to their locations. My hon. friend complains that there was no inquiry into that; and when the papers come down, they prove conclusively that an Order in Council was set aside by a departmental order to the different agents throughout the Northwest. In a letter to one David Phillip, Esq., Main St., Winnipeg, who asked if any change had been made in the rules regarding the locating of half-breed scrip, the secretary of the department said:

> I am directed to inform you that it has recently been decided to allow scrip granted to half-breed residents of the United States, under the Order in Council of the 13th August, 1904, to be located in the name of the grantee thereof by the holder of such scrip without requiring the grantee to appear personally before the land agent to make his entry.

What power had the department to give any such instruction? There is an Order in Council which requires the half-breed to appear personally in order to locate his claim. By what authority could the department vary that order? I am glad to hear the right hon. gentleman, upon the cases being brought before him, issued instructions not to carry out this departmental order.

Mr. OLIVER. It was suspended pending investigation.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood that a commission was to be appointed to make inquiry, and that no action would be taken with reference to the half-breed scrip until the commission had reported. What does that mean, if not that the order is reversed?

Mr. OLIVER. The order will be continued after the investigation, if no charge is found to stand. Let me just state the reason for the issuing of the order—not that I issued it or am personally responsible. The half-breeds covered by this Order in Council of August 13th are residents in the United States. Some of them, if not all of them, had become the wards of the American government, and were therefore not absolutely free agents in their movements; and in order that they might receive value for their scrip, it was necessary that they should be free to locate by agents instead of being required to locate personally. As the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, the direction is absolutely restricted to that particular scrip. And the reason is the one I have given. To insist that these half-breeds should locate that scrip in person would simply be an additional tax on the value of their scrip which they would have to pay, even if they could make the trip into Canada to locate. And if they could not, they could not get any value at all for the scrip. That instruction was given therefore in the interests of the half-breeds.

Mr. HAGGART. Then the order is suspended until the commission of inquiry ascertains whether or not there has been fraud committed, and the Minister of the Interior says that the order will only be suspended until such time as that inquiry is made. But the objection I make is a more serious one. What authority had the department to issue any such order? None whatever. Any party who would act under such an order is liable to punishment. It is a fraud upon the people. There is an Order in Council which says you shall not do such a thing. By what power does the Minister of the Interior vest himself with authority to set aside that Order in Council without the sanction of the Governor General? My opinion is that if it were not for the action of my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Foster), all the scrip would have been issued and located. There seems to have been some authority which is not brought down in these papers, some counteracting authority to the different agencies throughout the Northwest, since that departmental order was issued. Why are we not in possession of that? I do not see in the papers brought down that the departmental order in reference to this scrip has been acted on at all. We ought to have that information. This transaction looks at the first blush like a very disgraceful one, but we shall await until all the papers are brought down and we see what the action of the department is.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentlemen will state in so many words, in a written memorandum, exactly what papers they want, we will try to procure them to the best of our ability, but it is very hard to cover all the points on a mere cursory inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. I shall not hold the minister responsible for any papers not brought down which are not covered by the memorandum I sent to him. This memorandum calls for the missing parts of this correspondence. My hon. friend reiterated that in one part of the country I want to be understood as being opposed to the half-breeds getting their lands and that in another part of the country I take the opposite position. For his first statement he cannot find any words of mine. There is no rason why he should misrepresent the facts, and he ought to be furnished with the proof before making a statement. It is easy to make a charge of inconsistency, but it is another thing to establish it. I am not at all satisfied with the statement of the hon. minister that he proposes to send somebody to investigate the matter. That does not fill the bill. It will not be filled until we get an opportunity, before some commission or somebody competent to take evidence, of examining the parties under oath—both the parties in and those out of the department. This matter cannot be hushed up by any little device of appointing a commission and sending it out to the half-breeds. That is only a small part of the whole question raised. The question raised is as to what has taken place in the department and between the department and friends of these gentlemen, and we must have some opportunity somewhere and somehow of getting evidence under oath. I want the government to seriously consider whether or not they cannot give a sub-committee with power to examine under oath ; but if we come to the conclusion that we cannot stay here all year just for this matter, I am not unreasonable. We may leave the thing as it is now, and let the committee or commission be granted another year. We do not wish to keep the House unreasonably. But the case is not made at all by the minister saying he is going to send somebody down there to make investigations as to whether these half-breeds have told the truth or not. The matter goes far deeper than that, and I hope that the government will look at it in that way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) should remember one point—and I am sure he will agree with me on reflection. The government must not hold an investigation simply upon hearsay or insinuation, but upon charges preferred. But the government will be bound to hold an investigation when there is substantial cause for it. My hon. friend has made different statements here ;—I had not intended to take part in the debate, but his later remarks make it necessary for me to say a word. We have in the department a direct allegation of fraud made against this man Macdonald by the half-breeds who declare that their signature to certain papers was secured by false representations, and that the papers were really of a different character from that represented to them. When this allegation was brought to the attention of the Minister of the Interior he at once took steps to have an investigation made. Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) to-day made a different statement. He did not make a direct allegation, but only an insinuation. Perhaps it is premature for him to make up his mind on the matter ; perhaps, as time goes on and he gets further information he will be prepared to make a direct statement. To that statement we shall be bound to listen. He made a statement the other day which, it seems to me, he ought not to have made unless he is prepared to substantiate it. He said a moment ago, in his first remarks of to-day upon this subject that there was a rumour that papers in the Interior Department had been tampered with, and that it was said there were even ex-employees who either abstracted, or did away with, or destroyed, papers which might be compromising to them. He did not state that of his own authority, but said that there was a rumour to that effect. That is a very grave statement——

Mr. FOSTER. No doubt.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—too grave a statement, to be made in the way my hon. friend has made it. It is not sufficient for a gentleman occupying the high position that my hon. friend does in this House merely to say that there are rumours afloat. They are always afloat ; some may be true, but many are false. When he has reason to think that these statements are true and that such acts have been committed, then I can tell him that I am as much interested as he is—more interested than anybody else—in learning the truth. The moment charges are made which necessitate an investigation, we shall have an investigation. But I think my hon. friend had better wait until he has all the facts before him, when he can make what charges he has to make. He has asked to have the papers brought down, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has been most diligent in preparing them.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no fault to find in that respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It appears that all the papers are not yet down. It will be for the Minister of the Interior to see to it that they are brought down. If the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) finds that there are papers missing that ought to be there, he can make his statement, and we will be bound to give it our best consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the Minister of the Interior what steps have been taken to

hold the investigation? What kind of investigation does he propose to make?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have decided to have the matter come before a judge—County Judge Myers, of Winnipeg. That gentleman will hold an investigation into this assertion of the half-breeds.

PROPOSED EXPERIMENTAL STATION, NIAGARA DISTRICT.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask if the government will be good enough to lay on the table the correspondence from the Niagara fruit district in southern Ontario, with reference to the establishment of an experimental station in that district?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will refer the matter to the minister in charge.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

The House went into committee on Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

On section 1: mortgage in schedule A confirmed.

Mr. HAGGART. Would the gentleman in charge of this Bill be good enough to explain what the effect of this change in regard to mortgage is on the mortgage already authorized?

Mr. FIELDING. So far as the mortgage is concerned to secure the government's guarantee, the matter was placed by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in the hands of Mr. Shepley, of Toronto, to advise, and his report has been printed and distributed. The mortgage is necessarily a very elaborate document, and we have to rely on the advice of legal gentlemen with regard to it. It was under consideration for a long time, a good many points being discussed, sometimes between Mr. Shepley and myself, sometimes the Minister of Justice and Mr. Shepley. But the sum and substance is set forth by Mr. Shepley in his report which certifies that the mortgage conforms to the Act.

Mr. HAGGART. I have only this moment received a copy of Mr. Shepley's explanations. But the explanations seem just a little more difficult to understand than the document itself. Mr. Shepley says:

> The first article gives extended definitions to certain compendious expressions made use of in the mortgage for purposes of convenience.

Mr. FIELDING. This report is on the form of the mortgage.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). There are three schedules attached to this Bill. The first schedule is the trust deed which is necessary to carry out the provisions of the original contract made between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by which the government undertake to guarantee certain bonds which are to be issued by the Grand Trunk Pacific Company to enable them to finance the undertaking so far as the portion of the line is concerned between Winnipeg and the Pacific ocean. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will remember that on that portion of the line the company is authorized by its charter to issue bonds not exceeding practically $20,000 a mile with respect to the prairie section and, I think, somewhere about $50,000 a mile with respect to the mountain section. The undertaking of the government is to guarantee that issue of bonds to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost of construction with respect to the prairie section limited to $13,000 a mile, and on the mountain section bonds to the extent of 75 per cent of the cost whatever it may be.

Then my hon. friend will remember that there is an obligation on the part of the government, or rather an assumed obligation, to exempt the company from the payment of interest on these bonds for the first seven years with respect to the mountain section; and in so far as that section is concerned, if the interest on the bonds is not paid for the three years succeeding the first seven years, then that is to be a deferred payment. It is intended to give effect to that provision of the agreement. My hon. friend will notice that the only two departures from the original contract in this trust deed are, first, with respect to the prairie section, the government obligation to guarantee to the extent of $13,000 a mile remains intact; but under the provisions of the company's Act of incorporation their power to issue bonds is limited to $20,000 a mile with respect to the prairie section, and under the provisions of the trust deed, it having been ascertained that $20,000 a mile was not sufficient for the prairie section the trust deed provides that the company may issue bonds to the extent of $21,500. That is in accordance with the terms of the agreement between the government and the company, by which agreement it is provided that the company must find the money, whatever it may be. So our obligation to endorse is limited to $13,000 a mile, but the company will, under this schedule, get power to issue to the extent of $21,500.

Mr. HAGGART. It must be more, that would only be $1,500 more a mile.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is all, it is the provision of the agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. The company assumes no further obligation.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. Then I draw attention to this further provision which constitutes a departure from the agreement as contemplated at the time the Bill went through the House. My hon. friend

will remember that provision was made respecting the issue of bonds, pending construction. The company was authorized to issue what we call interim bonds, and when the construction was completed it was made obligatory on the company to surrender these interim bonds which were to be endorsed by the government, so that they might be replaced by a permanent issue. It was found impossible, practically, to finance the scheme in that respect, because these bonds could not be floated; bonds of that character which were practically interim bonds issued for six or seven years could not be floated. I understand there were financial difficulties in connection with the matter, and the result is that we have made provision under this section for a present issue of permanent bonds extending over the whole period; so that instead of having an issue of bonds, as it was originally intended, of a temporary character which should be superseded by a permanent issue at the end of construction, the issue now is of a permanent character applicable to the whole period of construction, which is estimated at seven years.

Mr. FOSTER. In what part of the schedule does that appear?

Mr. FIELDING. The change respecting the bonds is set forth by Mr. Shepley in his report. He says:

> The guarantee of interim bonds during the period of construction to be compulsorily convertible into the guaranteed permanent bonds on the completion of the work of construction, which was the scheme for interim aid contemplated by the agreement of 1903. During the negotiations it was found impracticable to devise a workable scheme on the precise lines of the agreement, and there were found to be formidable market objections to bonds issued on the terms contemplated. The method adopted in the mortgage submitted is to provide for the immediate issue of permanent bonds, adding to the fifty-year period of currency of such permanent bonds, which period was under the agreement to begin on the completion of the division, the seven years limited by the agreement of 1904 for such completion, making the bonds at once fifty-seven year bonds.

The objection from a finance point of view was that making two issues of bonds, one at seven years and then another of fifty years, that is making two separate transactions, involved two separate market charges, which would amount to a very large sum on a huge transaction of this character. There was no objection from the government point of view to making the one issue of bonds for fifty-seven years rather than making one issue for seven years and another for fifty years. The net result, so far as the government is concerned, is the same, and there is a large saving of expense by having one issue instead of two.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the object of the interim bonds at first?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To assist the company during construction. In a first draft of the agreement it was provided that the company should receive aid on the completion of the line. As the matter progressed it became clear that the road could not be built on those terms, so we had to provide for the issue of interim bonds which at the close of construction, would be compulsorily convertible into more permanent bonds. And in that conversion there were these market charges which, on a large transaction, would amount to a great deal of money.

Mr. HAGGART. These are the only two changes?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, as respects the issue of bonds, and the liability of the government.

Mr. HAGGART. Then as regards the prairie section it is to allow them to increase their issue of bonds above $17,500.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend will look at the original agreement he will find that authority is given to issue bonds with respect to the prairie section to the extent of $20,000 per mile, and on that $20,000 per mile the government guarantee $13,000 per mile. But it has been ascertained that so far as this section is concerned the financing of the enterprise would entail an issue of bonds to the extent of $21,500, and under schedule 'B' they are authorized to issue to that extent. But our obligation remains unchanged.

Mr. HAGGART. $13,000 was 75 per cent of the total amount, that would be $17,500. But you increase that amount to $21,500, without any other obligation on the part of the government than exists at present.

Mr. FIELDING. That is correct.

Mr. FOSTER. So much as regards the financial part, and that is all that is referred to?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only change, though it is not strictly a change, is with respect to the character of the undertaking instead of having the western extension as security for the bonds we take in addition the leasehold interest in the eastern section so as to cover at once the whole transaction.

On section 2,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 2 confirms the mortgage in schedule b. It has reference to the transaction between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company in regard to the second mortgage bonds. It is a condition of their agreement with the government that they shall get the second mortgage bonds guaranteed by the old Grand Trunk Railway Company, and schedule b provides for that mortgage.

On section 3,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 3 provides for their own issue for branch lines, with which the government is not concerned.

On section 4,

Mr. FOSTER. What does Mr. Shepley mean in paragraph b, on page 4, when he says :

> There has been some amplification of detail in the definition of cost of construction given by the fifteenth paragraph of the agreement of 1903.

What is that amplification ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The paragraph to which that refers is to be found at the end of page 10 of the Bill which we are now considering. It is the schedule, article 1, section 5. My hon. friend will see that the expression 'construction work' is practically intended to cover the work during the process of construction and is intended to enable advances to be made on materials which have been delivered in the country, which would not be covered by the original section 15 of the first agreement.

Mr. HAGGART. If they have the material for the construction of the work in the country you can make advances to them, even if it is not on the ground where the work is proceeding ?

Mr. FIELDING. It was thought that probably the words in the existing Act would permit that, but to prevent any doubt it was made clear that on goods delivered in Canada, although not actually delivered on the railway, advances may be made. For example, if a ship load of rails were landed in Montreal—that is not a very good illustration, because we expect to make the rails in Canada—these rails will have to be paid for, and the moment they are delivered the lien of the government applies to the property and we can make advances on them, so long as they are to be used in the construction of the work.

Mr. HAGGART. Does the lien of the government apply ?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. How is it made to apply ?

Mr. FIELDING. That matter was specially discussed with counsel, and it was agreed that the Act covered it. My hon. friend will see that Mr. Shepley says on page 4 of his report that :

> Upon such delivery in Canada they become at once a parcel of the property covered by the mortgage.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose we will have to take Mr. Shepley's opinion of it.

Bill reported.

RELIEF OF ARTHUR HOWE HERSEY.

On the order,

> House in committee on Bill (No. 167) for the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—Mr. T. G. Johnston.

Mr. HENDERSON. On Friday last I asked that this Bill stand over until to-day. I will again state the reasons why I shall ask a postponement of the Bill at the present. It appears that when this Bill came before the Private Bills Committee of the House of Commons the promoter was not present. Neither was the respondent represented, inasmuch as the notice to her solicitor had failed to reach him. The respondent is anxious yet to be represented before the committee in this case. I have not read the evidence myself, my copy having been mislaid, but I am informed that this is a somewhat peculiar case ; not, at any rate, an ordinary case, inasmuch as there is no direct evidence of actual adultery. The respondent is anxious to be represented, and owing to the fact that the notice failed to reach her solicitor she was not represented. I think it would be a very reasonable thing on the part of the House to grant the request. A very short delay will certainly take place by meeting the views of the respondent in this case. I therefore beg to move :

> That order No. 2 be discharged, and that Bill No. 167 (letter E of the Senate) be referred back to the Committee on Private Bills for further consideration.

Mr. FIELDING. Has it been the practice for our committee to take evidence on these subjects ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes ; we have done so.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been the practice for a committee of this House to take evidence as well as the committee of the other House ?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes ; I remember distinctly when it was done.

Mr. A. JOHNSTON. Just one word in answer to my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson). When this question was up on Friday evening last my hon. friend from Middlesex (Mr. Calvert), who is in charge of this Bill in the absence of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston), in whose name the Bill stands, made the statement that he would prefer that no action should be taken in regard to this Bill until such time as the promoter should be able to be here. It may well happen that my hon. friend from Lambton may be able to be here within a day or two, and it might not be unwise to defer any further action until such time as he is in the House. I therefore beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not so understand the request made by my hon, friend

from Middlesex on that occasion. I understood him to say that the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. T. G. Johnston), who is in charge of this Bill, was absent. It appears that the hon. member for Lambton is ill. It is quite uncertain when he will be here. He may not be here for a week, or perhaps weeks. I do not see that the case would be prejudiced in any way by the fact that he is not present. I presume he has simply lent his name to those who are putting through the Bill and that he does not feel any direct interest in the matter. I fail to see that anything would be gained by throwing it over until the hon. member for Lambton shall be here. I have no desire to delay the matter further than to simply allow the Bill to go back again before the committee, and allow the Private Bills Committee to deal with it and give it such further consideration, after hearing the solicitor for the respondent, as they think advisable, and then to again report to the House, when the matter can be disposed of. I have no desire to delay the matter, and I would prefer to go back direct to the committee at as early a date as possible and have it dealt with by that committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Why not allow it to go to the committee and then allow Dr. Johnston's convenience to be suited as to when the committee should be called ?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that if the course adopted is pursued and the convenience of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Johnston) is consulted as to the time when the committee shall be called, all the interests would be served.

Motion agreed to, and Bill referred to Private Bills Committee.

NORTHWEST TELEPHONE COMPANY.

On the order :

Consideration of amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 28) An Act to incorporate the Northwest Telephone Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I object to proceeding with this. There must be some misunderstanding about this amendment. The amendment purports to be to clause 19 of the Bill. Clause 19 reads as follows :

No right, except as provided for in subsection 2 hereof, hereby or by the Electric Telegraph Companies Act conferred, shall be exercised——

These are the important words :

—without the consent of and upon the terms to be agreed upon with the council of a city, town, incorporated village or township, or with the municipality of a county within which it is proposed to exercise such right.

The words added are :

Or other proper authority vested for the time being within the ownership of the land.

Mr. HENDERSON.

This is nonsense ; the Bill had better stand.

Order allowed to stand.

QUESTIONS.

ABOLITION OF TRADING STAMPS.

Mr. AMES asked :

Is it the intention of the government, during the present session, to introduce legislation with a view of abolishing what are known as trading stamps ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is the intention of the government to introduce legislation this session dealing with trading stamps.

SALVATION ARMY AND IMMIGRATION.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government had any correspondence with the Salvation Army in regard to immigration to Canada ?

2. Will said correspondence be laid upon the table of the House before the immigration estimates are further discussed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has had correspondence not with the Salvation Army, but with Mr. Rider Haggard with regard to immigration to Canada. The correspondence will be brought down.

ELECTORS IN NORTHWEST.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. How many names of qualified electors appear upon each of the lists used at the election on 3rd of November, 1904, for the electoral districts of Saskatchewan, Mackenzie, Humboldt, Qu'Appelle, East Assiniboia and West Assiniboia ?

2. What was the total number of votes cast in each of the above mentioned electoral districts at the said election ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

No. 1.	Saskatchewan	6,442
	Qu'Appelle	8,087
	Mackenzie	3,260
	East Assiniboia	9,613
	Humboldt	3,617
	West Assiniboia	8,569
No. 2.	Saskatchewan	3,530
	Qu'Appelle	5,632
	McKenzie	2,495
	East Assiniboia	6,786
	Humboldt	1,799
	West Assiniboia	6,512

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Immigration—salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $157,200.

Mr. MONK. It is our intention to present a motion, of which I will give notice to my hon. friend, in regard to the general policy of the government respecting immigration. I scarcely think it would meet the views of my hon. friend were we to present that motion this evening, as there are very few members in the House, and I would venture to suggest to my hon. friend that he take up some other items and keep the most important ones for that discussion at a future date.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure it is the wish of all members to expedite the business of the House, and, without wishing to detract from the freedom of debate or to stop the presentation of any line of policy that may be thought well, I would say that if it would suit the hon. gentleman as well, it would suit us very much better, to proceed with this main estimate in regard to immigration, and take up the question of policy on a supplementary vote which will have to be asked for later on.

Mr. MONK. If this is the usual vote for immigration, we might proceed with it, and reserve the other votes for another day.

Mr. OLIVER. The information that would be elicited in the discussion of this vote will be available for the presentation of the main question on a future day.

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely my hon. friend does not intend to come down with any supplementary estimates in addition to this large sum of $767,200.

Mr. OLIVER. I am given to understand that there will be a supplementary vote of about $30,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. This is a very considerable vote, and I think it is presented in a very objectionable form. In the estimates of the Public Works Department, for a very much smaller amount, you will find eight or ten items. In the committee, we elicited from the superintendent of immigration a considerable amount of information in regard to the money spent and the directions in which it was spent. I think there should be special items for printing, the salaries of agents and their expenses. We ought to have a good deal more detail in the estimates than we have, and I think it is up to the minister to give a pretty full explanation of what he has done, and what he intends to do with this vote of $157,200. The next item of $610,000 shows an increase of $74,000. The vote for the present year was exceptionally large. The minister, in explaining the supplementary estimates, stated that it was due to overlapping. But it seems to me that expenditure on immigration is altogether too large for the results we are getting. Last year the report showed that the items were divided as follows : for continental Europe, $78,000 ; for Great Britain and Ireland, $236,000 ; for the United States, $205,000 ; total for these three items, $519,000, leaving to be spent in Canada for 1903-4 $225,788. I cannot understand why such a large sum of money should be required in Canada to take care of the immigrants after they arrive. The minister may be able to give some satisfactory explanation of that. I hope he will, because our only object is to have the money well spent and to get good value for it. Then, for the present year the main estimates were $672,276, with a supplemetary vote which was passed the other day of $300,150, making in all $972,426. That certainly is a very large vote for immigration. My hon. friend, while he was a private member of this House, took very serious objection to very much smaller amounts. I quite understand that he was not a minister of the Crown when these estimates were put through and while this money was spent ; at the same time, having taken office, I presume that he is prepared to take full responsibility, as he has to do, whether he is personally responsible or not. We find expended in continental Europe for the present year $133,786, in Great Britain and Ireland $239,000, in the United States $318,000 and in Canada $282,-150, making a total of $972,936. I think the minister ought to be able to give us a detailed statement of what he has done with this money and why he requires so much. It is a well known fact that the United States has never had an immigration agent abroad soliciting immigrants, and at the present time it is a criminal offence for any person to do that. They are spending, I presume, about as much money to keep undesirable people out of the country as we are spending to get all kinds of people into the country. I will not at the present time go into the general question of immigration until I hear the explanation of the minister on the first item.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not understand definitely from the hon. member for Jacques Cartier whether he was willing to go on with these estimates to-night or not ?

Mr. MONK. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the general remark that the expenditure is very large, and that it is increasing, that is certainly something to be considered carefully, and to be justified by the results. The position taken by the hon. member is that inasmuch as the United States does not assist immigration, Canada should not do so.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I did not just say that, but you may put it that way if you like.

Mr. OLIVER. What I understood from the hon. gentleman was that inasmuch as the United States did not solicit immigration, it was a questionable policy for Canada to do so. But as a matter of fact immigrants have gone into the United States

by the million while the population of Canada practically stood still in so far as the influx of new population was concerned. For a generation or two, while our population was increasing by thousands, theirs was increasing by the million. Not only were we not getting immigration but we were losing our own people to the United States, and this condition continued many years even after we had the Northwest opened up by railway communication. While therefore there was no necessity for the United States to solicit immigrants since they were coming in without solicitation, the reverse was the case in this country, and we had to exert ourselves to secure new population to settle our waste lands or we would be permanently left behind in the race. The reverse of the policy advocated by the hon. gentleman was therefore adopted. The policy of securing immigration was entered upon vigorously with the most happy results. True the expenditure has been large, but the results have been more than proportionate. From a material point of view, they have been eminently satisfactory. The mere fact therefore that our expenditure on immigration is increasing is not necessarily an evidence of unwise policy or administration. As long as the results of that expenditure are satisfactory, there is no particular ground for condemnation. Of course it is none the less necessary that the expenditures should be carefully looked after, money should not be wasted and every criticism that will tend towards a better direction or a reduction of the expenditures without lessening the result will certainly be welcome. With regard to the criticism as to the large amount of the vote in bulk, while a vote in bulk has its objectionable side it has also a very useful side. The immigration service is one which, in the nature of things, cannot be absolutely controlled. If for one reason or another, there should come a special stream of immigration or a special urgency should arise in a certain direction, it is absolutely necessary that the urgency should be met at once ; and when we vote the amount in bulk, the funds are available anywhere within the limits of that vote, as they would not be if the vote were confined to a number of different items. We can get a better service for less money, so long as the money is properly handled, by giving a vote in bulk than by subdividing it. So far there has not been any great objection to the handling of money in that way. I fancy that every expenditure on immigration has met with probably as little objection from the Auditor General as any expenditure in any of the other branches of the government. So long as we do not mishandle the money, it is a very great advantage to the department to have this money voted in bulk.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What other changes are there in the policy of the department in the last three years ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that I know of any. Our policy is of course to secure as many desirable immigrants as possible with as little expenditure as possible. Of course as conditions change, there will have to be changes in our system to meet them, but there has been no change in our general policy from the start to the finish. That policy has been to get as many settlers as possible with as little expenditure as possible.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be useful if my hon. friend would give us an idea of what changes he proposes to make, if any, in the policy followed by his predecessors ever since this government came into power. Did the hon. gentleman say that there is no material change in that policy ? A moment ago in reply to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson), he said that the fact that the United States had received a very considerable influx of immigrants without any expenditure, and that during the same period we had received but few immigrants, proved that Canada required to spend considerable money in order to equalize the conditions. I do not think that that follows as a matter of logic. In the United States they have never encouraged immigration. They have never spent a dollar for that purpose on which we are spending millions every year. The money they have expended has been spent for the purpose of guarding against strangers and undesirable immigration. And, in spite of that, they have had, during the last twenty-five years, an unprecedented flow of immigrants into that country. As my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) stated, the immigration law forbids any person to induce immigrants to come to that country. Shipping agents may advertise the time of departure of steamers and conditions for transportation, but anything more is forbidden. And we all know how extremely stringent the law is in the United States as to the admission of immigrants and how these conditions, stringent as they are, are enforced, one might almost say, to perfection. One reading the report of the United States Commissioner of Immigration setting forth the results obtained by the preventive officers of the immigration staff of that country can easily see that their policy is absolutely the opposite of our own. And yet, what is the result ? We know that hundreds of thousands of people go into the United States every year. We know that the best of the immigrants to be had in the old world go to the United States. Last year, I believe, over 850,000 immigrants arrived at American ports. And all this without inducements held out, without canvassing, without any single item of this immense expenditure which we make every year for immigration purposes. Far from following such a course as ours, immigrants are charged upon en-

taring the American republic a tax of $2 a head. And this gives a revenue which exceeds by several hundred thousand dollars what they expend—a very large sum—for purposes of immigrant inspection. I think I am within the mark when I say that in 1896 Canada was spending about $200,000 for purposes of immigration. Of course, the system was the same as that of to-day—the promotion of immigration—but on a very much more moderate scale. I think that last year all the expenses, direct and indirect, connected with immigration would make a total of considerably more than $1,000,000—though the expenditure may not appear in the Auditor General's Report as connected with immigration. I think that the number of immigrants who came to Canada last year was about 130,000. I do not know that our system of inspection and control of that immigration is at all what it ought to be. It will be necessary to refer to that later on. But my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, some three or four years ago, stated in the House that we must proceed with extreme caution with respect to immigration. I have often read these remarks of my hon. friend, and I have no doubt that he remembers them also. He was of opinion then, and quoted authority for his contention, that desirable immigrants should be carefully selected, and that, after they reached this country, they should be carefully followed in order to make sure that they realized the expectations formed of them, and became bona fide settlers in this country under favourable conditions. He stated also, in substance, that it was time to call a halt in regard to indiscriminate immigration at any rate, and that if we continued to import people at the rate we had done for some time past, we would be—to use his own words—laying the foundation in the Northwest, whither most of these immigrants go, of most difficult problems for the Dominion government and the local authorities to solve. Is not my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) disposed to carry out the views he expressed on that occasion ? I regret that I have not his speech here, but I would assume from what he said on that occasion that he intended to make very serious modifications in the system of indiscriminate immigration which we follow at the present time. Does he not consider that some change is necessary ? Or is he in favour of continuing, without reservation or restriction, the policy of his predecessor ?

As regards the grouping of the expenditure, I agree with my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson), not only with regard to these items, but with regard to most of the items of the estimates, that discussion would be much shorter if more details were given. But this is particularly true in regard to the items respecting immigration. Here is a proposed expenditure of $767,000 grouped under two headings only. This arrangement obliges us to ask many questions which might be avoided were the items properly divided.

Mr. OLIVER. As to the form of the vote, I may say that these sums have been divided for purposes of statement to the House, so that, I think, we shall be able to answer any questions that may arise quite as well as if the division were made in the estimates. And this form of vote does not prevent us from increasing one expenditure and decreasing another, as the urgency of the case requires. If money is voted for a certain service, and even if a balance remains unexpended, no part of the vote can be used for another service, no matter how badly it may be needed. But this difficulty has been avoided in the past, the result being actual economy in the service.

With regard to my own view and with regard to questions of policy, I have nothing whatever to take back of what I said on the occasion referred to by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I have always looked upon the question of immigration as one of the most important that the country had to deal with. There is no doubt that immigration brings problems of more or less difficulty to the part of the country affected ; and I think now, as I thought before, that it is not wise to shut our eyes to these problems. At the same time we all recognize the necessity of increasing the population ; we all recognize the necessity of encouraging immigration. As I said, the policy of the government has been to induce immigration, and, so far as I am concerned, the policy of the government will be to induce immigration. I think it has never been a part of the settled policy of the government to induce indiscriminate immigration, and it will not be the policy of the government to induce indiscriminate immigration or to deal with immigration indiscriminately.

As I said a few minutes ago, changed conditions will require to be met by changed methods. It is impossible for me, having only recently entered the department, and not having had an opportunity to familiarize myself with this matter, to say at the present time what may be done in one regard more than is being done, or what may be done in another regard less than is being done. I think my hon. friends will not be so unfair as to demand such a statement from me at this time. To put the case shortly, my view is, as it always has been, that the country requires a vigorous immigration policy, and that that policy should be acted upon with due regard to the ultimate effect upon our country of the people whom we induce to settle in it ; and that while no money is too much to spend to secure an immigration of the right kind of people, any money is too much to spend on an immigration of the wrong kind. I do not think there is any disagreement between the two sides of the House, or between any two members of the House on that point. We are all agreed in

that respect, and it is only a question of how best to carry out that policy. On the one hand we want the people, we want them quickly, and we want as many of them as we can get ; on the other hand we want to procure as desirable a class as possible ; and the effort of the department will be to attain both objects so far as possible.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I had hoped for a change in the policy of immigration when my hon. friend the present minister took office, because we know he has made some vigorous speeches in this House upon that very question. I do not see how we can reconcile his position that there should be no change in the policy of the government with his previous utterances on this subject. Now I have a lot of quotations here of his speeches, I am not going to quote any of them to-night, because we expect another discussion ; but there is one that fits in so well here that I cannot refrain from reading it. It will be found on page 3740 of the 'Hansard' of 1902. Mr. Oliver spoke as follows :

> I am given to understand that a new system is being adopted in regard to immigration from the British Isles. I am not familiar with the details of that system, but I will say that there is no possibility of adopting any system which could be less effective than which has prevailed during the past year. I am satisfied that any system that is adopted will be an improvement.

Now I might almost say that I agree pretty well with the minister. I do not think we have got very good results from the money we have been spending on immigration. We have had many agents drawing salaries, and who have not given good value in return. There is another system to which I am even more strongly opposed than to the salaried agents, and that is the commissioned agent. It seemed to be the opinion that no matter who an agent induced to come into this country, it was all right and he could get a commission. Then there is another thing. The superintendent of immigration told us the other day that for certain immigrants we gave $5 a head commission to the steamboat agents. I believe these are continental immigrants, farmers and labourers. Well, we only pay 7 shillings per head for British immigrants. Now it seems to me that policy should be reversed. I know what the answer will be, namely, that the steamboat agents or, the parties taking charge of that kind of immigration, pay their own advertising and that sort of thing. Well, we pay for the advertisements in Great Britain and Ireland, as well as in other countries. Now the fact of the matter is that a great deal of this money, in my judgment, is wasted. Besides that, a great deal of the literature is wasted that we send out in such great quantities. I have been told by one man in particular who lectured in the old country that they had agents at the door giving away literature, and after the lecture was over you could pick up hundreds of pamphlets on the street that had been thrown away broadcast. A few years ago my hon. friend was with me in opposition to the policy of paying $5 bonus. But if we have to give bonuses let us give them to our own people. I am not at all in favour of bonuses, I want that understood ; but if we have to give a bonus to any man, let us give it to the Englishman, the Irishman or the Scotchman, then we will have one of our own people amongst us. The other day I came across a good Scotchman, a very intelligent man, and he said, I think if you dealt as well by the Scotch people as you do by the Doukhobors you would have very little trouble in getting a large number of them. We not only gave $5 per head for the Doukhobors, but we gave them assistance besides when they had hard luck in the winter time. I do not object to that, but as they are a very prosperous people I think we ought to get that money back. Now the minister has not given us one bit of information as to the first part of this vote : 'Salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries. That item is of a wide scope, and I think we ought to have some information about it. I do not feel disposed to be unduly severe on the minister, knowing that he has only recently taken office ; but I think he ought to give us at least some information about that vote of $157,200.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be pleased to give all the information in my power.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. In the first place, why do you want so much money for agents in Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. There is required $102,230 for the service in Canada ; $31,530 for the United States ; $19,700 for Great Britain ; $3,700 for the continent. There is an increase of $20,000 over last year. This is to pay the salaries of several new appointments, some increases of salaries, and to pay the salaries of several officials whose services in the past have been paid from the vote for contingencies and general expenses ; that is to say, we are meeting to a certain extent the criticism the hon. member made in the beginning that a certain amount, $7,500, which was formerly paid out of the lump sum of contingencies, is now paid out of this specific sum voted for salaries.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Give us the amounts for salaries.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The new appointments, salaries, amount to $12,986.25, an increase of $1,000. There was transferred from the general vote $7,500 ; that makes a total of $21,486.25 and there is a decrease of $1,500, making a net increase of $19,986. The new appointments are as follows : Dr. A. C. Hawkins, medical officer, Halifax, $1,000 ; Dr. J. C. Howe, medical officer, Quebec, $1,000 ; Dr. A. Potvin, medical officer, Quebec, $1,000, and Dr. A. T.

Stewart, medical officer, Montreal, $1,000, making $4,000 for medical inspection at ports of landing rendered necessary by the increased stringency of the efforts which are being made to prevent the landing of undesirable persons.

Mr. MONK. What would be the duty of the medical officer in Montreal ?

Mr. OLIVER. The duty of the medical officer is to inspect people, who come to Montreal through New York and Boston.

Mr. BLAIN. I brought to the attention of the hon. minister, when the immigration item was before the committee last, the case of some immigrants who had come over to Canada and who had been stopped at Prescott, Ont., on their way to the United States. I understood them to be immigrants from the old country who had crossed our border, who had come up to Prescott and then desired to cross over to Ogdensburg, but were stopped by the United States officials. I asked the hon. minister if he would be good enough to investigate the matter and be prepared to give us a statement in regard to it. Perhaps the hon. gentleman could give it now.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not the correspondence in hand but we will be prepared to place it before the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he approves of and if it is his intention to carry out the policy of his predecessor in regard to the expenditure of the money of the people which is voted for the purposes of immigration ? I find by reading the Auditor General's Report that last year the great bulk of this money was paid to political friends of the government for services that I think added very little to the bringing in of immigrants. At page L—15 of the Auditor General's Report I find that the salaries at Ottawa were $17,978.06. But, that is only a bagatelle, because I find that F. C. Blair, who is a salaried officer was paid the following amounts : Board and lodging, $99.65 ; cabs, $4.55 ; fares, $16.11 ; livery, $224.10 ; pullmans, $14.50 ; street cars, $4.20 ; stage fares, $1.40 ; tips, $2 ; sundries, $2.61 ; making a total of $369.12, that this gentleman has disbursed. But, this is only a small matter. Take the case of Mr. H. Charlebois. He receives pay for services, 33 days at $5, 27 days at $4, and although he is not a permanent officer at all, the government furnish him with a uniform cap costing $5. Then, for board and lodgings he receives $123.20 and for pullmans, $88 ; making a total of $489.20. J. Edgar is paid for services 52 days at $5, and he received a uniform cap costing $6.50. board and lodging, $109.40 ; pullmans, $66 ; cabs, 1 ; street cars, $2 ; tips, $2.25 ; making a total of $447.15. He puts his hand into the chest, takes out money belonging to the people of the country, and expends it in tips although he is simply working by the day receiving $5 a day and expenses. But, that is not the worst. Take the case of J. Franklin, services, 193 days at $5, 9 days at $4, board and lodging, $425.55 ; cabs, $3.75 ; pullmans, $276.50 ; street cars, $8.45 ; tips, $6 ; sundries, $4.25 ; making a total of $1,651.80. This gentleman takes $6 of the people's money with which to tip waiters, &c. Next we have R. W. Hillyard, services 147 days at $5 ; 6 days at $4 ; 4 22-30 m. at $1,000; board and lodging, $425.50; bus, $4.40 ; coal oil, $2.24 ; fares, $44.55 ; hand basins, $8.03 ; livery, $135.55; provisions for immigrants, $5.85 ; pullmans, $235 ; street cars, $11.45 ; telegrams, $2.70 ; tips $27.70 ; transfers, $4.20; sundries, $2.03, making a total of $2,074.87. This gentleman spends $27.70 for tips, but that is not the worst Geo. A. Johnston receives pay for services 125 days at $5 ; 1 day at $4 ; 4 22-30 m. at $1,000 ; board and lodging, $481.80 ; cabs, $2.25 ; fares, $27 ; pullmans, $305.50 ; provisions for immigrants, $3.55 ; telegrams, $2.80 ; tips, $11 ; wash basins, $1.50 ; sundries, $4.04 ; making a total of $1,875.11. L. Kehoe receives pay for services 18 days at $5 ; 19 days at $4 ; board and lodging, $71 ; pullmans, $56 ; street cars, 70 cents ; uniform cap, $5 or in all $298.70. Mr. W. D. Scott receives for board and lodging, $532.50; baggage transfer, $7.75; cabs, $14.75; map, $1; pullmans, $68.75 ; street cars, $9.25 ; tips, $5.25 ; making a total of $639.25. The next is Mr. G. B. Smart. Mr. Smart is set down as a salaried officer at $1,400 looking after pauper children, and here are his expenses : Board and lodging, $465.38 ; baggage transfers, $8.50; cab and bus fares, $56.40 ; cigars, $7. The government have to furnish him with cigars. He charged them up to the government. He took the people's money bought cigars and smoked them with his heels up on the seat of a pullman because he is allowed $107.85 for pullmans. Fares, $48.78 ; livery, $264.75 ; postage, $3.76 ; printing cards, $2.60 ; pullmans, $107.85 ; street cars, $19.20 ; telegrams, $11.55 ; telephones, $4.10; tips, $23.95; sundries, $1.87 ; making a total of $1,025.69. He takes $23 of the people's money with which to tip waiters and others and this added to $7 for cigars, makes $30 of the people's money expended in this way, yet, this vote is supposed to be for immigration purposes. Of what assistance is it towards bringing immigrants into this country to pay $7 to Mr. Smart to buy cigars and $23 to give in tips to waiters ? Is it the intention of the hon. Minister of the Interior to continue this policy under his management of the department ? Is he going to allow the people's money to be frittered away in this shape ? If so, we had better say we will give up importing immigrants at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. My friends opposite approve of it and say it is all right for a

civil servant to put his hand into the treasury and take out $7 and buy cigars and give $23.50 in tips to waiters. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are frittered away in that way. Every servant in connection with this department at Halifax, Montreal or Quebec is allowed three uniform suits during the season, and two or three caps, running into $100 a year besides salary and liberal expenses. Surely the minister will reform the policy of the government unless he approves, which as an honest man he cannot do, of the conduct of the department. No wonder he is asking an increased amount, adding to the civil service list and appointing friends. I could point out agencies in the United States where some of these officials receive $6,000 and $7,000 between salary and expenses, holding office at Detroit, Milwaukee, &c. It is all detailed in the Auditor General's Report. Surely the minister can run the department and get as efficient service for one quarter the money that is spent here as is shown by the Auditor General's Report for last year. Let the minister look at the item of pullman car fares. Most members of parliament, or at least a great many of them, in travelling from Ottawa to Toronto do not occupy pullman cars, but here a civil servant if he travels must have a pullman car charged to the people of this country. I think it is time the minister would call a halt and ask these gentlemen to pay for their own cigars and tips to waiters out of their own pockets, instead of out of the pockets of the people. I trust the minister, before the vote passes, will cut down the item as it can be cut down, and still have a better service than we have had in the past for the money voted.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not had the time or opportunity to go over the actual working of the department since taking hold, but I can quite accept the criticism made, which is perfectly in order, and I shall certainly accept the duty laid on me when I have the opportunity to go into the administration of the department, and do the best I can to secure reasonable economy, accompanied of course by efficiency. I am not able to say just how it comes that these expenditures have been made and all that astonishes me is that the books show these accounts have been paid after having passed the lynx-eyed Auditor General.

Mr. TAYLOR. Because they are certified by some officer of your department and the Auditor General is obliged to pay.

Mr. COCHRANE. I expect you know well enough.

Mr. OLIVER. I only wish he would be as good with some accounts I know to be perfectly honest but which he is not willing to pass.

Mr. COCHRANE. Never mind the Auditor General. Let us know what the minister is going to do himself.

Mr. COCHRANE.

Mr. OLIVER. On inquiry of the officer of the department here in regard to one or two of those expenditures, I find that Mr. Blair is employed as an inspector of the immigrant children and this expense of inspection is paid by the imperial government. There is an arrangement whereby when children come out under official supervision they have to be officially inspected every year and for this inspection, except the first inspection, the imperial government pay, so that the expense, as I am given to understand, is a mere form ; although appearing in our report as charged upon our department it really represents a payment to us by the imperial government. The same is true in regard to a Mr. Hillyard, whose name is mentioned there in regard to the same employment. In reference to the use of pullman cars I understand that this use has mostly taken place in returning from the conduct of immigrants out west. We start the immigrants from Montreal or Ottawa in charge of a guide so to speak, who accompanies the party to Winnipeg and sees to their distribution over the branch lines there and then comes back. The trip from Winnipeg to Ottawa occupies two days and nights, and any one travelling on the train must either use a pullman or sit up, and I think it is generally considered it is necessary for even a government official to sleep ; it is upon that ground I believe that these pullman expenses are paid. As to the use of pullmans between here and Toronto we pay, as the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor) has said, about $5 a day. I take it as cheaper to pay the cost of a pullman from here to Toronto and have the officer travel at night than have him lose $5 worth of daylight in making the same trip so that while I do not at all care for extra luxuries—and certainly some of these expenses will bear very careful inquiry—I think there is sometimes an appearance of economy that is not economy and an appearance of extravagance that is not extravagance.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will the minister tell how many children these three inspectors inspected ?

Mr. OLIVER. The number on the inspection list at present is about 1,100.

Mr. COCHRANE. Where are the homes situated that these children are furnished to and distributed from ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are mostly distributed amongst the farmers.

Mr. COCHRANE. The minister must know—if he does not he ought to—that they come to homes at first in Belleville, Peterborough and so forth and then are distributed to the farmers from the homes.

Mr. OLIVER. There are 13 receiving homes in this country and they come from about 115 in the old country.

Mr. COCHRANE. Are there any in central Ontario, Belleville, Peterborough, &c., that distribute the children that these gentlemen inspect? My opinion is that that inspection is a perfect fraud on the country. The hon. gentleman says there is something to be said; there was a good deal to be said in connection with such an expenditure when the Conservative party was in power.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. The hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' if he would mind what he is doing and not be so quick with his 'hear, hear,' and his simple grin and pay more attention to the conduct of public affairs it would be better for him.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is another gentleman with his 'hear, hear.' I did not expect to see the hon. gentleman in the House; he said he would resign, but I knew that he would not be very resigning if he could get out of it.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE. How are you on the question of skimmed milk?

Mr. COCHRANE. How are you? I will let you know if you repeat that to me outside the House. If you had any manhood about you, you would not do it. You come outside the House and say that to me, and I will let you know. I was saying to the minister that when the administration that I used to support was making economical expenditures, there were men then on this side of the House who would keep us all night talking over a few dollars of expenditure. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to say 'hear, hear,' and smile, but they do not realize that they are spending the people's money for tips and cigars. Last year or the year before Walker's whisky was furnished to the Minister of Agriculture. The poor people of the country are earning by the sweat of their brow the money to pay the taxes which hon. gentlemen opposite are spending. I do not object to any expenditure for the good of the country, but I object to officials travelling in special cars. When we were in power hon. gentlemen opposite talked from morning till night about the iniquity of Sir John Macdonald travelling in a special car; yet I have heard on good authority that the late Minister of the Interior travelled about the Northwest with his father and brother in a private car, for which, I suppose, the country is paying. In the section of country where I live I venture to say that not one of these gentlemen ever inspected one of the homes that the hon. Minister of the Interior speaks of. They have been inspected by ladies; but so far as these gentlemen are concerned, unless more has been done in other sections of the country than in that section, the inspection of these children is a perfect fraud on the people, and the money is worse than uselessly expended.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that the officers of the department reiterate that the inspection has been made every year.

Mr. COCHRANE. I emphatically contradict the statement.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Would the minister tell us when the two assistant inspectors were appointed?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Blair is not now employed. Mr. Smart is, and has been a permanent inspector, and he is assisted at the present time by Mr. Hillyard.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Mr. Scott, the Commissioner of Immigration, told us in the committee that there were three—Mr. Smart, Mr. Hillyard and Mr. Corry.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Corry was appointed quite recently in Manitoba.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Last year, according to the report, there were 2,204 children, of whom 1,188 were in four of Dr. Barnardo's homes. This year we have only 1,142 children, yet there are one or two additional inspectors. Under these circumstances, I do not think that increase can be very well justified. Even if the inspection has to be paid for in the old country, that is no justification for wasting the money, because it gives us a bad name.

Mr. OLIVER. The difference in the number of children does not make very much difference in the work of inspection, inasmuch as they are scattered widely all over the country from ocean to ocean. It would be easy to show that it would not cost so much to inspect half a dozen children located in one school section as two separated in different counties.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But you had twice the number last year and only one inspector.

Mr. OLIVER. No; there were two. Mr. Hillyard was acting as inspector last year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Here is an item of some considerable importance on which I would like to have a few more details: Commissioner Smith, expenses for land guides, interpreters, temporary agents, clerks, travelling expenses, mattresses, provisions, and all expenses connected with locating immigrants on land, $130,000.

Mr. LAKE. I understand from the minister that while we spend on immigration from the United States some $30,000 on salaries we spend only $18,000 in Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. OLIVER. In the United States $31,000 and in Great Britain and Ireland $19,000.

Mr. LAKE. Although I realize that the class of immigrants from the United States is a very good class, still I think it would be better to put forth greater efforts in the mother country. I do not think any class could equal the small tenant farmer class, the men who work their own farms in the mother country. We are not getting enough of them. If a larger amount were spent to get that particular class, we would get better results than we do from the expenditure in the United States.

Mr. OSLER. The efforts of the department in the past have been, as they will be in the future, very strongly directed towards the object the hon. gentleman mentions. But the difficulty in securing the immigration of tenant farmers from the old country is that they are wanted in the old country just as much as they are here. I can assure him that no effort will be spared, but they are a class of people very conservative in their habits, if not in their politics, and will require to be attacked apparently from as yet an undiscovered point in order to secure them.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the hon. minister intend to continue the payment of $5 per head to agents who bring in immigrants from the continent ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am given to understand that there is a contract for ten years. I cannot give the date at the moment, but it was entered into and the department would be bound by it.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. A very bad contract.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly. Of course the question of policy would always have to be considered.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Will you bring down that contract ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have it here but there are reasons why it should not be generally published. I shall be glad, however, to place it at the disposal of my hon. friend, on the understanding that it will not be made public.

Mr. MONK. I think it would be well if my hon. friend would give us the different contracts by virtue of which we are bound to pay a bonus to steamship companies or other tranportation companies on the carriage of immigrants.

Mr. OLIVER. There is only the one.

Mr. MONK. I think the House is entitled to see that contact unless there be grave reasons of state why we should not. I assume that my hon. friend himself did not make that contract binding us for ten years to pay $5 a head on every immigrant from the continent. That is certainly a very condemnable policy indeed.

Mr. HENDERSON. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says the country is bound for ten years. He is a lawyer and I am not, and I presume he means that we may be bound to make good a contract entered into by the government. I however, do not think that we are either morally or legally bound. The ex-Minister of Interior (Mr. Sifton) knew perfectly well that he had no authority to make any such contract. This parliament never authorized it. Beyond the period of one year for which money is voted, no minister can make a contract binding parliament. The thing would be monstrous. What is the use of parliament meeting once every twelve months if a minister, at his own whim, may appropriate the public money for ten years to come ? The present minister would be only doing his duty if he would cancel that contract and take care not to enter into any contract in the future beyond the period for which the money is voted I trust we shall have no more revelations of this kind. I trust that the present minister will have too much self-respect to enter into any other such contract. There is no use saying that we are bound by it for ten years. As a matter of fact we are not bound either legally or morally, and I trust that the hon. minister will see that the contract is cancelled at once. We can do very well without getting immigrants from the continent except from one or two special countries. The time has come when we can get all the immigrants we want without paying anything per head and we will get a better class. The poorest kind of immigrant is the one you have to pay for. The man who will make a good citizen is the one whose only inducement to settle in this country is what the government offers in the way of land and what the country offers in the way of a fertile soil and healthy climate. And I trust that there will be no more of this bonus system, but that whatever obligation has been undertaken by the previous minister will be forthwith cancelled, and let men come to this country of their own free will. I do not see the need for filling up this country so hastily. Immigration, I think, is coming in with sufficient rapidity. Perhaps, even if it were not coming in so fast, we could take better care of those who do come, and the immigration would inure more to the benefit of the country. But, by all means let us cease giving bonuses to bring in a class of immigrants that have never proved as acceptable as those that have come in without government aid.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN. Is there any law on the statute-book which authorizes the Minister of the Interior to enter into this contract, or has he entered into it by virtue of his position ?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume that the Minister of the Interior made the contract in

the belief that it was sound public policy and by virtue of his authority as Minister of the Interior and as officer charged with the duty of inducing immigration.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Perhaps the minister has found the details of that expenditure of $130,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. The amount directly expended under the authority of Mr. Smith, of the Winnipeg office, is $80,000. There are other amounts that make up this total of $130,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There must be a lot of details.

Mr. OLIVER. I can give the details for the $80,000. It will be observed we have been considering one end of this service, the inducing of settlers, but this has to do with the location of settlers.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Does the explanation the minister is about to give cover the current year to the end of this month or the coming year ?

Mr. OLIVER. The particulars I have are for the year ending June 30th, 1904.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But later on the minister will be able to give us the expenditure for the current year ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think so. The expenditure during the year ending June 30th, 1904, was $76,087, which is about equal to the estimate we have made for the coming year $80,000. But the expenditure for the current year was larger than usual because items were paid that had been carried over. That expenditure is covered by the supplementary vote for the current year, which has already passed the House. But expenditures in the ordinary way, have remained about the same. This expenditure was divided into these classes :

Miscellaneous, $333.
Interpreters—services and expenses, $2,566.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Cannot the hon. minister state the number of these ?

Mr. OLIVER. The officials whose salaries will come out of the $80,000 are those in the west who are engaged in the work of locating settlers.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I suppose their expenses also were paid ? Can the minister give the expenditure under that head ?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenses are paid out of the vote for contingencies and general expenditure, and it cannot well be given for the different individuals.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Each man would have to make a return to the department of his expenses, and I should think the figures would be there showing each man's account with all the details.

Mr. OLIVER. We have such details for the past years, but not for the coming year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. But it is on past experience, I presume, that you have based your present estimate ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Travelling and living expenses of officials in the west for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1904, $8,401. There is another item, transportation and location of immigrants, $7,673. Some of these officials might possibly be included in some other items of expenditure in this service. The hon. member asked me for the salaries of the western officials for the coming year, but we are not able to give the item for contingencies for the coming year. I was giving the particulars of the expenses for contingencies last year, $80,000. Miscellaneous, $333 ; interpreters' services and expenses, $2,566; land guides, $11,274 ; sundry services, carpenters, clerical assistance, temporary agents, $12,202 ; delegates' expenses, $125; travelling and living expenses of officials in west, $8,401 ; uniforms, $2,099 ; advertising, $478 ; collection of exhibits, $8,309 ; equipment, bedding, utensils, &c., $5,013 ; provisions, $3,563 ; laundry, cleaning office, &c., $1,629 ; medical services, expenses, supplies, &c., $4,466 ; transportation and location of immigrants, $7,673 ; contingencies, Winnipeg agency, $4,371 ; contingencies outside service, agencies in west, $3,579 ; total, $76,087.

Mr. HERRON. How is it that some of the interpreters are getting $600 a year and other $1,200 ?

Mr. OLIVER. It depends somewhat on the length of service of the interpreter, and somewhat on the importance of the service.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Are the officers whose names the hon. gentleman read engaged the whole year round ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, on fixed salaries. The item for interpreters and land guides includes other people than the salaried officers whose names I read. The land guides are employed temporarily, by the day.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. There is another matter that seems strange, to which I wish some explanation. The Report of the Minister of Interior, page 166, gives the deportations at 270, the same report on page 169 gives the deportations at 85, in the same year ; while Mr. Scott, in his evidence before the committee the other day, gave the numbers at 157. To my question at a previous period of the session, the Prime Minister stated that there had been deported 359. There seems to be a great deal of confusion in the figures. I would like the minister to explain the discrepancies.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the figures do not cover the same periods, nor do they relate to the same matters.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I will read the question and answer :

1. How many immigrants were deported from this country during the fiscal year 1904, and up to the 1st of February, 1905 ?
2. What were the nationalities ?
3. What was the cause of their being deported ?
4. How many were deported for disease, and for what disease ?
5. How many because they were liable to become paupers ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1. During the fiscal year, 1903-4, 359.

That is a straight answer to a straight question. Now I would like some explanation of these divergent figures. I think our public documents ought to be reliable, and a man could quote either of these three figures and say he was quoting official documents.

Mr. OLIVER. It is impossible to give an answer off-hand. I am informed that the figures do not cover the same periods.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. It covered the fiscal year 1903-4. That is what the annual report covers.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. member to say that the question was : What were the deportations for the fiscal year and up to the end of February, and that the answer was as to the number for the fiscal year.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have the two answers here. I only read one of them, but I have the other as well :

From the 1st July, 1904, to the 1st February, 1905, 387 were deported.

I will send it over to my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER. What was the question which the hon. gentleman said was answered differently from this ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have your report. If you will turn to page 166 you will find that in table 9 the number of persons deported is given as 270.

Mr. OLIVER. During what period ?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I suppose during the fiscal year 1903-4, because that is the period covered by the report. Then, look at page 169. I might as well send over the evidence taken at the committee if you want it.

Mr. OLIVER. There is an evident discrepancy between the answer read by the premier and the statement in the blue-book. It is impossible at the moment to say where the error was, but we will take measures to verify the one statement or the other, and see which is correct.

Mr. HERRON. The hon. minister has given us a statement this evening about large expenditures in the way of interpreters and agents locating settlers. I cannot understand how that applies to one part of the country differently from another part. In the locality where I live the country is practically settled for a radius of twenty-five miles. I never saw one of the gentlemen that the hon. minister has spoken of locating settlers. I do not think there ever was one in that locality, and I do not see why this is necessary in one part of the country and not in another.

Mr. OLIVER. As the hon. member knows, the locality in which he lives is sufficiently attractive to bring settlers without any special advertisement or effort, but where the attractions are not so great it is necessary to employ the services of agents to bring the settler and the country together.

Mr. HERRON. I have reference to locating settlers after they come into the country. According to what I understand from the reports, these gentlemen are paid for locating settlers and for showing them around the country. They hire teams to take them out and see the land so as to get a location. I am positive that there never were any of these gentlemen in the locality where I live.

Mr. COCHRANE. I understood from one of the gentlemen who was before the committee that these locating gentlemen who are such an expensive luxury got $2 a day from the government in cash, and that if a man wanted one of them to show him the land so as to enable him to locate he would have to pay from $4 to $6 a day extra for a team. I should think these gentlemen who are paid by the government should not be receiving that much from a poor man who goes out there to locate his home, and that he would not be called upon to pay for a team to go around the country. What benefit are these agents if they have to be paid every day for their travelling expenses ? I should think that when the government paid them they would not be extorting money from people who employ them to assist them in locating land. Do they have to have tips, too ?

Mr. OLIVER. A team is necessary for the travelling of a person who is looking for land, and he gets the benefit of the transportation by means of the team as well as of the services of the land guide in finding the lines and looking them up in his location. It seems to me a very satisfactory method of dealing with the question. I have heard no complaints either as to hardship towards intending settlers or dissatisfaction on their part. Any one who has ever had occasion to go out to look for land in a new country will know that it is of the very greatest advantage to the new pioneer who does not understand the lines and stakes or the lay of the land to have an experienced and reliable man with him. They are certainly

all willing, as far as I know, to pay for their services.

Mr. HERRON. There are two or three men in my locality who make a living by that sort of business. When a man is looking for land he goes and hires with these men and also hires his team. He drives them over the country, and the man who is looking for land pays him about $5 a day for the use of his team and his own services. That has been paid in every case by every settler who comes into the district where I live.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount was paid last year under the ten years' contract referred to a few moments ago ?

Mr. OLIVER. Under the arrangement during the past three years the total sum paid has been $87,000 I am informed roughly. That has been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company, the organization with which the arrangement is made.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the amount on the increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. It was a little less last year and it is expected to be less next year; it is rather on the decrease.

Mr. MONK. Has the minister any information to give in regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company. Who are the parties interested? It owns no ships and is not a regular shipping company. At the time the Doukhobors came to this country I think $48,000 was paid to that same company. Does my hon. friend know anything about the company, who constitute it and what is its character generally ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe that it is an organization of steamship companies and it is quite possible to place at the disposal of my hon. friend all the information in regard to it. There is no Canadian reason why it should not be entirely public, but if the company is to continue its operations there are reasons why the facts should not be published outside of Canada. If the members will be satisfied with an opportunity of examining the question for themselves individually, we will be very glad to place all information at their disposal and if they insist it will have to be made a public document and open to the world, but our policy would be, if it is intended to continue the operation of the company, that is should not at the present time be made public.

Mr. BLAIN. I think it is a strong reason why the items should be more in detail for immigration purposes as pointed out by the members for Lennox (Mr. Uriah Wilson) and Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Here the government enters into a ten years' contract without any consultation with the House at all. If an item had been placed in the estimates for payment to steamship companies, or rather steamship agents, for inducing farmers to come to Canada, a fixed amount in a separate column, then the minister would be entitled to give the House some information as to how that money is expended, but here a contract has been entered into and the House has no opportunity of discussing that item. It seems to me to be a pretty general policy and a policy that I think ought to be looked into. I agree with the statement of the member for Lennox, that the details should be given in order that the House should be better informed on these items, as the money is being voted from time to time.

Mr. ALCORN. A good deal of the criticism which has come from this side of the House with regard to this item has been directed towards the expense, alleged to be unnecessary in many instances, of providing salaries and expenses for the numerous agents of the department; and towards the classes of immigrants being brought to this country. As bearing upon those two points and generally upon the subject of immigration of farm labour into Canada, I ask the attention of the minister for a moment in regard to a private immigration scheme which is in operation in my own county of Prince Edward, Ont., with very beneficial results. A Mr. R. J. Crothers, a farmer in my county, having had correspondence with certain British immigration agencies, I think in the first instance with one, of which Lord Aberdeen is the head, was joined by his neighbours, with a view of continuing the immigration of that class of immigrants. They formed an association amongst themselves—farmers who required farm help—and upon payment of a nominal fee each farmer becomes a member of that association. As he requires farm help he makes application to the secretary stating the class of help he requires, the wages he is prepared to pay, whether or not he will advance the passage money, and it is understood in all cases that he is hiring for one year. These particulars are sent to the old country with a statement as to whether a married man is required or not. Then the associations in the old country with whom Mr. Crothers has communication send out the man, guaranteeing that he is a decent man and of the best class. In this way, since this private scheme has been in operation in Prince Edward county and in Hastings, an adjoining county, some 350 men have been brought out, chieffy from the north of England and south of Scotland. I have met many of these men and I am quite certain they are of the very best class, especially adapted to agricultural labour because that was their calling before coming here, and they are especially selected in regard to qualification by the home associations. These men and their families amount to about 600 souls, that this private association has already brought out and placed

with the farmers of those two counties. When the man is sent out he is met at the station by Mr. Crothers and immediately taken to the farm of the farmer whose employ he is to enter. He knows before he leaves the old country to whom he is going, by what route, he is met on his arrival and taken to the farmer and knows especialy exactly what he is to get, and in all cases he is engaged for at least a year. It appears to me that if the government would see fit to appoint such men as Mr. Crothers, men of substance with a reputation in their own locality and having the confidence of the people amongst whom they live, being farmers themselves and not adventurers, not people seeking a job, but people responsible to the farmers with whom these men are placed, immensely satisfactory results might be expected. If there is one difficulty facing the farmers of Ontario today it is the problem of farm labour, and I think this, one very excellent method by which that growing need may be very largely, very effectually and very satisfactorily supplied, if the government would accord to people in the position of Mr. Crothers, something in the nature of official recognition by appointing him as an agent, the proper sort of men would be obtained. Of course the success of the scheme would lie absolutely in the class of men who would act as agents and none but the best men should be employed. I bring this matter to the attention of the minister with the view of having it receive his best consideration, and that he may decide whether such a policy as that could not with good effect be adopted. Here is an instance in which to my personal knowledge it has worked excellently. I know of no other means by which that body of men could have been brought into that locality.

Mr. OLIVER. The suggestion made by the hon. member for Prince Edward is an instance of what I alluded to a little while ago, the necessity of amending the immigration policy from time to time to meet new demands and new conditions. The present immigration policy of the government was instituted for the sole purpose of filling up the Northwest, and I think it has had a fair measure of success. I do not think it was ever suggested that an effort should be made by the Dominion immigration authorities to deal with the problem of farm help in the province of Ontario, but it is generally recognized that there is now a greater requirement in that direction, and that the Dominion Immigration Department is now a proper means for attempting to meet that demand. The plan outlined strikes me as being very commendable, especially in view of the success which has been attained, and I assure the committee that I shall be very glad to consider the project laid down by the hon. member. I am looking for information, and while not promising a change of policy, yet if anything can be shown which will indicate an improvement, I shall be only too ready to accept the suggestion and act upon it.

Mr. ALCORN. I may say that the efforts of this association have been absolutely without help from any outside source. It has paid all it own expenses, and its success has been entirely due to its own efforts. I brought the matter to the attention of the ex-Minister of the Interior some time ago, and his answer was that he did not think it could be done because if it were done in one instance, he would have to appoint local agents in every county. I replied that that was exactly what we ought to do—perhaps not necessarily in every county, but in groups of counties. The man I mentioned is willing to take charge of Prince Edward and Hastings, and possibly one more county, provided he can give his time to the work. It seems to me that the class of men to whom I allude, responsible, substantial and respectable men, having the confidence of their community, if appointed agents, would be the very best means the government could adopt to bring out just the class of men of whom the farmers are in the most urgent need.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I regard this as a very important matter. The report, at page 168, gives a classification of the detained immigrants who came to this country: British immigrants detained, 1 in 1,325; Italians, 1 in 40; Russians and Russian Jews, 1 in 11·6; Syrians and allied races, 1 in 3·4. Why should any effort be used to bring to Canada a class of immigrants of whom 1 in every 3 or 4 is diseased. I think the hon. minister will agree with me that they should not be induced to come to our country at all. Last year the United States agents at Naples refused to take 10,000 people; the steamship agents would not sell tickets to them, because they were satisfied that they would not pass examination in the United States. Last year the United States practically refused admission to 8,000 people—4,800 paupers, 1,600 diseased, 1,500 under contract to labour, and 35 criminals. According to that statement 7,935 were rejected. Of these, 2,928 were rejected on our border. What became of these? As those deported are put at 359 I take for granted that the rest must be in this country. It does seem to me that a large percentage of those in this country will not make desirable settlers; and if the United States rejected them, I think we should. We certainly do not want paupers or criminals, or people liable to become paupers, or people suffering from contagious diseases. The United States last year practically refused to allow 11,000 people who came to their country to enter. I am strongly of opinion that it is to the

best interest of this country to have a strict medical examination of intending emigrants in the old country before they are allowed to embark for this country. It is true, that will entail a little expense, but we could easily curtail the expense of payments to shipping agents sufficiently to cover it. If a steamship company brings an immigrant who is diseased into the United States, and the disease might have been detected by a medical examination before the immigrant embarked, the company is liable to a fine of $100, and in addition to pay all the expenses incurred by the immigrant while in the United States, and to take him back to the country from which he came. Great Britain is feeling perhaps more keenly than any other country the effects of this bad immigration; because many of the immigrants, no matter from what European country they come, go to Great Britain and are embarked at British ports; so that if they are rejected, they go back to Great Britain. There is a Bill now before the British parliament to prevent that. I am more anxious about the class of immigrants we get than about the money we spend on immigration, and I think the minister is exactly of the same opinion, and I have great hope that in the future he will exercise his good judgment in that direction.

Mr. OLIVER. It is hoped, by the increased stringency of the medical inspection at the ocean ports, to put the shipping companies dealing with Canada in the same position as those coming to the United States. When an immigrant is detained in Canada for medical reasons, the shipping company has to pay the expenses of the treatment, and, if the immigrant is deported, the expenses of the deportation. By the increased stringency of the regulations and their stricter enforcement, the burden on the companies will be increased, as it has been in the United States and they will be just as careful about bringing immigrants to Canada as they are about bringing them to the United States.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The United States is contemplating putting a medical man in each port where the immigrants come from and having a rigid examination there.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly we may do the same, but for the present the object which the hon. member has in view is the same as the government have in view. The means he suggests are being taken up to a certain point, and if found insufficient will be extended along the same lines.

Contingencies in Canada, British and foreign agencies and general immigration expenses, including salaries of extra clerks at head office, $610,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Before the committee Mr. Scott gave us a list of the publications, and they are also published in the annual report, he gave what they cost. The estimate ought to be divided, namely, so much for publication in the way of pamphlets, so much for advertising in newspapers, so much for maps, so much for salaries, so much for contingencies and so on. You ought at least to have ten items.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the hon. minister explain this item of $4,750 for the Winnipeg 'Free Press'?

Mr. OLIVER. That was to assist in the publication of the harvest number of the 'Free Press' last year. It was a special illustrated edition, giving the results of the harvest and a general write-up of the country. There could not be a more desirable or more effective advertisement.

Mr. BLAIN. How was it circulated and where?

Mr. OLIVER. Chiefly throughout the United States by means of government agents both salaried and commission.

Mr. BLAIN. Did some of the employees of the government prepare the articles?

Mr. OLIVER. No, they were written by the 'Free Press' staff.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. You published a book called Canada. How many did you publish and what did they cost? They were very beautifully done.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the arrangement is to print 10,000. The price is not fixed, but it is to be arranged with the King's Printer.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How will they be distributed?

Mr. OLIVER. No arrangement has yet been made. The publication, as my hon. friend has said, is a very handsome one. It is printed as a presentation book, and copies will be distributed where they will do the most good. No plan has yet been defined as the work has not yet been done, but any suggestion will be gladly received.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I understand the matter has been referred to the King's Printer to fix the price. Can the minister give the price asked?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no contract with regard to the printing. It is special work specially done, and the cost of printing is to be decided by the King's Printer.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The publisher must have asked a price.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly he intends doing so, but there is no contract, and he is subject to the decision of the King's Printer as to the actual value.

Mr. TAYLOR. What was the total amount spent last year on printing and advertising in connection with immigration?

Mr. URIAH WILSON. And will the minister give us at the same time the amount spent in each different country ?

Mr. OLIVER. I can give the details of the estimate we are asking the House to vote. They are as follows :

Advertising, copies of papers, pamphlets, &c., for Canada..	$ 10,000
Advertising, printing, pamphlets, &c., United States..	90,000
Advertising, printing, pamphlets, &c., Great Britain and Ireland..	75,000
Advertising, printing, pamphlets, &c., Iceland..	10,000
	185,000

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I asked for the amount spent in each country in which the printing was done.

Mr. OLIVER. I will bring that down later when we are in supplementaries.

Mr. TAYLOR. I see by the Auditor General's Report of the year before last that in that year we spent $39,628 in Canada for printing and advertising ; $112,717 in the United States for the same service, and $65,550 in England for the same service—a total of $217,895, or nearly a quarter of a million dollars. And if you go through these items, you will find them much the same as those for travelling expenses, tips and cigars for officials. For instance, 463 western newspapers were given advertisements for farm labour—little newspapers scattered throughout Manitoba and the Northwest, not one of which is seen in the country from which these labourers are to be drawn. The Winnipeg 'Nor'-Wester' was paid $4,691 for four columns and 1,000 copies of the weekly for seventeen months, and 23,000 copies of a special edition at five cents a copy. This, it seems to me, is simply throwing away money.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. This was a special illustrated edition.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was the regular weekly edition. But my hon. friend (Mr. Derbyshire) would back it up just the same if the price was fifteen cents a copy. We are throwing away a quarter of a million dollars——

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. But we get the results—the people are coming, the very best class.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not as a result of the money spent on officials and advertising, but because that country has been opened up by railways, has yielded immense crops, and so has become known abroad.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Through these same papers.

Mr. TAYLOR. No ; but through the general press, which reports the facts and does not receive a cent for it. Why, T. O. Currie, the head heeler of the Patrons of Industry, who had to be bought up by this government, was sent to the United States and established in Wisconsin, and $4,017 was paid to him——

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. But see the immense number that came from there——

Mr. TAYLOR. My hon. friend (Mr. Derbyshire) can make a speech and boom this expenditure all he likes, but here is over $4,000 spent on Mr. Currie, and I defy Mr. Currie to show that he ever sent a dozen immigrants into this country. Then there is Mr. Grieve, another kicker, who used to be a member of this House—he was sent over there and $4,699 was spent on him.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. But the people are coming in from the United States and driving their cattle with them.

Mr. TAYLOR. Not because of this expenditure, but because the Canadian Pacific Railway ran through that country and opened it up, and the country has advertised itself by its splendid crops. The government might recall every heeler it has out in the name of this immigration service, it might stop every dollar of this expenditure on printing and advertising, and still the people would come in. The government is simply throwing away the people's money. The idea of spending thousands of dollars on this 'Nor'-Wester,' with its special editions at five cents a copy. It is something like the special issue of my hon. friend's (Mr. Derbyshire's) paper at Brockville at five cents a copy.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. But the 'Brockville' is an old established family journal. Every body reads it.

Mr. TAYLOR. But old as it is, it has to feed at the government crib. It is simply an outrage upon the people to take $217,000 of their money and distribute it amongst these papers in printing and advertising.

Mr. HENDERSON. This is certainly a very large amount to go through in one vote—$610,000. I notice that altogether we are voting for immigration for the coming year $767,200. Last year we voted in the main estimates $672,276. And, if I remember correctly, we afterwards had a vote of $300,000 in the supplementary estimates, making a total of $972,276 for immigration in the year 1904-5. The minister is now asking for $767,200 for the coming year, 1905-6. Does he contemplate adding to this by a supplementary estimate ? I think it would be as well if the minister would squarely tell the House and the country how much he intends to spend on immigration for the coming year, instead of dividing it up into two sums, one to be voted now and the other possibly a year from now, after a very considerable expenditure has been made without the authority of parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. It is expected that we shall have to ask the House this session for a supplementary vote of $30,000. As to a supplementary vote for the coming year to be asked next session, not being Providence itself, I cannot give any information on the subject. But I can assure the hon. member that there will be economy of administration so far as is consistent with efficiency. But, as I was compelled to say on a previous occasion, if the urgency of the case demands it, the Department of Immigration will have to take the responsibility, on behalf of the government, of meeting the requirements, and trusting to the judgment of the House afterwards to support us in doing so. The necessities of the immigration service must be met if immigration is to be maintained.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think I understand the hon. minister. He is asking for an appropriation of $767,200 to be expended on immigration during the coming fiscal year and says that a supplementary estimate may be brought down for $30,000, a total of about $800,000. He will ask the authority of parliament for the expenditure of this money. But he says that if the Immigration Department think fit, they are going to spend more. Now, I think the minister has been long enough in this House——

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say if the Immigration Department thinks fit; I said if circumstances compelled a larger expenditure, it would have to be made.

Mr. HENDERSON. 'If circumstances compel.' Who is to be the judge whether circumstances compel a further expenditure or not? Certainly this House is the only institution that should say what amounts should be expended. Beyond the amounts voted by this House, the minister has no right to spend one dollar, even if he thought a further expenditure might bring more immigrants into this country. This House is to be the judge, not the minister, and the sooner the minister comes to the conclusion that he is merely a servant of parliament the better it will be for this country. It is absolutely impossible for this House to control the expenditure of the country if a minister, without the assent of parliament, without parliament knowing anything of it, is going to spend money simply because he, the minister, thinks it may be desirable to do it. What right has he to think? He has no right whatever to think anything beyond the rights that parliament give him. No man making a statement like that can say for one moment that he is a constitutional administrator. I hope and trust that the minister, starting out now in his career as a minister of the Crown, will give some attention to the ordinary decencies, shall I say? —of the administration of a department, and that he will limit himself to the appropriation that parliament has authorized him to expend. Now, beyond the $610,000 and the $30,000 which he says he is going to ask for in a supplementary vote, the minister will have no power whatever to expend another dollar. Parliament has a right to control this matter. If parliament thinks $800,000 is sufficient to expend on immigration in one year, that is the limit of the minister's operations. I trust we will not have a repetition of what we have had this last year, of a minister coming down towards the end of the year and asking another supplementary vote of $300,000, after one-half of it, and possibly two-thirds of it has actually been expended without the consent of parliament. Now then I hope I have made myself clear on that point. May I ask the minister how much of this appropriation has he estimated to pay steamship companies for bringing immigrants into this country? I understand him to say that a contract exists to pay at the rate of $5 a head certain steamship companies for bringing immigrants to this country. I would like to know what amount of this $610,000 is estimated for that purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. It is estimated that $40,000 will be required to pay bonuses to agents of steamship companies for bringing immigrants from Great Britain, and $50,000 to agents of the North Atlantic Trading Company for immigrants brought from the continent of Europe.

Mr. HENDERSON. And this contract, as I understand it, has been made for ten years, and it is a contract that no minister of the Crown had any right to make.

Mr. OLIVER. Not to pay a bulk sum.

Mr. HENDERSON. Not to pay one dollar of it, because no minister has power to bind this parliament beyond twelve months, unless he comes down to parliament and gets an assent to it. The Minister of Trade and Commerce comes down annually and asks for steamship subsidies, but he does not ask for subsidy to be paid for five or ten years, or rather he does not enter into a contract himself for five years to pay a steamship company a large subsidy for carrying the mails or otherwise, and then come down and tell parliament that they have got to vote the money. Now this policy, if it can be called a policy, must at once be dropped; and so far as I am concerned, if the minister does not take the very first opportunity of cancelling this contract, and should I have the privilege of being a member of this House again when an estimate of this kind comes down, I shall move and urge in the strongest language that so much of the appropriation as is intended for that purpose be struck out of the estimate. Now I hope and trust that the minister is not going to override parliament and usurp all its functions. Leave a little for the members of parliament to do. My hon. friend at his right (Mr. Derbyshire) smiles. He is one of those men in the House who say, carried, for everything. You cannot propose a resolution but

he will say, carried. It does not require any consideration from him as to whether a resolution is right or wrong so long as he gets it disposed of ; and he smiles at the idea of members of parliament controlling the expenditure of this country. Doubtless he never dreamed till he came here that he had anything to do with the expenditure of the country, he thought that was something the ministers had to attend to. But I tell him that is not what his constituents expect him to do. They sent him here to watch and criticise closely the expenditure of the country, and to take his share of the responsibility for all expenditures that are made. Now I find no fault with the minister with regard to this contract, because I admit it was not a contract of his making. But he must understand that he has a duty to perform with respect to this contract, he has the right to cancel it, and he must take the first opportunity of having this contract cancelled, no matter who is hurt, unless he comes down to parliament and gets that contract ratified before he makes any expenditure. Let the members of this House say whether that contract is to be validated or not, whether that money is to be expended. I say without hesitation that I do not think we are called upon, nor that it is in the interest of the country that we should hold out inducements of this kind to bring immigrants from European countries. There are certain European countries from which we are delighted to receive immigrants, but there are others from which we do not want to get immigrants at all.

I am afraid that the most desirable immigrants from the continent of Europe come to us in the smaller numbers. There is a larger immigration, I believe, from countries where the immigrants are less desirable. I have made my statement as plain as I possibly could make it and I am going to look for a better administration in the future of this department than we have had in the past. I am going to look for economy, I am going to look for a fair, honest administration, and I am going to hope that the department of immigration will not presume as much as they have done in the past, that they will not imagine that they are the masters of the country when they are simply doing the work that parliament pays them for doing. I say this in no disrepectful sense at all. I do not wish to reflect upon the department, but I say that members of parliament are entitled to some consideration and that they should not be ignored whilst their constituents throughout the country hold them responsible for the public expenditures. I shall not make that proposition this year but if we should be fortunate enough to meet in another year I will bring this whole matter up, and if in the future another request of this kind comes before us, and I shall be in the House, I will deem it my duty to test the House on that question.

Mr. HENDERSON.

Government of the Yukon Territory—salaries and expenses in connection with the administration of the territory, $175,000.

Mr. SPROULE. I see there is a decrease of $60,000. We will have to have an explanation of that.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a decrease of $60,000 in the sum required for the current year which is made up as follows :

Salaries	$ 85,040
Living allowances	51,000
Travelling expenses to and from Dawson	12,000
Printing and stationery	8,000
Fuel	6,000
Freight, express and cartage	5,000
Telegrams and telephone service	3,000
Commission of five per cent to the Northwest Mounted Police officers on collections, postage and miscellaneous expenses	4,960
Total	$175,000

Mr. TAYLOR. Who are living expenses allowed to now ? I understand that judges and several others were to be put on salary and that no living allowance was to be made.

Mr. OLIVER. This department has nothing to do with the judges at all. This is in regard to the administration of the mining branch and of the local government.

Mr. SPROULE. The system was changed last year considerably in the Yukon, was it not ? You have appointed a new governor in the Yukon. What changes are contemplated in the arrangements for carrying out the government there ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that there is any change contemplated in the general administration. There has been a reduction in the staff administering the mining branch. A number of officials were disposed of last fall and by that means a reduction of about $60,000 was made in the vote.

Mr. SPROULE. This reduction is on account of that ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but I am not aware of any definite arrangement as to a change in regard to the administration. Of course the government has been administered by an acting commissioner for some time. Now, there will be a commissioner with full powers but as far as I know there is no change.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the present commissioner ?

Mr. OLIVER. The officers dispensed with were arrived at by the process of closing up certain outside offices which it was thought are not as necessary now as they have been in former days. The creeks having been so fully located there was not

nearly the same requirement for facilities for the transaction of such business.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is the gold commissioner now ?

Mr. SPROULE. E. C. Senkler, who has been the gold commissioner for seven or eight years.

Mr. SPROULE. What capacity is Mr. Congdon engaged in now ? I see by the papers that his position has been changed ?

Mr. OLIVER. He has the position of legal adviser to the local government.

Mr. SPROULE. Something like the position of Minister of Justice ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, scarcely. He is not a member of the local government. He would be like the Minister of Justice if he were a member of the cabinet or of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. They are expected to take his advice in all legal matters ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is the idea.

Mr. SPROULE. There seems to be an opinion outside that so long as he retained that position the amendment which was anticipated from the change of governor was not likely to take place, that the hanging on of the parties who had control in the past in some official capacity would have a controlling influence and it is expected that there will not be that improvement that there might be hoped for from the change.

Mr. TAYLOR. They have to keep him living at the public crib some way or he would squeeze them.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the same system is to continue in the future as that which prevailed in the past ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know of any change of policy that is in view except that with the change of conditions there and the change of commissioner probably changes will take place just as a change took place last fall, loooking towards economy. I am not aware of any large or definite change of policy that is immediately in contemplation.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the defeat the government sustained out there would likely result in radical changes in some lines.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that will be done until the new commissioner takes office and undertakes his work there. It is the same commissioner you have had for some years the gold commissioner. I thought my hon friend was speaking of the commissioner or governor. He is I believe only a governor by courtesy, but there is a new governor of the Territory, a new representative of the government in the Yukon and we hope to have a satisfactory degree of efficiency in the administration of affairs there that will probably meet all requirements. The gold commissioner, Mr. Senkler, has held the position for a number of years through evil and good report, and I am not aware that there is at present any demand for a change of that official.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose this office is not to be a training school for politicians. The governors seem to have become reform candidates in that constituency. The minister might state whether he proposes to have these governors while in office or after leaving office become reform candidates.

Mr. OLIVER. Judging from the success of the last one I would say not.

Mr. SPROULE. What was done about the Treadgold concession ?

Mr. OLIVER. That lease has been cancelled ; Mr. Treadgold relinquished the lease and has no connection with it whatever.

Mr. SPROULE. Was he paid any consideration for the money he had expended ?

Mr. OLIVER. He received no consideration from the government.

Mr. SPROULE. He did not put in a claim for it ?

Mr. OLIVER. He relinquished the claim as I understand he was unable to finance it and could not carry it on.

Grant to local Council, $125,000

Mr. SPROULE. How is that money expended ? Is it for roads, bridges and other local improvements ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is simply for carrying on the local government.

Mr. SPROULE. How was it expended last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. That sum goes into the control of the local council, an elective and appointed council and is added to by the revenues raised by the local imposts of the council and the double sum is then expended in travelling expenses of the council, maintenance and equipment of public schools, hospitals, &c., printing and stationery, fire department, Whitehorse, preventive service, grants to reading rooms, libraries, bonus to assist in quartz mining and the city of Dawson. The city was incorporated but gave up its charter and is now administered by the Yukon Council.

Mr. SPROULE. What expenditures have you for schools out there ?

Mr. OLIVER. $68,000.

Mr. SPROULE. What system of education have you in the Yukon ? I see different reports in the papers, but do not know whether they are correct.

Mr. OLIVER. I would ask the member for the Yukon to give the information.

Mr. THOMPSON. We have separate schools ; the Roman Catholics have a school of their own and there is also a public school both of which are supported by the government grant. The public school is composed of several departments and the teachers for that school are imported from all over the Dominion, but mostly from the west. The principal or superintendent of our schools is from the Territories. The Roman Catholic school is taught by the Sisters, but all the teachers there have to have a normal school certificate whether in the Roman Catholic school or in the public school. The separate school is in a separate building and is supported as I say from the public fund.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what law or authority is the system established out there ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It is by a local ordinance passed by the Yukon Council, I think, during the time that Mr. Ogilvie was commissioner.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the local council have the authority to pass an ordinance and adopt a system without getting some authority from a federal Act ? They must have done it under some Federal Act.

Mr. THOMPSON. I presume that the Act of the council could have been vetoed by the federal government ; but I presume that they have power themselves to pass the Act. I know that we make a grant yearly for the schools in the Yukon, and it is never questioned ; but I believe that any legislation we pass there has to be sanctioned by the federal government.

Construction of roads, bridle paths and other necessary works in connection with the Yoho park reserve and immediate vicinity, $12,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This is on the west side of the summit of the mountains in British Columbia. Field station on the Canadian Pacific Railway is the railway point, as Banff station is for the park on the east side of the mountains. The attractions at Yoho park are somewhat different from those at the Banff park. They offer greater opportunities for mountain climbing. The mountains are very much more rugged than those on the prairie side, and big game is more plentiful. Of late years Yoho park has attracted a proportionately larger number of tourists than Banff park, and it seems to have possibilities that are not found in the latter.

Cost of investigations and demarcations and other astronomical works of the Department of the Interior, including cost of instruments, $126,000.

Mr. TAYLOR. What is the cause of this $33,000 increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is largely made up of new matters, such as surveys of the 141st meridian, the boundary between Alaska and the Yukon, the eclipse expedition and the purchase of instruments for the observatory; also increased estimates for surveys on the 49th parallel and on the Alaska coast. These surveys are being made jointly with the United States. Our estimate is $82,000 for the Canadian share of the work, for which the United States has provided $200,000.

Mr. HERRON. Where is the survey to be made on the international boundary line ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is a renewal survey from Manitoba to the Rocky mountains. An arrangement for it was entered into last year.

Mr. HERRON. The old marks are plain enough.

Mr. OLIVER. The United States government is of opinion that such a survey is necessary. I presume that this will cover also the line in British Columbia.

Mr. SPROULE. Is the purchase of more instruments for the astronomical branch here or for the observation of the eclipse ?

Mr. OLIVER. It is for the observatory built on the Experimental Farm. The item for the purchase of instruments is $7,500. The chief item is for a meridian circuit, estimated to cost $5,000. The balance will provide for various optical and other instruments.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the diameter of the lens in the telescope there ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say offhand, but I am informed 15 inches.

Mr. SPROULE. It has always seemed to me that we did not show the highest wisdom in not getting a larger and better instrument when we were getting one at all.

Costs of litigation, $11,000.

Mr. OLIVER. This is the same as last year. It is to provide for miscellaneous items of litigation that will happen in the best regulated families.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was understood that when we got a Solicitor General there would be no money paid for outside lawyers. Was the whole amount spent last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. In 1901-2, $2,938 were spent ; in 1902-3, $7,336 ; in 1903-4, $11,000.

Keewatin—maintenance of lunatics, $2,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Why does the Dominion government support these lunatics ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because Keewatin is not in the same position as a province, and the Dominion is responsible. These lunatics are accommodated in the asylum at Manitoba and the Dominion pays.

Maintenance of assay office, Vancouver, $11,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. What revenue does the government get ?

Mr. OLIVER. We realized from siftings and findings $1,091.02, and from special assays $7.50, making a total of $1,098.52. This made a net expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1904, of $10,582.75.

Mr. THOMPSON. How much gold did they melt ?

Mr. OLIVER. The following is the statement :

	Deposits.	Ounces.	Value.
1901-02	671	69,925	$1,153,014.50
1902-03	509	36,295	568,888.19
1903-04	389	24,516	385,152.00

During 1904-5 the business done from the 1st July to the 15th May last shows gold valued at $426,000 was assayed.

Mr. THOMPSON. The Bank of British North America in Dawson last year melted and paid for nearly $5,000,000 in gold. I point this out so that the Minister of the Interior will know that the office is costing him too much. They had one assayer and one melter. The miners came in and sold the gold, and the bank had to pay for it on the assay certificate of their own melter.

Engraving, lithographing and printing maps of the Dominion and the Northwest Territories, $21,500.

Mr. TAYLOR. Here is an increase of $5,600. Why is that ?

Mr. OLIVER. This is an expenditure entered upon a year or two ago for getting out a standard topographic map of the Dominion in sheets. The standard topographic map is intended to cover the southern portion of the Dominion, the west coast and part of the Yukon.

Mr. TAYLOR. Has there been a distribution of those already issued ?

Mr. OLIVER. The work is in progress. Some of the sheets have been completed.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen one or two of these sheets, but I do not understand the system or design. A map is made of a section, but not divided according to ordinary requirements, as into provinces and so on. I cannot see what the usefulness of it is unless the maps are completed in some way, and I have not been able to get any information as to when the whole will be completed, or even when a province or any particular section will be ready.

Mr. OLIVER. As I understand, the plans were entered upon some time ago. The country is divided up into sections, and for each section one of these standard maps is made. By using these separate sheets the map of any district can be made up. A map of the whole country upon the scale chosen would be useless, as it would be too large to be displayed, but maps of portions of the country can be made up by using these sections.

Mr. SPROULE. But what I point out is that the work is not completed, nor are we told when it will be completed, or when any portion of it will be completed. And the maps of sections seem to be made without any relation to each other. There should be some design in the matter, and it should be known when the work will probably be completed either wholly or in certain parts.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a uniform design and the parts are being brought out in regard to such portions of the country that happen to be at the moment the most interesting. And, when complete, that part can be fitted in with the other parts whenever they are ready.

Mr. SPROULE. At what age of the world's history will it be completed ?

Mr. OLIVER. That will depend on the generosity of parliament in providing money.

Mr. SPROULE. Who is doing the work ?

Mr. OLIVER. The geographical staff of the Interior Department, and they are doing it gradually according to their capacity. To order the completion of such an immense map in a short time would involve a much larger expenditure, possibly, than parliament would feel inclined to authorize. Besides, it might not be possible to find the necessary number of men with the particular qualifications required.

Mr. TAYLOR. This seems to be simply to find employment for an unnecessarily large staff.

Mr. SPROULE. But the work should not be carried on in a merely aimless desultory fashion and with no idea when it is to be completed. This seems a merely childish arrangement from a business standpoint. For instance there is a map of part of the oil district—but only a part. When will the rest be completed ? I tried to get that information, and could not learn whether it would be completed next year, or ten years hence or ever. Yet we are asked to vote money for this service. It seems like frittering away money.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the information as to when it is expected to finish the map, but I can give information which will partly answer the hon. gentleman's question. Up to a few years ago the mapping of the Dominon proceeded in a desultory fashion. For instance the peninsula of Ontario, the most densely populated part of the Dominion had not been mapped as it should have been. The section from Windsor to London has now been mapped and the sheet issued. The Hamilton sheet will be ready in a week or two and the Guelph sheet is more than half prepared. Another sheet will cover the portion of the peninsula west of the line from Oakville on Lake Ontario to Collingwood on Georgian bay. Another sheet includes nearly the whole of

New Brunswick. Another covers that portion of Ontario immediately east of the Manitoba boundary which will be traversed by the National Transcontinental Railway—this is practically finished. Another sheet covers that portion of Quebec from the Island of Orleans to Montreal, and Ontario and Quebec are well advanced.

Mr. TAYLOR. Where are they printed?

Mr. OLIVER. The drawings are made here, and the Toronto Lithographing Company prepare the copperplates and do the printing.

Mr. SPROULE. Have these been distributed to members?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware what arrangement has been made for distribution. But I may say that those that are published, if they have not been already distributed to members, will be distributed.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. It is understood that the Autonomy Bill will be taken up, the clause in relation to the boundaries of the constituencies.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, June 20, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

HALF-BREED SCRIP.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of the Interior to be kind enough to bring down the instructions sent to Judge Myers, for the holding of an investigation into the half-breed scrip business.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Order in Council containing the instructions will be brought down at once.

PRINTING BUREAU.

Mr. SPROULE. We have had a good deal of trouble this session with regard to getting out speeches at the Printing Bureau. Not only is there considerable delay, but in many cases it seems impossible to get the speeches printed at all. Nor are the orders given executed in their turn. Frequently, so we are informed those given later are given precedence over those given early, and on this side of the House the impression prevails that hon. members on the government side are given the advantage in this respect. A good while ago an order was sent to the Bureau to publish a speech of mine on the Autonomy Bill, accompanied by a request to state what it would cost. The reply came stating the cost and shortly after I understood the order was given. After waiting for a considerable time for the speech I had inquiry made again, but could not find out whether the order had been received or not. However, it was arranged that the speech should be published according to the prices fixed by the Bureau. After waiting some weeks they sent a speech which was not at all the one ordered, but a mere side speech, not directly on the question at all, and the publication of which would not cost one-quarter that of the other. At the time the order was sent the type was not distributed, but it has since been distributed, and to publish this speech now would require the whole thing to be set up again, and it probably could not be got out before the session is over. I think it is high time that the attention of parliament was drawn to these things. Somebody must be in fault; somebody must be responsible for this careless and unbusinesslike management.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With whom did my hon. friend correspond?

Mr. SPROULE. With the chief whip's clerk directly to the King's Printer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very much surprised at this charge, because I know Mr. Dawson to be a most careful, painstaking officer.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think it was the King's Printer himself, but some others under him. All I can say is that, after waiting for weeks, a speech was sent which was not at all the one ordered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know Mr. Dawson to be a very painstaking and careful officer, and if his attention be called to the matter he must have some good explanation. Something should be done to prevent a recurrence of such errors.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 12,—distribution of seats—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to move that the schedules which were laid on the table some time ago, and which are printed and to be found on page 7 of the last printed Bill, be now adopted. I do not know whether my hon. friends opposite want a

discussion on the general arrangement of the schedule or to take them up one by one.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The rumour is general that the government proposed to submit this to a commission of judges.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are so many rumours to which my hon. friend, with his newspaper and otherwise, gives credit, that I take them all with a grain of salt, and that is the safest course to follow. My attention was called to this question by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, who asked whether it would not be advisable to leave the preparation of the schedules to the judges. I expressed no opinion then, but thought that it would be far preferable that we should have them presented to the House. I think they will be found, on the whole, eminently satisfactory and that there will be no necessity to refer them to the judges. Some exception may be taken here and there, but if there be differences of opinion, I am confident they will not be such that they cannot be reconciled in this very chamber. The schedules have been gone into with very great care, and, as far as I can see, taking the geographical condition and population and the condition of things generally, they could not be much improved, if at all.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it would be better to take them up one by one. The House would like to know the basis upon which the schedules were arranged. It is very important probably one of the most important matters presented by the Bill. It provides for the distribution of constituencies which shall elect the first house of representatives for each of these provinces. Every one knows that the first house will have most important functions confided to it ; so that it is of the utmost importance that the basis of representation shall be fair and reasonable, and it would be very desirable to have it so arranged by the government that it would appeal to the fair mindedness and reasonable appreciation of both sides of the House. Now, the government must have come to this through a certain medium. They have made up their representative districts from data which I imagine have been very carefully compiled, and I would like to have a most thorough explanation of the basis upon which they have presumed to recommend the electoral districts which they have defined in this Bill, and representations of which they have drawn upon the map. This side of the House is willing to accept a fair arrangement, but it is not, even at this late period of the session, willing to accept any other arrangement than one which will commend itself to its good judgment after a thorough explanation. I imagine that my right hon. friend, or whatever member of the government has this matter in charge, will give us the fullest possible explanation as to the principles on which the representation is based and as to the way the government have proceeded in applying those principles, and their reasons for applying them in this way.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There were many things to be considered in the preparation of the schedule for the distribution of seats. First of all, we had to consider the existing conditions. There is a legislature to-day in the Territories which are to be covered by those two provinces, and there are thirty-five constituencies in the two provinces—twenty in Saskatchewan and fifteen in Alberta.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the First Minister will confine himself now to the province of Alberta.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. We give twenty-five constituencies to each of the two provinces. Therefore it was obvious from the first that we had to provide for ten more constituencies in Alberta. The next guiding principle was the population, the object being to equalize as much as possible the existing population among these twenty-five constituencies. However, it is not possible, in a new country like this, to consider the question of population alone. Geographical conditions also have to be considered. To illustrate, population is more thickly settled along the lines of railway than it is in the outlying districts to the north and perhaps also to the south. Therefore it was not possible to apply the same degree of geographical extension in all the constituencies. Some had to be large and some small. But the prime object was as far as possible to give equality of numbers in the different electoral districts.

Mr. FOSTER. How equality of numbers ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Taking the unit of population. My hon. friend who will speak after me will give more particulars than I can give on this point. I confine myself at present only to the more salient points. Then there are some far outlying districts which are new and in which the population may be below the unit of representation, but which must be represented. In these cases we have to chose between two things—either annexing them to other districts, or giving them separate representation. I admit at once that the suggestion that would at once occur to one's mind under some circumstances would be to join such districts to existing districts, but you have this difficulty to contend with, that the distances are so great in that country that you might make a district of such magnitude that it would be impossible for any human being to cover it within any reasonable time. It is to be expected, when an election takes place, that candidates should visit the different sections of their constituencies and put themselves into communication with their electors ; but if these sparsely settled

districts in the north were joined to some of the existing districts, these constituencies would be so large that it would be physically impossible for any man to cover them, no matter what effort he applied to the task. Under such circumstances, it was necessary to form one or two districts in which the population is below the unit of representation, but which are far above the average in regard to territory. This applies chiefly to the district of Athabaska. All the other districts are, I believe, fairly well covered by the unit of representation. These are the salient principles which have actuated us—first of all, the existing condition of things. The present constituencies are the basis we have endeavoured to take. Some of them have been reproduced absolutely; others have been cut in two ; others have been differently arranged.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend inform me how many have been kept absolutely as they are now ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that I can at this moment. This information will come more regularly from those who are more familiar than I am with the country. That was the first consideration, at all events—the existing representation. The next was the population to be represented, and the next was the geographical distribution of the population. These are the three principles which we have had in mind, and I do not think it is possible to have any other guides.

Mr. FOSTER. What population was taken for each of these provinces, and what was the unit ? Was it made by dividing twenty-five into the population ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. My hon. friend who follows me will give all this information.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The right hon. gentleman has not told us what political considerations influenced him. He has mentioned three principles only. Then we are to gather that no political considerations entered into the matter ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only political consideration is justice and fair-play.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If the right hon. gentleman will realize that, I have no doubt this clause will get through in a very short time. But that is the point that is to be dealt with, and I hope that will be elucidated.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman, if he comes with an open mind, will be satisfied before we get through.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I think we will have to ask somebody else. If the shortness of my right hon. friend's speech measures the amount of his information we will have to forgive him, but we must have the information. I suppose some other member of the government will be prepared to give us the information.

Mr. OLIVER. For the province of Alberta the census was taken in 1901, and therefore had become an unreliable basis of information, because there has since been a large increase of population. It was therefore thought better to take as a basis the actual vote polled on the 3rd of November last. There were practically 20,000 votes polled in the new province of Alberta, exclusive of the district of Athabaska, and that would give a unit of 800 votes to each constituency, as you take in or do not take in the part of the country in which no vote was taken, as it was not represented.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What does the Minister of the Interior estimate the popuation of the new province to be now, roughly ?

Mr. OLIVER. The estimated population is 250,000, but there is no reliable data.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot conceive that this is all the information we are to get. We might just as well move that this committee rise if we are not to be given more information than this. Do ministers think they are going to come down with an important thing like this, and that they are going into it without any explanation of the whole basis, and how they have arrived at the basis. The Prime Minister evidently knew nothing about it. Is the Minister of the Interior going to make the same confession ? I may tell him straight that he will not get anywhere with his Bill until he makes the most ample and full explanation of the basis, the way in which he has applied the principles, and showed to us that it is fair and reasonable.

Mr. OLIVER. The map has been before the House for four or five weeks, the schedule has been before the House for four or five weeks. I have stated to the House the basis upon which the representation was made, and if that is not satisfactory I assume it is for the hon. gentleman to say wherein it is not satisfactory. I would say to him that while there is no effort on the part of members from the west supporting the government in any way to trespass upon this House, they are here, however, in support of their rights and of their dignity as members, and do not altogether accept the arrogant manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite seek to bulldoze members from the west on this subject.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, my right hon. friend will never get anywhere by attempting to bring up an argument of bulldozing and the like of that. Have we or have we not the right to a thorough and complete explanation of the way this distribution has been arrived at ? If we have, the sooner the minister is taught to give up his small bit of

politics, charging bulldozing and motives, the sooner he will become a more useful member of the cabinet than he bids fair to become by adopting this tone of debate. I have never, while I was a member of the government, attempted to bring a matter like this before parliament and do it in three or four words.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is altogether too hasty in his conclusions. I am sorry to say that my portfolio has not come in containing my papers, as otherwise I would have been prepared to show the number of votes cast in each constituency at the last election, and how many were cast in the proposed constituencies. In the meantime I will endeavour to give some information to the committee. The hon. gentleman has asked me what are the constituencies which are to remain as they have been. Well, first of all the constituency of Medicine Hat is about the same as it was before. Medicine Hat was in the district of Saskatchewan, now the greater portion of it is in the district of Alberta. It is larger by a few miles. The constituency Cardston is just the same as it has been. Lethbridge is exactly the same as it was before. Macleod is divided into two, as it was one of the largest districts in the Northwest Territories. So we have now the constituencies of Macleod and Pincher. High River is the same as it was before, exactly the same. Banff is a little larger than it was. Calgary, the limits are now confined to the city, whereas before it comprised a portion of the country district. Then on the west of Calgary is Rosebud. The boundaries of Gleichen are not the same.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the former constituency out of which Gleichen is made ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think a new one is made out of West Calgary, by the name of Innisfail. Out of these two constituencies of East and West Calgary we have made three, Rosebud, Gleichen and the city of Calgary. I have explained to my hon. friend that Banff is a little extended. A part of West and East Calgary has been added to Banff so as to equalize the population. Innisfail remains almost the same. There is a small change which is made in Innisfail, a small portion of the constituency being added to Red Deer.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What will be the length of Innisfail ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Innisfail will be the whole length of the province from the Rocky Mountains to the constituency of Medicine Hat. Red Deer, a new constituency, is made up of part of Lacombe and part of Innisfail. The present constituency of Lacombe is restricted and part of it goes into Ponoka.

Mr. FOSTER. That is formed from the old constituency of——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of Lacombe. The new constituency of Lacombe is restricted from its present territorial limits. The constituency of Ponoka is placed between Lacombe and Wetaskiwin and takes in part of Saskatchewan and Lacombe. Wetakiwin has also been restricted and part of it is given to Leduc which also forms part of Strathcona and part of which also was added to the new district of Vermilion.

Mr. FOSTER. Wetaskiwin is formed out of part of the old constituency of Wetaskiwin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, Wetaskiwin is restricted between Ponoka on the south and Leduc on the north.

Mr. FOSTER. There was a territory——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was a territory called Saskatchewan. There is one yet.

Mr. FOSTER. The present Wetaskiwin is taken out of that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it is restricted from its former limits and part of the territory within its former limits is given to Lacombe, part to Ponoka and part to Leduc.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is also divided from north to south.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The new constituency of Leduc is formed of a part of Wetaskiwin and part of Strathcona. Vermilion is also a new constituency made up of part of Wetaskiwin, part of Strathcona, part of Victoria and part of the added territory which was formerly a part of the Saskatchewan district. Strathcona now is very much restricted. Strathcona, as my hon. friend knows, abuts upon the Saskatchewan river. There is a pretty large population there and the constituency is restricted.

Mr. FOSTER. Strathcona I did not get.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Strathcona is very much restricted from its former limits. It abuts upon the Saskatchewan river and it is now restricted between Sturgeon, Edmonton, Leduc and Vermilion. The city of Edmonton is made into an electoral district.

Mr. FOSTER. Where was it before ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the district of Edmonton. It was a very large district comprising the city of Edmonton, the large district known as Edmonton, part of Sturgeon and part of what is now called Stony Plain.

Mr. FOSTER. It takes in more than the city of Edmonton ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it takes in the city of Edmonton alone, but as it was formerly it was a very large district. It was formed of the city of Edmonton, what

is now Stony Plain and part of what is now Sturgeon and St. Albert. Stony Plain is a new constituency between the Rocky Mountains and the different constituencies which I have named, that is Red Deer, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, Leduc and Strathcona. All that very large section of territory between the Rocky Mountains, the western limit of the province, and the different constituencies I have named, is now made into the constituency of Stony Plain. There is a new constituency of Sturgeon. It is confined between the city of Edmonton and the constituency of Saskatchewan, the district of Athabaska and St. Albert on the west. It comprised part of Edmonton and what is now Victoria. Saskatchewan is a new district comprised chiefly of part of Victoria and the new part of the Saskatchewan district which has been annexed to the province of Alberta. There is a new district called St. Albert. It was a constituency before, but it is not so large a constituency now. All these make a total of twenty-three constituencies.

Mr. FOSTER. Twenty-two, I have.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Twenty-three it must be. I will recapitulate—Medicine Hat, Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, Pincher, High River, Calgary City, Banff, Gleichen, Rosebud, Innisfail, Red River, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, Leduc, Strathcona, Edmonton City, Stony Plain, Vermilion, Sturgeon, Saskatchewan, and St. Albert. That makes 23. These are the 23 constituencies in the old district of Alberta in which is included two constituencies which were formerly in Saskatchewan ; that is to say part of Vermilion, Saskatchewan, and Medicine Hat. With regard to Athabaska, we have given two constituencies to Athabaska, and the reason is this : There is now a small population, not a very large population in Athabaska. I would remind my hon. friend that there is a wide difference between the western part of Athabaska and the eastern part. The eastern part ; that is to say the part which is north of Saskatchewan has not yet been settled. There may be a few hunters and a few Indians, but there is no settled population there, whereas in the western part of Athabaska there are settlers now going up on the Peace river which is a good fertile district, in which population is increasing, in which there is agriculture, in which there are to-day two grist mills. Then you have the river Athabaska district which is the line of travel from the north to the south and in which there are several small establishments. It has been hinted, I think by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) that these two districts were not entitled to two representatives. I grant at once that perhaps they are a little below the unit—but I invite the criticism of my hon. friend from Calgary as to the reasons why we gave two representatives. They are these. If we only gave one representative to the district of Athabaska which is comprised within the province of Alberta, it would be absolutely physically impossible for any man to cover that district within the time of the election—the distances are too great, the difficulties of communication are too serious, and therefore these people would have to remain practically unrepresented ; they could not have the advantage of seeing their member and their member could not see them, and for these reasons we have thought it would not only not be right, but it would not be just and fair that these people should not have the advantage of representation. I will give to my hon. friend the division of the different constituencies I have just named.

Mr. FOSTER. Is my right hon. friend going to give me the census population or the voting population ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Both. In the present constituency of Cardston the votes polled at the last election were 645 and the 1901 census population, 3,203.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend is now speaking of the census population ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Has any endeavour been made to get the present population ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will that be given as well ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not familiar with that, but it will be given by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver). We have endeavoured to get at the present population by different data such as the number of post offices, entries of homesteads, and such data as is in our possession and which we thought would be more correct than guess work.

Mr. FOSTER. Are you giving the number of votes polled or the number of voters ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The number of votes polled.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you give that instead of the number of names on the voters' lists ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have the number of names on the voters' lists, but it is not in my possession at the present moment.

Mr. FOSTER. The only reason why you would take the votes at all is as an indication as to an estimate of the population. If you give the votes polled you could come to no conclusion as to the population, because various causes might prevent the registered voters polling their votes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I propose to give both during the discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the Minister of the Interior to say that the number of voters on the lists was taken as a basis of the redistribution ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We took our information not only from one source but from several, first the census of 1901 ; next, the number of votes registered ; next, the number of votes polled ; next, the number of post offices ; next the number of entries for homesteads ; next, the number of school districts. At present I will give the number of votes polled and the census population of 1901.

Mr. FOSTER. That is all right, but I want an answer to this question. Was this distribution founded on the number of voters who are qualified to vote or the number who actually voted ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The relative number of votes cast to the total number of voters registered would be about the same in all the constituencies. If we have the number of votes polled we would know about the number of votes registered. However I will give all the information later on.

Present constituency.	Votes polled.	Census population, 1901.
Cardston	645	3,203
Lethbridge	826	2,838
Macleod	743	3,403
Pincher	1,108	1,959
Gleichen	785	2,101
Calgary (present city)	1,999	4,865
Rosebud	732	1,036
High River	1,021	2,472
Banff	720	3,634
Innisfail	828	3,379
Red Deer	843	2,009
Vermilion	763	1,795
Lacombe	881	2,565
Ponoka	764	2,775
Wetaskiwin	857	3,720
Leduc	697	3,450
Strathcona	956	4,248
Stony Plain	589	2,398
Edmonton	1,342	2,626
Saskatchewan	1,168	6,544
Sturgeon	782	3,272
St. Albert	754	3,005
Medicine Hat	1,159	3,144
Total	20,962	

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that in the case of Rosebud the population was apparently only 300 more than the vote polled.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Rosebud is upon the line where immigration has gone since 1901. The population in 1901 was 1,036, and a great increase in population is shown since, in the two constituencies of the north, Peace river and Athabaska, there was no vote the last time. The districts were not organized. The population by the census of 1901 was, for the constituency of Peace River 1,724, and for the constituency of Athabaska, 1,676.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are there special enumeration districts in Athabaska, or was the census given for the whole of the district? The Minister of the Interior may know. I was under the impression there was one census for the whole district of Athabaska.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware from the department here, but residing in Edmonton at the time I know that a census was taken by the census commissioner throughout the district of Athabaska and the north country. That is to say, it was not an estimate; it was an actual census taken by a visitation from the census commissioner to the people throughout the district. I think in the census of 1901, the district of Athabaska will appear in separate enumeration districts. There will be a number of districts corresponding with the polling subdivisions that were in existence at the date of the election in 1900.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In the district of Athabaska, if my recollection is right, there is no special enumeration district. That is in the census of 1901 the numbers are given for the whole of the districts ; it is not divided up into polling subdivisions as in Alberta and the other provisional districts.

Mr. OLIVER. There certainly were no polling subdivisions in the country, but the people are in settlements here and there through the country.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are they set out in the census?

Mr. OLIVER. I have every reason to believe so. I cannot imagine any other way of giving the census.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where did they get this information from?

Mr. OLIVER. From the Census Department. I did not see the books myself, but my information is that this is a transcript from the records of the Census Department giving the population by localities.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the minister tell us how much of that population of Athabaska are Indian and how much white?

Mr. OLIVER. This population is given as white and half-breed, exclusive of the Indians.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I have here Magurn's Parliamentary Guide, which gives the population of Athabaska district in 1903 as 6,615. I suppose that includes Indians as well as the half-breeds and whites.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. That is what is given in the census of 1901 for the whole district.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is only for half-breeds and whites.

Mr. FOSTER. From what sources are these figures of population obtained, through the Census Department ? Was the department informed of the limits of these districts and asked to give the populations for these districts?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And they made the calculation and gave the figures ?

Mr. OLIVER. A map was prepared showing the local constituencies and the Census Department was asked to take that map, compare it with their returns and give us the result, the number of people in each constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. And the minister has that statement from the Census Department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister bring that down as one of the items?

Mr. OLIVER. I will bring it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is, I suppose where you would look for it, to make them responsible for the accuracy of it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The ministers between them have given us two bases upon which they make the distribution, but the first minister spoke of five or six others. We should like to have these others.

Mr. OLIVER. The definite division of the constituencies is based on the vote actually polled on the 3rd November, as we believe that was the closest and most recent date upon which we could get information we could rely upon. The information with regard to post offices, homestead entries and other matters of that kind was arrived at in order to bear, not upon the question of division of constituencies, but on the question as to whether the bulk of the population was in one end of the country or the other. That information therefore would not have any direct bearing on the propriety of the actual division made, but would be merely corroborative evidence to show whether the trend of population was in this direction or that.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the dividing line ?

Mr. OLIVER. The dividing line generally accepted is practically the Red Deer river and the question whether the population was heavier north of that river.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the homestead entries indicate ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I promised that I would give my hon. friend the number of votes registered. I got them from the clerk of the Crown of Chancery :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

	No. of votes.
Medicine Hat	1,624
Cardston	933
Lethbridge	1,691
Macleod	975
Pincher	1,622
High River	1,622
Banff	922
Calgary city	2,653
Gleichen	1,286
Rosebud	1,187
Innisfail	1,216
Red Deer	1,192
Lacombe	1,174
Ponoka	1,127
Wetaskiwin	1,199
Leduc	1,078
Vermilion	1,105
Strathcona	1,278
Edmonton city	1,701
Stony Plain	766

Mr. FOSTER. Why could not that name be changed ? It is a very bad name in the heart of an agricultural country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are two names should be changed. Saskatchewan is another. If my hon. friend can suggest a better name than Stony Plain, I have no objection to adopt it.

Sturgeon	1,088
St. Albert	965
Saskatchewan	1,382
Total,	29,950

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to understand the figures for Peace River and Athabaska. Do they include Indians ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. PERLEY. In 1901, by the census, there were only 2,637 half-breeds and whites and 262 unspecified there. Now we have the information that there is 3,400 of a population not including the half-breeds, in the half of Athabaska, whereas in the whole there were only 2,637 whites and half-breeds according to the last census.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall have this point looked into. The only figures for which I am responsible are the population, the registered votes, and the polled votes. These I got from the officials in charge of the different books.

Mr. FOSTER. You take the number of actual voters and you base your distribution on that. What do you multiply that by to get at the population ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the way to look at it. Take the votes polled and the votes registered in each constituency, and the average is between 1,100 and 1,200.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the total number of registered votes, the total number of votes cast, and the total population since 1902?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The total number of registered votes is 29,950, the total

number of polled votes 20,962, and the total population 69,441.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And you estimate the population now at a quarter of a million?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The probable population on the 1st of July is estimated to be in the neighbourhood of 250,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Who estimates that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Interior Department.

Mr. FOSTER. How did the Interior Department get at that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure I do not know, except from the records of the population and the immigration.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. By a divining rod.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it will not be disputed by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House coming from the Northwest Territories, that the estimate made by the Interior Department of the population on the 1st of July in the two provinces to be in the neighbourhood of 500,000, is fairly correct. When we introduced the Bill we mentioned this estimate, and I do not know that it has been challenged.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That would be about 10,000 to each constituency.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the Minister of the Interior if I understood him to make the statement that the constituencies were based on the number of the votes polled last November, not on the number of votes on the list? I would certainly consider that rather an unfair way to divide up that country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Take, for instance, the number of votes polled in North Oxford the other day. There were in the neighbourhood of 1,200 more polled on June 13 than in November last. If the constituencies in the Northwest are based on any such vote as that, I do not think it is reasonable.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member will look over the list, he will find that the difference will not be material in the result. A proportionate number of votes were not polled in each constituency. Perhaps the hon. member is not aware that the voters' list in the Territories is not made up as it is here. It is made up by enumeration immediately before the election; and, as it is manhood suffrage, there is a good deal of latitude in the making up of the list, and it seems to us that if we want to give an unquestionable basis, the actual votes polled was the proper basis; because it might be said that one enumerator was a better figurer than another, and the fact that certain names were on the voters' list would be no evidence that the people were there, as it would be in the province of Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why were the names placed on the list by the enumerator?

Mr. OLIVER. Different enumerators in different parts of the country would take a different view as to whether a man's name should be on the list or not. One man might be more strict in his interpretation of the law than another. It is a matter that is left entirely to the enumerator, and in the end enumeration makes no difference, because a voter may have his name put on the list at the last moment, and vote. So that the voters' list is not at all the same sure guide to actual population in the west that it is here in the east.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the basis is as fair as it can be. Let me call the attention of my hon. friend from North Toronto to these facts. The population by the census of 1901 was 69,441, or let us say in round numbers 70,000. That would give, if you divide the population by 23 constituencies, a unit of a little over 3,000. The number of votes registered was 29,950, or let us say in round numbers 30,000. By dividing that number by 23, you would get a unit of about 1,300. The number of votes polled was 20,961, or say in round numbers 21,000. Dividing that by 23, you get a little over 900. So that on the whole I think that there is a fair correspondence between these figures, that no injustice has been done to anybody, and that the endeavour has been made to have as fair a division as was possible, especially if you consider the character of the population, which is sometimes in compact groups and sometimes very sparse.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior a little more closely how they came to make the estimate of 250,000 population for each of these provinces. If it was a guess of course it would be no good at all; and if it was worth trying to find out, there must have been some methods adopted. What methods were adopted, and what did they show? On the face of it, it would seem as if they were optimistic as to their estimate of the population. November, 1904, was not long ago, and you took as a basis of the population the registered vote. That gives you, say, 30,000. That would make about eight to a family in order to bring up the population to 250,000. I doubt very much if that would be the average in the Northwest. There may be some large families there, but there are a great many bachelor establishments. It seems to me that that would tend to bring down the average rather than to raise it. I would not think that more

than the general average of five to a family could be applied with fairness to the Northwest.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. More.

Mr. FOSTER. Just think about it for a moment. Go through the ranching district and through the agricultural country as well, and you will find many of what are called bachelor families—men without their wives, two brothers, a father and a son, or something of that kind. I do not know that you find, outside of the foreign population, any larger families amongst the stated families there than you find here; and I am quite sure that the foreign population, while it totes up pretty large, would not overcome that disparity. If you take five, and multiply it by the voters' list of November, that would give you 150,000, and there is a great difference between 150,000 and 250,000. I do not know that it makes any particular difference whether you estimate it at the one figure or at the other, if you base it on the voting population of last year. But it forms the basis for a disappointment hereafter, if you make an estimate of 250,000 people, and find that there are 100,000 or more less than that number. I would like to know the basis on which the government came to that conclusion.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say definitely by what process of calculation the the number of 250,000 was arrived at, but I think it was something of this kind. I think the census shows approximately 170,000 in the old district of Alberta five years ago, and of course the new province of Alberta takes in a considerable strip of territory besides, for which an addition is made.

Mr. FOSTER. You have already given the population for the present Alberta as 69,441.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I may say that when the time came to draft the Bill it was necessary to make some estimate of the population, and I proceeded by taking as a basis for the whole Northwest Territories the census of 1901. I found that census gave a population of about 165,000. Then to that I added the number of settlers that came into the country during the period intervening from the time the census was taken until the 1st of February last, and I found that number to be 240,590, according to the returns of the Interior Department. The details will be found in Sessional Paper No. 97 of this session:

Years	No. of settlers.
April 1, 1901, to July 1,1901..	12,213
Fiscal year, 1901-02..	44,070
" 1902-03..	79,357
" 1903-04..	75,042
July 1, 1904, to February 1, 1905..	29,908
Total..	240,590

To which must be added the census population of 165,555, making a total estimated population on the 1st of February of 406,145, to which I added, supposing the Bill would come into effect on the 1st of July, an estimated increase from February to July 1st of 50,000, making a total population of 456,145 for the whole territory. These figures are taken from the Department of the Interior, and were certified to by the deputy minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know what we could exactly understand by persons actually settled. They could get out homestead entries, but homestead entries and settlement are two different things.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that. I obtained, for the purpose of the Bill, the area of lands patented for homesteads and a table showing the lands that remained and the number of settlers. It gave both the number of homestead entries and the number of settlers which were taken as actually having arrived and settled in the Northwest Territories, exclusive of Manitoba, within the area affected by our legislation. Then my own estimate of 50,000 was added on to that. I am informed by the gentleman who obtained these figures that they were given by Mr. Scott, who has charge of the administration of the immigration branch of the Interior Department.

Mr. OLIVER. The apparent discrepancy between the number of voters on the list and the estimated population may be accounted for in this way, that the names of foreign-born immigrants who have come in during the past three years, as having been read by the Minister of Justice, would not appear upon the voters' list, as they are not entitled to naturalization or to a place on the voters' list until they have been three years in the country. So for the last three years the immigration of foreign-born people is not accounted for in any degree by the number of voters on the list. I may say further that I have before me a statement of the number of homestead entries in the district of Alberta up to the 31st of March, 1905, amounting to 49,845. If it were taken for granted that each homestead represents a homesteader, and each homesteader a family, and each family the number of five, it would give a population of 250,000, not taking into account the cities.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The government have no distribution of this 250,000 over these constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think any information is needed so far as the representation is concerned. A large proportion of the population have voted for some time.

Mr. FOSTER. The post office data—if the minister will give us that.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not taken the information in regard to post offices for each constituency, we have taken it merely as between the two ends of the province, between the north and the south, divided on the line of township 38, as that seemed to be the question that was in contention. We find that there are 110 post offices south of that line and 118 north of that line, not including those in the district of Athabaska. There are 139 school districts south of that line and 269 north of it. Of local improvement districts, there are 22 in the Dominion electoral district of Edmonton, 50 in the Dominion electoral district of Strathcona, 25 in the Dominion electoral district of Calgary and 7 in the Dominion electoral district of Alberta.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand the pertinence of that local improvement section.

Mr. OLIVER. The local improvement district stands in the same position as a township municipality in Ontario.

Mr. FOSTER. How does that bear on this matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. It indicates the density of population ; that is, where there are local improvement districts there are people in considerable numbers who are paying taxes for the improvement of their roads. Where there are no local improvement districts the inference is that the people are more scattered or less numerous, and that is the reason why they are not formed into these districts.

Mr. FOSTER. On the south of the dividing line how many local improvement sections are there ? If we are going to have reference to that dividing line we want this information respecting it.

Mr. OLIVER. Forty south and 64 north.

Mr. FOSTER. You say there are 139 school districts south and 269 north ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How many schools ?

Mr. OLIVER. The number of schools would correspond with the number of districts.

Mr. FOSTER. It might or it might not. If you have the schools let us have the school population.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not the school population.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see that the number of school districts gives you much to go upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the very basis.

Mr. FOSTER. It is simply the absolute bare number of school districts.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I assume there is one school in each school district.

Mr. FOSTER. You might have a school district and no school.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would not assume that there are school districts and no schools. People organize themselves into school districts because there are no schools. No districts are organized until there are people and the best evidence that there is population in a locality is that they have organized school districts.

Mr. PERLEY. There might be some schools with 5 children and some with 100. It is hardly fair to take the school districts alone. If we had the number of school children it would be something to go upon.

Mr. FOSTER. We should not only have the number of schools but the number attending the schools.

Mr. OLIVER. Hon. gentlemen are not at all bound to accept this statement as a basis of calculation. They asked for it and we gave it. The school question is not under our control here and we are not able at the moment to lay our hands on the information that hon. members think necessary. But we give them what we have.

Mr. FOSTER. The pertinence of that lies here that you are looking for something to base your action upon and it seems that you have based it simply upon the number of school districts. A fairer basis would be to get the number of schools and the number of children attending these schools in each district. Where will the number of school districts lead you unless you know whether there are 5, 10 or 50 children attending a certain school ? You do get something which is of the value if you find the number of children attending the schools in the different districts, but if this is all the information that the hon. minister has on the point, of course, we cannot cavil at him as far as making up his mind on such data is concerned ; only, the data might be broader—that is all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Have we all the underlying principles now ?

Mr. FOSTER. We have the post office, but again I might point out that the post office does not indicate much. You might have a post office where there are ten farms and you might have a post office which would probably serve a large colony. Simply the number of post offices authorized is open to the same objection as the number of school districts and even more. I know for instance that where there is a very small colony of five, or six, or eight farmers living a long way from a town the object of the department is, if possible, to give them a post office, but the number of people that the post office accommodates is very small whilst a town of

2,000 or 3,000 population has its post office. If you choose to take simply the number of post offices the one that serves a couple of thousand people counts just as much as the one which serves five or ten people. It is quite impossible to get at the population served by the post office, but the revenue is a thing you can get at.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These are only approximate sources of information. We have given to the House the direct information we have in the census, we have the absolute number of votes registered and we have the absolute number of votes polled. All these are accurate figures which cannot be disputed. In addition we have thought it advisable to look also for other information so as to get an idea of the actual population relatively between place and place, because, in this matter of distribution, the one principle that must guide us is that no injustice shall be done to one as compared with another. Well then, we have given the population and in confirmation of that we have given the number of post offices. That goes for what it is worth. It is not absolute; it is only approximate. The objections which my hon. friend has taken would be well founded if this was all the information we had to go upon. The same thing may be said in regard to the number of school districts.

Mr. FOSTER. I am just trying to get at what the government went upon in making up their minds, because this is the only way we can judge of their conclusions. Were there any other source of information beside the population, the votes actually polled, the registered votes, the homestead entries, the post offices, the school districts and the local improvement districts?

Mr. OLIVER. There are many others in confirmation but I think my hon. friend is in error in suggesting, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has already said, that reliance was placed on the number of post offices or local improvement districts or upon anything except the actual number of votes polled because this is the actual basis of distribution. All the rest is in confirmation.

Mr. FOSTER. Take the north line of township 38 as the division line of the Northwest council at the present day—what representation is there from the south and what from the north?

Mr. OLIVER. Including Medicine Hat, there are 9 from the south and 6 from the north.

Mr. FOSTER. Within this territory which is made up into 23 constituencies?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The other two constituencies were not represented before and two representatives are proposed to be given to that district north—one to Peace river and the other to Athabaska?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We have now heard what the government say are the underlying principles, and perhaps the Prime Minister will tell us if there was any political principle underlying the scheme. The right hon. gentleman referred to newspaper rumours, and I quote the following newspaper rumour from the Toronto 'Globe' of yesterday:

> Gossip is busy with the names of the men who will be officially identified with the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta from the date of their inception.

It goes on to say who are likely to be the lieutenant governors of the new provinces and then:

> It is a little more difficult to figure who will be called as premiers of the two new provinces. Mr. Rutherford, member of the Northwest assembly, is spoken of among others as premier of Alberta, while in the case of Saskatchewan the names of Mr. Bulyea, the present Commissioner of Public Works for the Territories, and Mr. Walter Scott, M.P., are frequently heard. Both these latter gentlemen would be equal in every way to the demands of the office.

Has this distribution of constituencies had any relation to the selection of the two premiers. Gossip is busy with it. Perhaps no political considerations entered into the calculation, but if they did we should have an explanation. In the old days when the constituencies were distributed, gentlemen of one political stripe sat down and carved up the country to suit themselves. Will the government tell us all the reasons that influenced them in laying out these constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend would not so lower the dignity of parliament as to intrude gossip as a basis of our deliberations. My hon. friend ought to be more solemn than that here. As to who shall be the premiers of the two new provinces; that is the business of the lieutenant governors and not of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) or of myself.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman I shall propose an amendment that this matter be referred to the judges who now reside in the province of Alberta, but before discussing the merits of that amendment I desire to call the attention of the House to some of the figures which have been submitted by members of the government to-day. The information which we receive to-day, we on this side had asked for several months ago. When this Bill was introduced on the 21st of February it referred to 'the schedule,' thus showing the fixed determination of the government to divide the constituencies in this parliament. When the schedules were brought down a month ago, or two months

after we asked for them, the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) asked for the number of voters in each local constituency and the number of votes polled, but notwithstanding that we have been waiting ever since for that information, it is only to-day that it is vouchsafed to the House. In its absence we have been obliged to make calculations for ourselves ; these calculations we have made very carefully and they are very far apart from the figures given to the House by the First Minister. When the schedules were introduced in this House the leader of the opposition stated that he had been advised by his friends from the west that the schedules were manifestly unfair, and it now devolves upon the hon. gentleman from Alberta (Mr. Herron) and upon myself, to assume the responsibility of having made this statement to the member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden). I hope to be able to show, before I take my seat, that there are a considerable number of people in Southern and Central Alberta who have characterized this schedule as being unfair. The Prime Minister says that certain constituencies have been left entirely as they were while others have been divided, and in the case of the constituencies which have been left as they were the kernel of the whole thing is that they all lie in the southern part of that province ; not one constituency north of township 24 has been left as it was before, although they run up as high as township 60. That very fact should have been sufficient to put the First Minister on his guard, and to have caused him to suspect that there was some discrimination against the southern part of that country. The right hon. gentleman told us that Medicine Hat in the south had been left practically the same, but I desire to point out that at least 40 townships have been added to the old constituency of Medicine Hat. Nothwithstanding that there is an additional representation in that province of 10 members, the constituency of Medicine Hat has been enlarged by at least 40 townships of 6 miles square, indicating that instead of there being any development in that section of the country it probably has gone backwards. The right hon. gentleman told us that Cardston has been left untouched ; but is Cardston just the same to-day as it was when the Northwest assembly made it a constituency in 1902, or has there not been an influx of population into that constituency ? We are told that Lethbridge has been left just as it was ; has there been no development which required a change in Lethbridge? We are told that Macleod is divided in two, that High River is left practically the same, that Banff is added to, that Calgary is practically the same—the city of Calgary is given one representative, but it had two members in the old House, one for East Calgary and one for West Calgary. As I have said, I hope to be able to satisfy the Prime Minister that there are a considerable number of people in central and southern Alberta who are complaining bitterly of this division, and I can tell the right hon. gentleman further that those who complain include many of his own followers. I desire to refer now to an editorial which appeared in the Calgary 'Albertan,' a strong supporter of the First Minister and his administration, and a paper which has probably the largest circulation of any Liberal daily paper in the western province. I read this editorial because it sets out the objections very clearly. It says :

> The announcement that the Dominion government had completed the schedule of constituencies for the province of Alberta and had decided upon thirteen seats north of Red Deer and twelve seats to the south is a bitter disappointment to the people of the south.
>
> The division is unfair, and cannot be defended. But the division, unjust as it is, is not as serious a matter as the method adopted by the government to arrive at the division. If the question of dividing the province had been left to an independent non-political body or even to a parliamentary committee composed of members of parliament who were personally uninterested in the division made, the people of the south would not have been aroused by the decision, even if we had only received eleven members south of the Red Deer line. We would have been disappointed, but would have felt that though beaten we had been beaten fairly and that though at a disadvantage we did not have a grievance. The present division is unfair, and the method adopted to decide upon the division is little short of iniquitous.
>
> Let us look at the division. The north boundary of the riding of Red Deer is some miles north of township 38 which is half-way between Edmonton and Calgary. At present we have below that line the territorial ridings of Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Cardston, Macleod, High River, Banff, East Calgary, West Calgary, Innisfail and a portion of Lacombe. That means eight and a part of another. To the north we have Edmonton, Strathcona, Wetaskiwin, Victoria, St. Albert and part of Lacombe.
>
> In other words the eight and a half ridings in the south are increased to twelve, and the five and a half in the north are increased to thirteen.
>
> Besides this the population has been increasing more rapidly in the south than in the north since the present territorial divisions were created.
>
> Let us take another example. In the Dominion House of Commons in the south district we have the ridings of Alberta, Calgary, a portion of West Assiniboia, and a very considerable portion of Strathcona. To the north we have Edmonton and the larger portion of Strathcona, and no more. Yet in the north we are to have thirteen ridings and in the south twelve ridings.
>
> The vote in the south district at the last election was very much larger than the vote in the north country, yet the greater representation is to be in the north.
>
> Let us take another injustice. The province of Alberta has a population of 250,000 people with a provincial representation of twenty-five, the unit of population being 10,000. Athabaska will have two representatives with a population of less than 5,000, and a white population of less than 1,000. That means that for legislative

purposes one white man from Athabaska has as much to say as twenty white men in Calgary. To meet this argument the man of the north will speak of the coming of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and will dilate upon the glowing prospects of the future. But we are dealing with the present now. The Grand Trunk Pacific will not come before the second election in Alberta, and by that time there will be a second division of seats. Then the Athabaska country could get the representation that its population entitled it to, and in the meantime with one member, its interests would not suffer.

But much greater objection can be offered to the method adopted to arrive at the division. It means that the people of the south are not treated fairly, that being at a disadvantage they are punished for it, that the spirit of fair-play which has characterized the Liberal party which has in its hands the creation of these divisions, in this case is lacking. The people from the south have asked no favours in this struggle.

The article concludes by saying :

The result of the present policy will be deplorable. It means the lining up in battle array of north against the south. During the first few sessions of parliament, when the representatives should be intent upon the grave problems of legislation, they will be engaged in a local strife, and the effect of it will not be obliterated this generation.

That is from a paper supporting this administration, and to-day on the next page it will be found supporting the present educational policy of the government in so far as it affects the Northwest Territories. There are a number of papers which support the First Minister criticising this, from Lethbridge, Macleod, Medicine Hat and I venture to say that papers from every place in the southern and central part of that province irrespective of politics are criticising this decision. What was the method adopted in arriving at this division ? From the Liberal press in that country it would appear and I am speaking subject to correction, that the work of dividing that country into 25 local constituencies was handed over to the hon. gentleman who represents Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. gentleman who represents Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) both from the northern part of that province. Fair as these gentlemen may be, they are tied down by local prejudices, they are the advocates of that upper part of the country, and yet we find them in the month of February admittedly cutting up that country into 25 local constituencies and, three months later bringing the schedule down to the House and stamping it with the judicial decision of the Minister of the Interior. I have sufficient information to know that the schedule which was prepared in the month of February by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot), both from the north, is exactly the same schedule as has been annexed to clause 12 of this Bill with one or two alterations. The method, the idea is the same. The people of the south complain, and I think with some reason, that they have had no opportunity of stating their case, of being heard, and if I am stating what is not correct, if the member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) did not prepare these schedules and submit them to the government, then of course they will correct me, I hope before I proceed any further.

Mr. FOSTER. You may proceed.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The situation is this that we have two men from one portion of the province with a local feeling existing which has existed for some time past, to whom has been handed over the duty of dividing that province up into 25 local constituencies, and the very best evidence of the unfairness with which they discharge their duty has been pointed out by the First Minister by saying that every constituency that has been left the same is south of township 24. I may be wrong, but if they can point out a constituency north of that line, that has not been altered then they have the opportunity of doing so now, but looking at the map the only constituencies they have left unaltered are the constituencies in the southern part of this province according to this distribution carved out by two members from the northern part of the province in the month of February. Why is this division unfair ? I would ask the First Minister to look at the map. On May 1st, 1902, that country was divided up into local constituencies by the legislative assembly at Regina. As has been stated there were 15 constituencies in Alberta, and as the Minister of the Interior has stated, nine of these constituencies were south of township 38 and 6 north. There has never been any complaint as to the fairness of that division. The member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) sat in the local assembly at Regina, and I venture to state that he will not say he ever raised his voice objecting to that division at that time.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I was not there when the division was made or I would have objected to it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You have been there since, but you have not objected.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Why should I ? It would not be of any use.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) sat in the House when the division was made, and I think he will bear me out when I say there has never been any objection made in reference to this division. Look at that division. In it you will find that there are only the portions of three ridings, or, to be correct, taking in Battleford and portions of four ridings going north of the city of Edmonton, a very small portion of the riding of Edmonton itself—the local riding which is shown in the blue line,—the riding of St.

Albert and part of the riding of Victoria. There is also a very small part of the riding of Battleford out of the east which also extends north. Now south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, there were eight ridings: Medicine Hat, Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, High River, Banff, East Calgary and West Calgary. Grouped together you would not have three whole ridings north of the city of Edmonton, as divided by the Legislative Assembly in May 1902, while this distribution gives eight ridings north of Edmonton. As I pointed out before, there were eight ridings south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, whereas, now there are in all nine. They proceeded upon the assumption that conditions have so changed in that country that it is necessary to add five ridings north of Edmonton and only one riding south of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The eight ridings north of Edmonton now are Athabaska, Peace River, St. Albert, Sturgeon, Saskatchewan, Edmonton, Stony Plain and Vermilion. Take another example. Township 38, which the Minister of the Interior submits as a fair line to divide that country in two—under that distribution which has never been complained of, there were, he says, six ridings north and the nine ridings south of township 38, and it is proposed by this schedule to give only eleven and a fraction south of that township, and thirteen and a fraction north. That is there have been added to the northern country seven and a fraction and to the southern country only two and a fraction. That is taking the line of township 38 and working out this scheme about 60 miles further north. It does not matter which line you take, it works out the same way, showing there must have been the grossest discrimination gainst the southern country or else the southern country has stood practically still since the 1st May, 1902. Now the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) says he was not in the Legislative Assembly when that division was made. Perhaps we will be able to give another example of a division which was made when hon. members now in this House for that country had seats here. Let us look at the country as it is divided up for federal purposes. Let us look at the constituencies in this House. They are four in number: Edmonton, Strathcona, Calgary and Alberta. That division was made in this House, only a couple of years ago. When it was made the hon. gentlemen from the Territories at that time were all of the one shade of politics. They were all supporters of the right hon. the First Minister. Surely they would not have made a division which would have been unfair to any part of the country or have discriminated against the interests of the Liberal party. That division was made within the last two years, and I find that south of that same township 38 we have the constituency of Alberta—the whole of it—the whole of the constituency of Calgary, parts of the constituency of Strathcona and part of the constituency of West Assiniboia. That is those two whole constituencies and a considerable portion of two more only get eleven seats under this proposed redistribution, while the constituency of Edmonton and the balance of Strathcona, north of the township 38, get thirteen and a fraction. When that division was made, it is to be presumed that the hon. gentlemen then representing the Territories, and who have a seat in this House now, divided the country so that every class and interests would have equal representation. That is there is given to one and a part constituency in this House thirteen in the local house, with the addition of Athabaska and Peace River, and two entire federal ridings and a portion of two others are allowed only eleven. There is another evidence of gross discrimination against the southern country. They have turned the scheme of the Legislative Assembly of 1902 up side down and have done the same with the division made by this parliament two years ago. All that need be done to see that is to look at the map. Take another example. In the constituency of Strathcona there were 5,871 votes cast last November, and to this constituency is given seven and a fraction, or practically eight seats. In the constituency of Calgary, where 5,653 votes were cast, they only get five seats. Is that representation according to the vote? The only justification possible for that division would be to show that the influx of population has been greatly to the north. I submit they cannot snow that because every evidence shows that the influx of population has been to the south and the greater development has been south of township 38. There will be in the local house 25 seats. Out of 23 of these votes were cast last November, and we have a correct tally of those 23, leaving out Athabaska and Peace River where no votes were cast. If we take the first 11 seats south from the International boundary and the 11, leaving out the constituency of Red Deer which is in the middle, and taking the 11 next north, it will be found that in the 11 south there voted 10,833 and in the 11 north there only voted 9,356, making a difference of 1,477 discrimination against the south.

If we take the voters on the list, we find that in the 11 southern ridings there are 15,567, while in the 11 northern ridings, leaving out Red Deer, Athabaska and Peace river, there are 13,345, or a difference of 2,222 in the votes on the list. Now, I have worked out every constituency; I have taken the vote polled and the vote on the list, by polling sub-divisions; and if hon. gentlemen think that in any case the figures are not correct, all they have to do is to ask for those of a particular riding or challenge them, and either admit that we are

right or show us where we are wrong, or intimate to us very quickly that no matter what we show they are prepared to go on and put this thing through roughshod over the wishes of the people of that country. Now, if we take the votes on the list, 2,222 more in the 11 southern ridings than in the 11 northern ridings, and multiply them by whatever figure you please—the figure usually taken is 5—you will observe that there is an additional population in the south of five times 2,222, which would be 11,110 more population in the south, which gets the smaller share of the representation. I want to point out another thing. The Minister of the Interior has stated that the surest guide is the vote that was polled, not the vote on the list. No doubt he considers that the surest guide, because it would result a little in his favour, and because, as I think I can point out, in the northern country in some polls a larger number of votes were cast than the number of names on the list, corroborating very strongly the suggestion that was made, that half-breeds came down from Athabaska and Saskatchewan to vote in the Edmonton riding. If any person examines the figures, he will find that in most of the northern ridings, where the foreign population predominates, a larger percentage of the vote was polled, showing the influence of the government official. If he looks at the ranching district, he will find that in some cases there was no vote polled at all, which is explained by the fact that an order issued by the Department of Agriculture last fall compelled all the ranchers south of township 34 to dip their cattle for the mange about the time of the election. The order expired on the 1st of November, but was extended for a week or ten days, and if they did not comply with the conditions their cattle would be sold or dipped and the cost charged to them. The result was that a very small vote was polled in the ranching country. The ranchers had to choose between saving their country and saving their cattle, and they preferred apparently to take the latter course. The argument that the influx of population has been to the north can, I think, be met by an examination of the homestead entries. The Minister of the Interior has intimated that township 38 is a fair line. Well, we find that north of township 38 there is the land district of Edmonton and half of the land district of Red Deer, while south of township 38 there is the other half of the Red Deer land district, the agency of Calgary, the agency at Lethbridge and a very small portion of the land agency of Battleford; but from the map issued on the 1st of January, 1905, showing the townships which are ready for settlement and those which are not, it will be seen that there is practically no settlement in that part, so that, in making up the calculation, I have left it out entirely. The thick settlement is in the Barr colony, which is east of the 104th meridian. I have the voters' list, which will demonstrate that. I find that in 1902-3 there were 6,614 homestead entries north of township 38, equalling 48 per cent; while south of township 38 there were 7,744 homestead entries, equalling 52 per cent. In 1904 there were 3,327 entries north of township 38, equalling 40 per cent, and 5,284 south of township 38, equalling 60 per cent. The total for the three years was 9,941, or 43 per cent north of township 38, and 13,028, or 56 per cent or 57 per cent, south of township 38. If you take an increase of four persons, or three, or two—it does not matter, it is no discrimination against the north to do so—and multiply that by the difference in the homestead entries, you will find a difference in favour of the south of 12,348 people in the last three years; and this is only so far as the rural population is concerned. Yet south of that township only two and a fraction seats are added, while north of it seven and a fraction are added, turning the local divisions upside down in the very teeth of the homestead entries; and this is called fair. Now, there are just two things that I want to point out while dealing with the homestead entries. The first is the point that was mentioned by the Minister of the Interior, that is, that the great majority of those people had no votes in the last election; so that when you are carving up the country on the basis of the voters' list, you are discriminating against the south. The south is suffering more thereby on his own argument. Another point I wish to emphasize is that we have a condition of affairs in the south which they have not in the north. We have two large irrigation schemes there. The Canadian Pacific Railway irrigation block near Calgary contains 3,000,000 acres, of which there have been sold, although it has only recently been put on the market, over 400,000 acres. There is half a million acres now on the market. Down in the riding of Lethbridge you have the Great Northwestern Irrigation Company, with about a million and a half acres, cut up into 40-acre holdings. None of the results from these two large irrigation blocks appear in these figures giving the homestead entries, which would make a contrast in favour of the south in the matter of population which would be startling. They talk about the northern country, about cutting up this constituency to satisfy the northern country; they will tell you that a population the grand prairie and Peace river districts will sustain. But that is only about 700,000 acres, hardly one-quarter of the Canadian Pacific Railway irrigation block at Calgary.

I want to point out that, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has truly said, when you take homestead entries you do not always find actual settlers. And where would hon. gentlemen expect that the speculative homestead entries would be, in a country where two railways are being built, or down in a country which

is settled? It is a matter of common knowledge that people will make homestead entries where they can get them, all along the proposed line of the Canadian Northern, and where the Grand Trunk Pacific is expected to pass. There are hon. gentlemen in this House, I know, who have made homestead entries in that country; a man can reside in the province of Ontario and have his entry made any time after the 1st of September, and it is not necessary that he should see the land at all until the beginning of the following June. Then time runs on and no steps are taken to cancel the entry unless some one complains to the homestead inspector. So you will find speculative homestead entries where it is supposed railways are going to pass. So much for homestead entries.

If we take the land sales by the government it will be found that of the even or odd-numbered sections sold to actual settlers in the last three years, 54 per cent are south of line 38 per cent and 46 north. That is another indication of the trend of settlement. If we follow up the inquiry to the land office, let us take the moneys that have been received in cash and scrip at the different land offices, always remembering that you have in the southern part of the country half of the agency of Red Deer. The figures for the year ending the 1st of June, 1904, are: Edmonton office, $38,711; Red Deer, $16,392; Calgary, $56,741; Lethbridge, $86,046. In other words, 22 per cent of that was north of 38 and 78 per cent south. Is not that a fair indication of where settlement is going in that country? Let us take another example. Look at the receipts for land, timber and registry office fees, and see if they do not tell the same story, namely, that the influx of population and the development are mostly in the south. The receipts from 1891 to 1901 from land, timber and registry office fees, were: North of 38, $253,795, or 34 per cent; south of 38, $538,516 or 66 per cent. For 1902-3, the receipts from the above sources were: North of 38, $174,417, or 34 per cent; south, $330,998, or 66 per cent. The receipts from the beginning to 1903, from all three sources were: North, $529,354, or 27 per cent; south, $1,429,182 or 73 per cent. Yet we are told that the division is fair as between the north and the south. If we adhered to the principle adopted by the legislative assembly, you would have fifteen seats south of 38 and ten north, or as nine to six—If you adhered to that principle, and as I have said, there has been no complaint made with regard to those constituencies in the local House.

Now, I have only been dealing with the rural population, but if we take the urban population from the very best sources of information we can get, we will find a greater influx of population, urban as well as rural, has been to the south. I have the figures here taken from Waghorn's Guide for the month of February for every village, hamlet and town. I have them figured out with respect to the local constituencies, but in order to save time I will not give them in detail. If any constituency is questioned, I am prepared to give the urban population in each one. The result is that south of the line there is a urban population of 42,550; whilst to the north there is only 21,300, a difference of 21,150 or 75 per cent south and 25 per cent north. I do not think that the strongest advocate of the northern country will contend that we have a larger urban population north than we have in the south. Now if you add these two together you find a total urban population of 63,750. As I understood the Minister of Justice some three or four weeks ago in this House, he said that he assumed the population of the province of Alberta was 173,000, instead of as now, 250,000. If he took the two together there were 500,000, and an estimate had been made up which will be found in the 'Hansard,' that Alberta showed a population of 173,000. Now that tallies with the percentage of urban population shown in the census of 1901, as near as any person can get at the figures. But that is one of the reasons why I would like to see this whole matter referred to an independent commission where full and complete inquiries could be made, so that every locality would have an opportunity of being represented and stating its case. Proceeding on the figures suggested by the Minister of Justice, of 173,000, that leaves a balance of about 105,000 exclusive of Indians, of a rural population. The question arises, in what part of the country is the bulk of that rural population? It is impossible to determine anything definite in regard to that. As I have pointed out, homestead entries are made up there in great numbers by people who have no idea of ever settling upon the land. But when we cannot get any accurate information, we have to do the next best thing we can. I have a map here which was prepared for the government two years ago, made up to the 1st of December, 1902.

On it are laid down in the proposed province of Alberta the townships that are largely settled and those that are sparsely settled. It would be interesting to have this map on the table of the House, and it is a marvel to me that an attempt is to be made to put this distribution through with such a lack of evidence before the House. This is a very important matter to the people of that western province. It may be considered a small or a light matter which can be put through down here by getting up and saying: We do not divide the constituencies up according to the vote but according to a combination of the vote and other sources of information furnished by our two friends from the north. The question should not be disposed of upon any such evidence as that. In the preparation of this map

I may say that information was obtained in regard to homestead entries, from the actual settlers, from the land offices, from the Hudson Bay Company, from the Manitoba government. In connection with the Manitoba and North Western Land Grant the sales of school lands, from the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company and from the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company. It is as complete as anything of the kind could possibly be and on it are coloured in green the townships which are largely settled and in red those which are scattered. It has been brought up to date. When I say that I mean up to the first of the year, and I desire to point out to members of the House that I cannot see any object to be gained by pursuing this inquiry beyond the 1st January to any later date because an election will have to take place within six months from the date of the creation of these provinces and any foreigner coming into the country after the 1st of January would have no vote. Even a man coming from one of the older provinces would not be in these new provinces long enough to vote. On that map it will be found there are 325 thickly settled townships south of 38, and 239 sparsely settled. North of 38 there are 248 thickly settled and 159 sparsely settled townships. What I desire to point out to the House is that all the figures I have given show that the distribution made by the legislative assembly on the 1st May, 1902, was absolutely fair, that the proportion was 9 to 6 and that if there has been any change since that date the change has been in favour of the south as the influx of population there has, of course, been greater. I will take these thickly settled townships and the scattered townships and try to determine where the bulk of the rural population is. That is a much more definite way of arriving at it than by any local improvement districts, I submit. If you take it that there are eight times the number of people in a thickly settled township as in a sparsely settled township your population will work out so as to show a rural population to be 105,504. While a calculation of that kind may result in certain local inaccuracies if you take it over the whole province you will find that it will equalize or balance. The result of it is, adding rural and urban population together, that there are, 102,834 people south of 38 and 69,021 north of 38. My right hon. friend the First Minister seems inclined to doubt this calculation, but I desire to be perfectly fair and to make myself clear, and perhaps I will be able to give him some more calculations which bear out the proportions I have arrived at and which he cannot doubt because they are returns from the government. The results therefore of the vote cast last fall of homestead entries, receipts at the land offices and the increase in urban and rural population all go to show that the influx of population into that country has been to the south. All these figures prove that the distribution should be now 15 seats south to 10 north. I am going to trouble the House for a moment in giving some further figures to verify what I have said, and I submit that whatever investigation you may make will bring you to the same conclusion as that which I have arrived. But, before I proceed to discuss that let me take up the basis of calculation adopted by the government—the schools. They say that there are 130 more schools north. What does that prove? Twelve children can form a school. You will find schools more frequently in a country where the roads are bad. No person will contend for one minute that in the ridings to the north where they have a continuous agitation for better roads, they would have the same number of schools if their roads were of the class that they have in the riding of Calgary. It simply proves nothing. Then, take the post offices. I have not been able to get a post office established in my constituency. We had the same difficulty with the hon. minister of the Interior when he represented that riding. We would plead with him for a post office but we could not get it. I might mention one that we desire to have established at Carbon. We could not get it. I can point out post offices in that northern country where the revenue is $60 and where it costs the government $1,500 a year to provide for them. The people in the neighbourhood of Carbon petitioned the minister time after time and they could not get their post office. Eventually it was got by sending the wife of a member of parliament to the hon. Postmaster General and telling him that she had two sons north of the Rosebud river and she could not hear from them more than once every two weeks. The result was that the post office was granted. The only post office that has been established in the Calgary district has been one that was asked for by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot). I have asked for several myself; one of them I might mention at Strathmore. But, the postmistress at a neighbouring post office who is running a store discouraged any attempt on the part of any person to take trade away from her store, and this was the sort of evidence that the government adopted in coming to a conclusion in regard to the request for a post office at Strathmore. I submit that places might be pointed out in the northern part of the country where there are post offices and where there is not as much need of post offices as there is at Strathmore. Therefore, I ask: What does the number of post offices prove? Then, they have told us that they have taken into consideration the local improvement districts. What does that prove? It is simply optional with the people whether they

establish themselves into local improvement districts or not. Again, you have the question of roads. The people in the south for years have preferred to pay their taxes direct to the legislative assembly. It is in a ranching country. It differs largely from the north in that respect, and these taxes are paid into the legislative assembly in the hope of again being paid out for the inspection of stock and in other ways. The local improvement districts established in that country, I say, prove nothing.

Let us look at some further figures and we will discover where the bulk of population is and where the settlement is going. Take the receipts of the railway company north of township 38 and south of township 38 ; take them at Strathcona which would include Edmonton and you will see what part of the country has been increasing in the greatest ratio. At Strathcona, which includes all goods that go to Edmonton, the increase in 1904 over 1903 of goods received was 20 per cent, and of goods forwarded 10 per cent. On the McLeod branch which is in the southern part, the increase of 1904 over 1903, in goods received is 75 per cent, and in goods forwarded 30 per cent. These figures will be gone into in detail before this discussion is over. The tonnage receipts and the passenger receipts tell the same story ; south of township 38 the passenger and tonnage receipts per mile are double what they are north of township 38. This indicates where the people are and where the business is being done. When the Prime Minister was speaking about the number of post offices, I wonder if he and his friends considered the revenue from these post offices. For instance, for the year ending June, 1904, the post office revenue in Calgary was $28,638, and in Edmonton $13,104. Take similar statistics all along the line south of the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and you will find the southern country has increased in far greater proportion than the north. I think it is a fair argument to say that you will usually find the most people around where you will find the most business being done, and on the 6th of February last, I moved for a return which was brought down showing the customs and inland revenue receipts at the different offices in the Territories for 10 years past. It will be necessary for me to mention only the figures for the last three or four years. At Edmonton, which includes Strathcona for this purpose, I find that the increase in customs receipts for 1903 over 1902 was about $25,000, while at Calgary the increase for the same period was over $50,000. At Medicine Hat which is in the south the increase for 1902 over 1901 in customs revenue was about $22,000. At Lethbridge which is also in the south the customs receipts were in 1901, $21,716.19 ; in 1902, $28,105.73 ; in 1903, $36,930.20. From all sources the customs figures for the south show in the last few years a larger proportionate increase than in the north. The same story is told by the Inland Revenue returns. The recapitulation at the end of this return to the House shows the following : Edmonton, (receipts) $103,034 ; Calgary, (receipts) $410,116 ; Lethbridge, (receipts) $42,162 ; McLeod, (receipts) $4,791. This shows in what part of the country the business is being done and where the people are going. Another fair argument is that in the part of the country where there are railways constructed you will usually find the greatest actual settlement. If we take township 38 as the dividing line again, it will be found that north of township 38 there are constructed only 150 miles of railway and part of that is but graded and not in operation. On the other hand south of township 38 there are 994 miles of railway in operation, so that I think it is a fair argument to say that you will find the actual settlement greatest in that part of any country where there is the largest railway mileage. You will not find a sufficient population to give 13 or 14 representatives in a country where you have less than 150 miles of railway in operation. Even if you give them the benefit of their expectations, and if you build the Canadian Northern from the longitude of Maple Creek to Edmonton for 200 miles and the Grand Trunk Pacific for 240 miles, and other proposed railways say 240 miles ; and add on the 150 miles already constructed, the total mileage in the south will be only 830 miles. A comparison of the number of chartered banks north and south of township 38 will tell the same story. All the statistics simply corroborate the statement I have made, and prove that the division of that country on the lines laid down by the legislative assembly would be absolutely fair. Let us take these 11 seats south and 11 seats north for a further comparison. I am leaving out the constituencies of Athabaska, Peace River, and Red Deer which is in the middle and which can be added to either the north or the south. But take the 11 seats south of township 38 and the 11 seats immediately north, and it will be found that there are required 1,415 names on the voters' lists for every constituency in the south, whereas in the north there are only required 1,114 names, showing a discrimination against the south of 201 voters for each constituency. I have stated to the Prime Minister that my figures do not agree with the figures he gave as to the number of votes cast and the number of voters names on the lists, and I will show where they vary. I have the figures worked out here according to the polling subdivisions, and I wish the right hon. gentleman would point to any constituency in which he thinks the vote is over estimated or under estimated. In Medicine Hat the number of votes polled was 1,168 and the number of names on the list 1,650.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have 1,159 as having voted ; there is a difference of 9.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You have added 10 townships to Medicine Hat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do you take the constituency of Medicine Hat as it was ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No, as it is. I have marked the polling subdivisions in each polling constituency and gone through the matter very carefully, and I want the right hon. gentleman to point out wherein my figures are incorrect, or else to admit that they are right. I am prepared to hand over any constituency carved up into polling subdivisions with the vote cast.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. According to our figures which I got from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery in a statement of 'the number of votes registered and polled on the 23rd of November, 1904, in the following proposed constituencies,' I find.

Medicine Hat, number on voters' lists, 1,624, polled, 1,159.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In a return to this House, three months ago, we got the voters' lists. We have been through them and have checked them as accurately as we could, and even picked out the names on each voters' list which would be in another polling subdivision, west or east of a certain range, and I propose to put my figures on 'Hansard' and I wish to be shown wherein any of them are wrong. This work was done by others besides myself who will follow me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What are my hon. friend's figures for Medicine Hat ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. On the list 1,650 and polled 1,168.

Mr. P. TALBOT. Do your figures include spoiled ballots ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Spoiled ballots would not come out of the list.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a difference of nine votes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The difference is probably accounted for by the fact that you have added to the old constituency of Medicine Hat 40 townships.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I had added nothing. I got these figures from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery and if they are wrong it is not my mistake.

Mr. OLIVER. It may be that in one case there have been counted only the votes that were counted and in the other case there may have been given the votes cast, including the spoiled ballots.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. There is a much larger discrepancy in the votes on the list from the figures given by the Prime Minister and the number as voted. If I am not trespassing on the patience of the House I shall call out the constituencies wherein we vary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

After Recess.

The committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Before recess I was attempting to deal with the number of votes cast of the proposed local constituencies and the number of votes on the enumerators' lists. With regard to certain constituencies there is some difference between the figures submitted by the right hon. the First Minister and those submitted in the calculations made by hon. members on this side. I regret very much to have to trouble the House with these figures, but had this information been supplied us three weeks ago, as it should have been, I possibly then might have been able to point out where there was any error in the figures submitted by the First Minister or have been able to discover some discrepancy in our own calculations. But as a great deal of care was taken to find out the exact number of votes on the lists and the exact number polled, I propose to place upon 'Hansard' the result of these calculations :

No.	Constituencies.	Votes.	Names on the list.
1.	Medicine Hat	1,168	1,650
2.	Cardston	621	851
3.	Lethbridge	858	1,236
4.	Macleod	715	1,121
5.	Pincher	1,147	1,678
6.	Gleichen	774	1,260
7.	Calgary city	2,184	2,682
8.	Rosebud	749	1,189
9.	High River	971	1,528
10.	Banff	750	1,017
11.	Innisfail	896	1,325
12.	Red Deer	608	1,095
13.	Vermilion	632	1,068
14.	Lacombe	778	1,182
15.	Ponoka	794	1,068
16.	Wetaskiwin	834	1,416
17.	Leduc	876	1,068
18.	Strathcona	872	1,291
19.	Stony Plain	584	748
20.	Edmonton	1,340	1,689

I might say with regard to Edmonton that one of the polling divisions was missing in the list brought down as will be found in some of the other constituencies, but in that case we took a percentage of the total vote cast and allowed that much for the polling subdivision.

21.	Saskatchewan	1,237	1,757
22.	Sturgeon	717	1,098
23.	St. Albert	740	960

A calculation, I believe, will be made which will practically show that the figures as given us by the First Minister will re-

sult in proving our contention, namely, that undue representation has been given to the north and that the south has been discriminated against. As I pointed out, on the vote enumerated on the list, if you take the eleven seats from the international boundary, it will be found, totalling them up and comparing them with the eleven seats north after Red Deer, excepting Peace river and Athabaska, that there are over 200 more names on the lists for each of the eleven constituencies in the south than for the eleven in the north. As has been already pointed out, a large number of settlers who have gone in there the last three years have had no votes, the influx of settlement has been south, and the southern country suffers in comparison with the north by reason of the settlers not being there long enough to qualify and have their names put on the lists. As I have pointed out, in the calculation of homestead entries, the lands sold by the Great Northwestern Irrigation Company would not appear, and it is quite apparent to anybody who considers the matter at all that the influx of population has been largely to the south. I need only point out one instance in connection with that southern irrigation block, and that is that in the one town of Raymond—the hon. member for Alberta will bear me out in this—there was a population last fall of 2,500 people and yet less than 200 names appear on the enumerator's list. People who went in there a couple of years ago were not in the country a sufficient length of time to enable them to be placed upon the list.

Now, let us make some comparisons between the constituencies in the south and those in the north. Take, for example, the city of Calgary, with 2,184 votes polled, and compare it with the city of Edmonton, with 1,340 votes polled, or 2,682 names on the list in Calgary as compared with only 1,689 in Edmonton. The same representation is given to both. Compare the constituency of Pincher Creek, with 1,678 names on the list, with its coal mines at Frank, Blairmore and Coleman, and a ranching and farming country in the constituency, with Stony Plain, where there are only 748 names on the list. If the right hon. the First Minister will do me the honour of looking at the map published by the Department of the Interior on the 1st of January, 1905, he will find that in this proposed constituency of Stony Plain practically no townships are shown as surveyed and ready for permanent settlement. On this map I find this explanation 'Townships coloured buff are the townships for which township plans have been printed.' It will be apparent to any person who looks at that map that in this proposed constituency of Stony Plain there are practically no townships for which plans have been printed up to the 1st of January, 1905, which, I think, is very good evidence as to where the permanent settlement is. I venture to state that there is not in the constituency of Stony Plain a village or hamlet of 300 people. There is nothing there that requires special representation. If you look at the map you will observe how the constituencies of the south are permitted to run right across to the boundary of British Columbia; and when we get up to township 38, we find that an additional constituency, Stony Plain, is added in this unsurveyed country, in which there is practically no permanent settlement. There is no reason why that constituency could not be represented, as it always has been, by parties living farther east or by one of the members for Edmonton. In that connection, I may say that I observe in the local papers that two, if not three, citizens of Edmonton have already been nominated for three constituencies in the north—Messrs. Cross and Boyle and another—showing that that section of the country could be properly looked after by a member residing at or near Edmonton. Take the constituency of High River in the south, with 1,605 names on the list, and with the thriving villages of High River, Okotoks, Nanton and Cayley, and with two banks chartered at High River and at Okotoks, and compare that with St. Albert, with only 950 names on the list. What I have said with regard to the land not being surveyed in the constituency of Stony Plain applies equally to the constituency of St. Albert, showing that there is a lack of permanent settlement there. Contrast Medicine Hat, in the south, with 1,640 names on the list, with Vermilion, with only 1,092 names on the list. In comparing these two constituencies I desire to point out that the old consituency of Medicine Hat has been enlarged by the addition of at least forty townships, for no reason presumably but that it is in the south; because no person could contend that there has not been a considerable development and influx of population into that constituency since the distribution of seats by the local assembly in May, 1902. I have already pointed out that no additional representation is given in the constituencies of Cardston, Lethbridge or Medicine Hat, all of which happen to be in the southern part of the province; that no parallel case has been pointed out in the north; that then additional representation has been given all along the line, constituencies being cut in two when there has been absolutely no necessity for it. In giving the calculations which I read a few moments ago, I omitted the constituencies of Athabaska and Peace River, for no other reason than that there was no vote cast there in the last election. There has never been an election there, and it was utterly impossible for anybody to make a calculation which would be at all authentic or definite. For that reason I prefer to take for the calculation those constituencies in which votes were cast last November, and in which voters' lists have been

prepared. But if we include in the calculation the two northern constituencies, the contrast in favour of the south will be even more apparent. If we assume that each of the constituencies of Athabaska and Peace River has a voting strength of 300, or 600 in all—and that, I think, is liberal, in view of the figures that have been submitted to this House, or that were annexed to the proposed schedule when it was sent to the hon. gentleman who leads this side of the House—the figures give Peace River a population of 800 and Athabaska 1,436, totalling 2,236. Divide that by five to ascertain the number of votes, or by any other figure you choose to select, and it will give a voting population for the two constituencies of 447. So, when I am allowing 300 for each constituency, I think I am within the mark when I say that it is a fair and liberal allowance. Now, take these constituencies in the south as having each a voting population of 300 and compare them with those in the north. Take all the constituencies of the north, and include Red Deer in the south. It matters not for the calculation in which part you place the constituency of Red Deer, as it is practically at township 38, the dividing line in the calculation which I have submitted. If we take the theoretical number of 100 as entitling each constituency to a seat, the figures will be as follows with regard to the number of names appearing on the list: Medicine Hat, 135; Cardston, 72; Lethbridge, 100; Macleod, 92; Pincher Creek, 137; Gleichen, 103; Calgary city, 219; Rosebud, 97; High River, 125; Banff, 83; Innisfail, 108; Red Deer, 89; Vermilion, 87; Lacombe, 96; Ponoka, 87; Wetaskiwin, 115; Leduc, 87; Strathcona, 105; Stony Plain, 61; Edmonton city, 138; Saskatchewan, 144; Sturgeon, 89; St. Albert, 78; Peace River, 35; Athabaska, 35. That is, out of the 12 southern constituencies 7 go over the 100 mark, and 10 out of the 13 north are under that figure. I work it out on that basis as catching the eye quicker than by setting out the figures as I have done with the 11 seats north and south.

Now let us deal with these two northern constituencies as they are, and perhaps answer some of the arguments advanced by the right hon. the Prime Minister this afternoon. It would be interesting to have the area of each of these constituencies so as to be able to determine if it would be at all possible to get a vote in that vast territory; it would be interesting to know how far apart settlers are in the respective constituencies, wherever there are any. As I will point out in a few minutes, the mail service of once a month costs $1,500 to this country for a single post office, which serves the whole of that district of two constituencies, producing a revenue of $66 a year. Could we form any estimate of what it would cost to have an election in either of these constituencies, or would it be possible to hold an election? There are no lines of communication. And what is it going to cost in this new province to elect these two members in each of these constituencies? I venture the statement that for each one of them an election will cost the new province ten times as much as in any of the constituencies to the south. If any one was being hurt by not having two representatives, I would not for a moment urge that they should be deprived of two representatives. But let us look at the population according to the census of 1901. It has been repeated over and over again in this House, that in the whole district of Athabaska there were only 241 white people. Now, we are not taking in the whole of Athabaska, we take in about 50 per cent; I am willing to say that it includes 70 per cent of the population. But I may point out now that for some reason or other, if I am correctly informed, representation is not given to Athabaska in the new province of Saskatchewan. That statement has been made to me, and I believe it is correct. Now if we take 70 per cent of that white population of 241 it would give us 160 people, and if we look at the census of 1901 we will find that in the whole province of Alberta there are two and a third times the number of people now, on the estimate of the Minister of Justice when he put it at 173,000, that there was when the census was taken in 1901. No man will argue in this House that there has been a greater influx of population, proportionately, into Athabaska than there has been into the other portions of Alberta. For a number of years back there has been no difficulty in getting settlement along the lines of railway construction; therefore I think we are justified in assuming that the influx into Athabaska has been no greater proportionately, than into the rest of the province of Alberta. Therefore if I multiply 160 by two and one-third it will give a population of 400. Where have the additional half-breeds, if any, come from into Athabaska? If they have gone in there from the northern part of Alberta, the northern part of Alberta would be depleted thereby. But has there been into that country the last two or three years any influx of settlement, either of white people or of half-breeds? Therefore, I say that the time is not ripe yet to give that district two representatives.

For the purpose of finding out just what population was there, as nearly as I could get at it, some days ago I placed a question on the order paper which, with the answer, will be found on page 7271 of 'Hansard':

1. When was the post office established at Lesser Slave Lake?

The one post office in the whole of Athabaska according to the Post Office Guide.

2. From what railway point are mails forwarded, what is the distance covered, and how often do these mails arrive ?

3. What other post offices have been established in the Territory of Athabaska, and when were they first opened ?

4. How many letters were received and despatched from Lesser Slave Lake during the last four years ?

5. What was the revenue collected and the expense incurred in connection with the Lesser Slave Lake post office ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for the Postmaster General) :

1. 1st June, 1903.

2. The railway point from which mails are forwarded to this office is Edmonton, which is 318 miles from Lesser Slave Lake. The immediate point of departure for the mails for Lesser Slave Lake is Athabaska Landing, which is 105 miles from the railway at Edmonton. The service is once per month.

3. Lesser Slave Lake has been in operation for some time, and three other offices were authorized in February last, viz.: (a) Spirit river, (b) Peace river crossing, (c) Vermilion. In addition to the service thus in operation for the service of Lesser Slave Lake, there are two trips made annually to the far north, beginning at Lac la Biche, which gets its mails from Edmonton via Fort Saskatchewan, Whitford and Saddle lake, and ending at Fort Resolution, passing through the following settlements in Athabaska, viz.: Fort McMurray, Fort Chipewyan, Smith Landing and Fort Smith.

The Royal Northwest Mounted Police are also taken advantage of in their patrol trips. They carry a mail bag with them and undertake the conveyance and delivery at the first regular post office they come to of all matter handed to them.

4. As no record is kept of matter mailed at an office, this information cannot be given.

5. The revenue of Lesser Slave Lake is as follows : 1903, $20 ; 1904, $66.13. The salary of the postmaster is $30 a year.

The expense in connection with the service is as follows : For the monthly trip from Athabaska Landing to the post office at Lesser Slave Lake and to Peace river crossing, which is not a post office, $125 a trip or $1,500 a year is paid. For the service to the far north, which extends into the Mackenzie district, $525 a trip or $1,050 a year is paid.

Therefore, in 1904, there was only one post office for that whole district including that portion of Athabaska which is not taken into the province of Alberta ; and the revenue derived from that post office, in that district to which they propose to give two representatives, is $66 a year, and the mail delivery is made once a month. How do you propose to get the members down to the seat of government to meet the assembly ? If any argument was needed to satisfy the First Minister, if he desires to be fair in this matter, that that country is not ripe for representation at present, it is the fact that in the whole of the district of Athabaska there was only one post office in 1904, and the revenue derived therefrom was $66. Yet to that district you are giving two representatives—greater representation than you give to the constituencies in the south such as for example Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Pincher, Cardston, or High River. If any argument were needed to satisfy him that the time is not ripe or that their interests cannot be represented in the local house by the member for North Alberta just as well as they can be looked after in this House by the member for Edmonton it is afforded by this return which was brought down and which is to be found at page 7271 of 'Hansard.' There is no navigation in that country and no means of communication as far as the returns show. A question in regard to that matter was asked in this House a week or ten days ago. The answer is that as far as the government know they have no evience of it. I want to point out that some few years ago the Hon. James Ross, who now occupies a seat in the Senate, reported on the advisability of giving Athabaska a representative in the then local house, and he made the statement—and I do not think he will deny it—that the distances were so great, that the means of communication were so few and that settlement was so sparse that it would be absolutely impossible for any man to attempt to adequately represent that constituency, and if you divide that territory into two the argument of Mr. Ross equally applies. When I am charged across the floor of this House by the hon. Minister of the Interior with saying that the people there are not fit for representation I reply that he is placing a meaning in my words that I do not intend them to convey. I do not pretend to say that they are not fit for representation, but I do say that the time has not come and that they will be done no more injustice by giving them representation in the local house with the northern part of Alberta than you are doing to the district of Nipissing, the northern parts of the province of Ontario and the outlying parts of the constituencies in the province of Quebec. If the argument applies that they should have representation because there is no person representing them in the local house, and that, as the hon. Minister of the Interior says, they are contributing man for man their share towards the revenue of the country, then, why not give representation in this House to Athabaska, Mackenzie, Ungava, Franklin or Keewatin ? The men living in these districts are contributing equally their share man for man towards the revenue of the country. Why should an exception be made in this case? What is it that requires special representation up there ? Is it an agricultural country especially ? The returns of grain or of wheat shipped in or out of Edmonton might be interesting. They have two flour mills up there, but it is simply because they tell us of the great distance they are from where that commodity can be obtained. What particular trade is there which requires representation ? Is there any shipping, lumbering or fishing ? There is simply the fur trad-

ing industry, and experience shows that it desires to be left severely alone. There is no class or interest that requires special representation in that country any more than there is in the outlying portions of the constituencies in Ontario and Quebec to-day.

Now, in regard to the proposed schedule there are some inaccuracies in the description, but I do not propose to detain the committee by dealing with them here. In describing constituencies that are bounded by rivers neither one side or the other of the river is mentioned. If there are islands in between there is going to be confusion created. In running along road allowances why not specify the centre of the road so as to avoid confusion ? There are a number of other points of a similar character that I desire to bring to the attention of the committee, but they can be mentioned when each constituency comes to be considered specifically. But, one objection I do desire to point out now is that the boundary between the constituencies of Innisfail and Rosebud cuts the thriving town of Olds in two. Part of the town is in one constituency and part in the other. It is not necessary for me to take up the time of the committee in pointing out the many inconveniences that will result on account of it. The right hon. leader of the government has seen fit to doubt the figures that I have given in regard to where the population is in that country. No explanation has been given why the plan adopted by the legislative assembly giving 9 seats to the south of township 38 and 6 to the north has been practically turned upside down. Any person can observe that by simply looking at the map. That is beyond contradiction. The same equally applies to the representation which was given in this House three years ago when four constituencies were created out of the old district of Alberta. No criticism can be made of the argument, that, having regard to the contention which was made then, this proposed schedule discriminates against the southern country. The return showing the amount of money received for customs in the different parts of the country, bearing on the point as to where the business and population are, is a government return and cannot be contradicted. The same applies to the return as to the inland revenue receipts which was brought down. Does the right hon. leader of the government desire to contradict the figures as to railway construction when I say that only 150 miles have been built north of 38 and that 999 miles have been built south of 38, which is some indication as to where the permanent settlement is and will be. I can get the figures in detail if any person desires to criticise them. Am I right in the figures which I gave of the railway receipts showing where the bulk of the receipts is taken in from both passengers and tonnage of freight in the different parts of the country and showing that the proportion of increase has been greater to the south than to the north ? All these, I submit, have a bearing on the question as to where the population is and where the business is being done. None of these things are criticised, but as soon as I mention urban or rural population the right hon. First Minister finds fault with the figures. Figures have been handed to me showing that the population, less Indians, might be assumed to be 165,000. I do not pretend that the following figures are direct evidence of the location of settlement, but I do say that they corroborate the figures that I gave to the First Minister showing where the urban and rural population of that country was. If we assume that the population is 165,000, and work it out on the homestead entries for the last three years it would give a population of 75,500 north, and 89,000 south. Based on the customs receipts from 1894 to 1904, the population would be 52,000 north and 113,000 south. Based on the customs receipts given in the government return from 1903 to 1904 the population would be 54,000 north and 111,000 south. Based on the Inland Revenue receipts from 1903 to 1904 the population would be 40,000 north and 125,000 south. Based on the land, timber, and registration fees the population would be 53,000 north and 112,000 south. If you take the average on all these calculations the population would be 52,000 north and 113,000 south. If any gentlemen opposite wishes to work out the figures on the basis of the receipts from the different government offices he will find I think that I have been liberal in my estimation of the population in the north. The object of parliamentary representation as I take it is to give each class or interest in the community a voice in the government of the state. Looking up the precedents in this and other countries, I find that the aims of representation for electoral divisions are summarized in the instructions given to the commissioners in New South Wales a couple of years ago. These commissioners were instructed to divide up that country into local constituencies having regard to (1) the existing boundaries. (2) the community or diversity of interest ; (3) the lines of communication ; (4) the physical features ; (5) the quota to be ascertained by dividing the number of seats into the number of names upon the list. In the Transvaal which is being divided now by commission, I find that a margin of 10 per cent is allowed. As to the schedule proposed by the government in this case, let me ask what evidence has the government or what evidence have the members of this House before them to enable them to decide as to that division in an intelligent manner having regard to the above consideration which should be given effect to ? To-day for the first time we were told what was the total vote polled in these respective divisions. Are we expected to discuss that right away. To-day we are told

for the first time the number of names enrolled upon the list. Are we expected to grapple with that subject and decide upon it without deliberate consideration. I submit to the First Minister that this is a most important matter to the people of the west and that the government should not go it blindly, or ask their supporters to go it blindly upon the evidence which they have submitted to-day. What the people of that country desire is that they should have an opportunity of being heard in the matter; an opportunity of representing their case to some body which will listen and give attention to it. I am not suggesting that they would not receive attention here, but I submit that the evidence is not at hand which would enable the members of this House to decide what a fair electoral division of that country would be. The people of the west desire to have some independent tribunal before which these local constituencies could place their claims, such for instance that of the town of Olds which has forwarded a resolution protesting that they are placed right upon the line of two constituencies. I would urge on the First Minister that this is not a party matter. Local politics in that country have not hitherto been fought out on party lines, and probably they will not be in the next elections. This is a matter in which the government can afford to be fair and to give to the respective portions of that country an opportunity of stating their case. If any person doubts my assertion that this is not a party question, let him read the Liberal press in southern and central Alberta, and he will soon be assured that just as strong objections come from the Liberals as from the Conservatives. The Prime Minister has expressed a desire to be fair, and he has now a grand opportunity of showing to the people of that country that his professions are something more than empty sound. If the Prime Minister does not choose to accept the figures I have given him; if he prefers to listen to the men who happen to have his ear; then it is not unfair that I should ask on behalf of, I believe, of 95 per cent of the people of southern and central Alberta, irrespective of politics, that they should have an opportunity of presenting their case to an independent tribunal. That is what they desire, and they will abide by the result knowing they must abide by it. If my suggestion is adopted by the government, it will have the effect of alleviating that sectional fight between the north and the south which this division is going to continue for many years to come. I shall therefore move Mr. Chairman that the distribution be transferred to a judicial committee. But, before I read the amendment I might point out that in it I have specified that the personnel of the committee shall be the justices of the Supreme Court in the province of Alberta. I may say that one of these gentlemen has been Assistant Attorney General in the legislative assembly for a number of years and has a thorough knowledge of existing conditions in that country. Another of the Supreme Court judges, the Chief Justice, when the distribution of 1902 was made, was Commissioner of Public Works at Regina, and the third judge has resided in that country since, I think, the year 1881, and has lived in both the northern and southern portions. I am not making this motion with any desire of obtaining any party advantage. I might remark two out of the three Supreme Court judges have been recently appointed by this government; not that I am suggesting that their political views lean that way now, for I suppose they are expected to abandon politics when they go upon the bench. However, two out of these three judges have been recently appointed by this government and the third was appointed under the Conservative administration. I think my proposition is manifestly fair, and it will I am sure satisfy the First Minister that no attempt is being made to take any advantage in a political sense. I therefore beg to move seconded by Mr. Herron :—

That section 12 be struck out and that the following be substituted therefor :

12. Until the said legislature otherwise provides the legislative assembly shall be composed of 25 members, to be elected to represent the electoral divisions hereinafter mentioned.

(a) Such division shall be made by a board of commissioners consisting of at least three persons resident in the said province and being judges of the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories who shall for that purpose be appointed by letters patent under the great seal immediately after the coming into force of this Act, and who shall divide the said province into twenty-five electoral divisions.

(b) The letters patent appointing the commissioners shall require the commissioners, in making the divisions, to have due regard to the distribution of population, the public convenience, the existing local divisions and such other considerations as appear to them best calculated to do substantial justice.

(c) In case of the death or resignation or refusal of any one or more of such commissioners to act, a successor or successors shall in like manner be appointed, and in the event of there being no resident judge or judges available any judge or judges of the said Supreme Court may be appointed such successor or successors.

(d) Within a time to be limited by the said letters patent the commissioners shall complete such divisions and report the same to the Lieutenant Governor of the said province, setting forth in such report the boundaries of the electoral divisions to which such report refers and the ranges, townships and sections comprised therein, and shall assign an appropriate designation to each electoral division. Upon receipt by the Lieutenant Governor of the said province of the report of the commissioners completing the divisions aforesaid, the respective territories described as constituting the respective electoral divisions into which the said province shall have been divided as aforesaid shall become and be the electoral divisions of the said province as if the same had been so set apart and established as such by this Act.

(e) The commissioners shall also within the said time limited forward a duplicate of their said report to the Secretary of State.

(f) The said report and the said duplicate thereof shall be signed by the commissioners, or in case of a disagreement, by a majority of them, and the report of the majority of the commissioners shall be the report of the commissioners.

(g) The said report shall be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' and in the official gazette of the said province forthwith after the receipt thereof.

(h) The commissioners may frame rules and orders for regulating the conduct of their proceedings and generally for carrying into effect the provisions thereof.

(i) The letters patent appointing said commissioners shall confer upon them the power of summoning witnesses before them and of requiring such witnesses to give evidence on oath, orally or in writing, or on solemn affirmation (if they are persons entitled to affirm in civil matters) and to produce such documents and things as the commissioners may deem requisite to the full investigation of the matters into which they are appointed to inquire, and the commissioners shall have the same power and authority to enforce the attendance of witnesses and to compel them to give evidence as is vested in the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories in civil cases.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member has certainly given us a deluge of statement in support of his plea that the part of the new province of Alberta south of township 39 should have fifteen representatives in the first legislature of the province as against ten in the northern part, but I think he has given very little argument in support of his contention that this question should be referred to a commission of judges. It struck me that the whole argument we have heard in regard to this matter from the other side of the House was very strongly tinged with partisanship, that from beginning to end the argument was on partisanship, and I merely suggest that if the commission of judges were appointed and if it should be so unfortunate as to agree with the schedule placed before the House I am afraid that the commissioners would not be free from accusations of partisanship from my hon. friends on the other side. They could hardly be expected to agree with his very remarkable contention that the situation demands fifteen representatives in the south as against ten in the north. I think that admission on his part is a sufficient evidence as to his desire for a careful judicial decision and a sufficient answer to his assertion of non-partisanship.

In regard to his complaint that my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) and myself have had more or less to do with the preparation of this map and schedule, I do not know that either my hon. friend or myself have any apologies to offer for having given such advice as we may have been able to give to the government in regard to this matter which certainly concerns the constituencies which we represent. I may say, further, that in the early part of the discussion on these Autonomy Bills there was an offer made, I think I am safe to say, on the part of my hon. friend and myself, to meet our co-members from the southern part of the province to discuss this amicably, and arrive at a joint conclusion, but we only needed to meet once to find out that our conclusions were as wide apart as the statements which my hon. friend has made in the House and the positions of my hon. friend from Strathcona and myself. In fact I am given to understand they absolutely refused to join in the discussion. However, be that as it may, we have no apologies to offer for having taken it upon ourselves in representing our constituencies——

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that I myself or Mr. Herron was ever asked to discuss electoral divisions with him?

Mr. OLIVER. To the best of my belief, yes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. By whom?

Mr. OLIVER. By myself.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did you ever ask me to discuss electoral divisions with you?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot be sure, but I think so.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I do not think you can. I wish to emphatically deny that I was ever asked by you or any person else on the other side of the House to discuss electoral divisions.

Mr. LAKE. I may say as far as I am personally concerned also that I was never approached on that subject by any member on the other side of the House with a suggestion to discuss this question.

Mr. HERRON. I might say that the minister did ask me something in connection with the division of my district on one occasion. That was late in the evening and the following morning the Bill was laid before us.

Mr. SCOTT. I would call to the recollection of my hon. friends on the other side of the House that we had a conference in which this matter came up in room 48, on one occasion and the proposal was made at that conference at which the members of the Northwest government as well as I think nearly all our hon. friends from the Northwest Territories who sit on that side of the House were present. The proposition was made by myself.

Mr. LAKE. I was not present on that occasion nor did I hear of it.

Mr. SCOTT. Possibly the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) was not present. The member for Calgary was present with Mr. Haultain and Mr. Bulyea.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do you intend to say that I was present when any mention

was made of dividing that country up into electoral divisions? I have given that statement an emphatic denial. I was at a meeting when the boundary was discussed, whether it should be the 4th meridian. We sat there until 9.30 waiting for the hon. member for Edmonton, the present Minister of the Interior. I left at 9.30 o'clock after we saw that the boundary between the two provinces could not be satisfactorily adjusted and I again desire to emphatically deny that the question of dividing that country into local constituencies was ever mentioned in my presence.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not wish to impugn the veracity of my hon. friend from Calgary at all, but I make the statement that at that conference the proposition was put forward by myself in the shape of a formal motion that for each of the proposed provinces there should be a bi-party committee appointed from the representatives there present to deal with this matter of redistribution and our Conservative friends there immediately took the position that they would not take part.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Who were the Conservative friends who took that position that they would not take part.

Mr. SCOTT. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) makes the emphatic statement that he was not present and heard no such suggestion at all.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would like to have the name.

Mr. SCOTT. I distinctly recollect that Mr. Haultain was present, and I think my hon. friend from Alberta was also there.

Mr. HERRON. I state most emphatically I was not.

Mr. LAKE. And I also state most emphatically that I was not present.

Mr. OLIVER. At any rate we assume responsibility for having advised the government in this matter. We do not say that the government has taken our advice, but we take the responsibility of having advised it, and I think we would have been doing considerably less than our duty to our constituents if we had not done so. But I am not aware it was any part of our responsibility to ask members opposite to take part with us. They have their responsibility as we have ours, and perhaps they will say that we refused their offer to consult with regard to this matter. If they do not, then they must take the responsibility, just as well as we, of there having been no general discussion. We have no more responsibility in that respect than they. But what has been said here by the hon. memmer for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) makes it quite evident that a joint discussion would have been absolutely useless. The contention he put before the House made impossible that any agreement should be reached.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Why ?

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend will be patient, I shall try to explain why. The first position taken by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is that the distribution of seats which was made by the local assembly after the election of 1902 was a proper basis of representation. He takes the ground that because the Northwest assembly made that distribution, it therefore must be right—a distribution which gave eight seats south of this township line of township 39 and six seats north.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did you not say 9 to 6 this afternoon ?

Mr. OLIVER. I was speaking of the old district of Alberta. I am speaking now of the new province of Alberta to which we gave nine seats in the south to six in the north. But the Northwest assembly gave the old province of Alberta eight seats on the south to six in the north. In the votes that were polled on the 3rd November last, the six northern seats polled 9,817 against 9,666 polled in the eight southern seats. The hon. member takes that proportion of seats as a fair basis of representation, and I leave his argument to the House for its consideration. We say that it is not a fair basis.

Mr. BARKER. His argument was the very opposite.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member will pardon me for using my own ears. Starting out with the supposition that the southern country was entitled to eight representatives and the northern only to six, he then builds an argument which satisfies himself but which has no basis in fact. It is the simplest thing in the world to arrive at any result by eliminating anything you do not want and adding anything you do. By following this operation, my hon. friend arrived at the absurd calculation that there are 50,000 people north of the line and 150,000 south of it, or figures to that effect.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I proceeded on the assumption of the Minister of Justice that there was a population of 173,000 there and made my calculation accordingly.

Mr. OLIVER. My understanding of my hon. friend's argument was that by this method he reached the conclusion that there are about one-third as many people north of this line as there are south. Take any standard you please which has any basis in fact, and you will see how absurd is that conclusion, and consequently must be the premises from which it was drawn.

Mr. BARKER. He said nothing of the kind.

Mr. OLIVER. Take for instance his suggestion that because customs receipts

in the southern half are greater than in the northern half, its population must be greater and the southern half must be entitled to greater representation. On the same basis of calculation, the city of Montreal would be entitled to greater representation than all the rest of the province of Quebec. A similar argument he used with regard to the receipts of the land offices and the receipts from timber and other dues. Well, the amount of receipts indicate the amount of trade and the wealth of the country ; and no one disputes that in this southern country, with its nine hundred miles of railway and its investment of capital for many years, there is a greater aggregation of wealth than in the northern part with only one hundred miles of railway in operation. But it does not follow that the northern part shall be disfranchised because its people have not as much money in the bank or because the customs receipts or the land office receipts are less. It is the people who vote and not their money. Winnipeg has more customs receipts and handles, I suppose, more business than all the rest of Manitoba, yet it has only one representative. It has 100,000 of a population approximately, which I presume, is twice as many as any other constituency in that province, but still it has only one representative. The statements of the hon. gentleman may possibly be correct, but they have no bearing on the question. The question is as to the number of people who are to have representation ; and when my hon. friend leaves that question and gives us a lot of very interesting statistics to show how the country in the south has progressed, he does not thereby strengthen his case.

My hon. friend has suggested that because great irrigation works are going on in the vicinity of Calgary, there must be a large population there. But he knows that these irrigation works were undertaken because there was no population to speak of in that country, because it was not a country suitable for a large population. As a matter of fact, this great district, in which these irrigation works are situated, and which has something like 200 miles of railway, passed a vote at the last election of about 700 or 800 votes. Because a country has 900 miles of railway, he says it must contain a large aggregation of people, but here is a district with 200 miles of railway which only cast 700 or 800 votes. The extension of railways is not an evidence of population, and everybody knows that a great part of southern Alberta—while it is a most desirable country, a country in which men have become wealthy—is not suitable for a dense population. It in a ranching country, the population of which must largely be in the town—a prosperous, if you like, population but not a dense population. In regard to the considerations upon which the distribution before the House is made, it has been stated already that the vote cast at the last Dominion election was accepted as the basis of population. That was accepted because it was the most recent, definite, unquestioned and unquestionable statement that could be obtained. There was nothing more recent that would be absolutely authoritative. My hon. friend complains that the number of votes on the list was not considered instead of the number of votes cast. That might alter the conditions slightly, but not materially ; but everybody will admit that prepared as our voters' lists are in the west, there may be some question as to the reliability of the list but there is no question as to the reliability of the votes when the ballots are in the box.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the voters were not there ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Dead men vote.

Mr. OLIVER. Not there. That is in Centre Toronto.

Some hon. MEMBERS. In South York.

Mr. OLIVER. The votes actually polled are taken as something definite, reliable, unquestioned, recent. Then we must necessarily take the areas of country affected. My hon. friend does not desire to consider area at all ; but the purpose of representation is to forward the general interests, and the general interests include the development of unoccupied country. That is the great interest which we in this Dominion parliament have to serve, and that is what the provincial legislature must serve in administering the local affairs of that country. It is the undeveloped area that is our source of wealth, and the policy or principle that would exclude area from representation is certainly detrimental to the well-being of the country. We are prepared to take issue with the hon. gentleman on that point. The third consideration is the prospective development of the province. The first legislature will sit presumably for a term of four years, and where immediate development is assured on a large scale, development which must in the nature of things eventuate before the end of the legislative term, that development should certainly be taken into consideration. And so, when my hon. friend says that there should be consideration of the 900 miles of railroad existing in Southern Alberta, so we say there should be consideration of the 700 or 800 miles to be constructed in northern Alberta within the next two years—certainly within the life of the first legislature. There is under construction during the present year some 275 miles of railroad in northern Alberta, north of township 38. The results in the way of settlement from the construction of those 275 miles through a strictly agricultural country cannot be estimated in figures less than tens of thousands, and any scheme of representation that would not give

some consideration to that development, which is not merely in prospect but is assured, would certainly fall far short of meeting the fair and reasonable requirements of the country. I will not dispute with the hon. gentleman as to the figures which he read of the vote in each constituency. It matters very little whether it is a few more or a few less; the general result is about the same. The question at issue is not between several constituencies, but between northern Alberta and southern Alberta. Now, the vote cast at the Dominion election in the province of Alberta, not including the district of Athabaska, amounted to practically 21,000, giving 12 constituencies in the south, including Red Deer, although part of it is north of the line mentioned. That is, 11,406 votes in the 12 southern constituencies as against 9,553 votes in the 11 northern constituencies, a difference of 1,853 votes, exclusive of the district of Athabaska. Now, we say that the greater area of the northern part of the old district of Alberta, to which is added the area of the district of Athabaska, and the prospective increase of population resulting from the construction of 275 miles of railroad during the present year and the balance of 700 miles of railroad within the next four years, are certainly ample justification——

Mr. BARKER. Is the hon. gentleman calculating for a distribution of seats four years hence?

Mr. OLIVER. No; I am calculating for a distribution of seats this year which will stand for four years. We believe that the allowance of 1,800 votes for the difference between 69,000 square miles in the south and 211,000 square miles in the north, with the increase of railway facilities, is certainly not taking any undue advantage. On the contrary, we consider that the country to the south is receiving everything that it can reasonably claim, or that is claimed by sound argument, from the statement my hon. friend has made here to-day.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is not overlooking the fact that he is providing for an election that must be held within six months, and not four years hence.

Mr. OLIVER. I am aware of that fact; but I am aware also that the representatives to be elected will in all probability be elected again four years hence, and that therefore we are entitled in all fairness to consider the conditions as they will exist four years hence, as when a distribution was made of seats in the Northwest Territories, allowance was made for a prospective increase of population. What was right then is right now. My hon. friend has found a great deal of fault with the representation of the district of Athabaska, it is going to cost money to represent it. Now this new province of Alberta lies immediately alongside the province of British Columbia. It is very little inferior to British Columbia in area, or, we believe, in value, and we believe that not the least valuable part of the district of Alberta is that part now called the western part of the district of Athabaska. The northern line of the new province of Alberta is identical with that of the province of British Columbia. But there is no part of British Columbia that is not represented in this House, and the isolated parties of miners in the northern part of British Columbia, far north of the Peace river on our side of the mountains, are secured in their right to representation both in the local house and in this parliament. There is a member representing that part of British Columbia lying immediately across the mountains from the Peace river, which is just as inaccessible, just as difficult to reach, and having very little less population if any than the proposed district of the Peace river. My hon. friend has the easiest way in the world of arriving at his conclusions; by the elimination of what he does not wish to see, and by exaggerating what he does wish to see, he can produce any result he wishes. So when he does not want to give that northern country the representation to which it is by area, and population, and possibilities and prospect entitled, he simply ignores it, and says it can either go without representation, or it can be represented by somebody who does not know any more about it than he shows he knows himself, if we are to judge from his arguments.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does the hon. gentleman contend that whilst the northern country is going ahead the southern country will stand still?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely not. My hon. friend has rather been led into that suggestion reversed, but I have not. We admit the progress and success of the southern country. It certainly has gone ahead marvellously, and is entitled to all consideration. But that is no reason why the progress of the northern country, the greater possibilities of the northern country, because of its greater area if for no other reason, should therefore be ignored. I was rather struck by the easy way in which my hon. friend disposed of a certain constituency to which he particularly objected, the proposed constituency of Stony Plain. He spoke at some length of the population of the constituency of Cardston. Now the constituency of Cardston I know probably as well as he does and Cardston only gave 640 odd votes at the last election, while the district of Stony Plain gave a little over 600 votes. But he proceeds at once to eliminate the constituency of Stony Plain by producing a map which he says shows there are no surveyed lands within that constituency. Now the Department of the Interior may have made an error, and may not have shown the surveys that have been made there, but I can assure him that

the constituency of Stony Plain, as it lies on the map, contains 10 organized school districts which are conducted year in and year out, and most of those school buildings are quite equal to any in any country locality in eastern or western Canada. There is no part of Manitoba or of the Northwest Territories that is more closely settled than the settled portion of this particular district of Stony Plain, and there is no part more successful in its farming operations. But my hon. friend, by the scratch of a pen, absolutely wipes it out of existence. He says that the district of Athabaska might be just as well represented by some one who lived somewhere else. Now if that argument of my hon. friend is to prevail, I suppose by the same reasoning some of the constituencies of Ontario and Quebec might be wiped out of existence because they are represented by non-residents, by gentlemen who live in Montreal and Quebec, or in Toronto. But the people of Stony Plain do not recognize that they are off the map, for they have been busy in selecting a resident candidate to represent them locally. My hon. friend mentioned some names as having some connection with this particular constituency. These gentlemen have no connection with it, and that only shows that my hon. friend is not careful in the arguments he puts before the House to support his contention.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I did not state that a resident of Edmonton was nominated for Stony Plain, I said for some constituency in the north, it may be Athabaska or Peace River, for aught I know.

Mr. OLIVER. I understood him to say that Mr. Boyle had been or was going to be nominated.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I said Mr. Boyle and Mr. Cross had been nominated in Edmonton to represent northern constituencies, and I thought that a third party had also been nominated—three men resident in the city of Edmonton are already nominated to represent three northern constituencies.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that. I do not know that any of them are nominated to represent three northern constituencies. The only constituencies I have knowledge of are those of Stony Plain and St. Albert, and in most cases I am given to understand that local men are in the field for those constituencies.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Has not Mr. Boyle been nominated ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not that I am aware of. However, when an hon. member has given the House such a deluge of information, it is not unfair that when I come to speak of a subject with which I am acquainted and he is not, I should state to the House that he has been somewhat astray in his conclusions; at any rate, that he has not shown that care in the presentation of his facts that was due to the House in dealing with so important a subject. I do not know that it is necessary to discuss in further detail the differences between the two ends of the district of Alberta. But my hon. friend has laid very much stress upon certain conditions which, he says, point to a large population in one part and small population in the other, and perhaps it may be right also to allude to some of these same matters. When he finds more post offices in the north than in the south he says that is no evidence of population ; it is only evidence that the Postmaster General has favoured that end of the country, and he proceeds to tell us of a certain town in his own constituency where the Postmaster General granted a post office simply because a lady asked him. If anything could be easier than that, I do not know what it is. I think, having regard to the action of the Postmaster General in granting post offices in his constituency, it is not fair of him to allege that the northern country has been favoured to a greater extent than the part where he says the population is, particularly when he tells us that in this great district of Athabaska, with an area greater than that of all the rest of the province of Alberta, the Postmaster General has only seen fit to grant one post office in three years. He can have his argument that way if he likes. Either the Postmaster General is stingy with post offices or he is liberal with post offices. If he is stingy with post offices, then northern Alberta has not got more than it is entitled to in proportion to the rest of the country ; and if he is liberal with post offices, then surely the south is advantaged more than the unfortunate district of Athabaska is. As a matter of fact, the question of the number of post offices has only an indirect bearing on the question. The district of Athabaska is traversed by two great rivers—the Athabaska and the Peace. I think my hon. friend said there was no travel in the country. These two rivers are navigated by lines of steamboats. There are plying on the waters of the Athabaska river within the proposed district of Athabaska four river steamers, one belonging to the Hudson Bay Company, one belonging to the firm of Cornwall & Woods, one belonging to the Roman Catholic mission and one belonging to the firm of Hislop & Nagle. On the Peace river they have three steamers, a large one and a small one belonging to the Hudson Bay Company and a small one belonging to the Roman Catholic mission. My hon. friend has undertaken to belittle the resources and people of the Peace river country. There is a purely agricultural settlement ; I will go so far as to say a more purely agricultural settlement than any existing in his constituency of Calgary, situated on the lower Peace river at Fort Vermilion, in latitude 57.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I may point out to the hon. minister that the returns show

that the constituency of Calgary yields more per acre than the constituency of Edmonton, and yet he says it is not a grain country.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to argue as between Calgary and Edmonton, but I merely say again, as I know his constituency, I think, certainly as well as he does, that the settlement of Vermilion, on the Peace river, is a settlement in which the people depend more entirely upon the results of the cultivation of the ground than does any settlement in the constituency which he represents. That is not saying anything as to the respective values of the two sections. I merely say that it is a strictly agricultural settlement situated on the lower Peace river, that there is a roller process flour mill run by steam, lighted by electricity, turning out flour for the northern trade equal to any that is produced in any part of the district of Alberta.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If you will refer to your own paper of January 10th, the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' you will find the condition of the country fairly stated there. They were not looking for representation then; they were looking for an experimental farm; and you will find on page 6 of the Edmonton 'Bulletin,' which is owned and published by the hon. gentleman, I believe, the following:

T. W. Lines brought up the matter of an experimental farm and wanted the government and the sitting members for Edmonton and Strathcona memorialized on the subject. Two years out of ten the mill of the company which he represented had been forced to shut down owing to a lack of grain free from frost. The local wheat millers were occasionally in the same position and had to import wheat. Our potatoes could not be sold in the Kootenay district. These things were due to the lack of information, &c.

So that when you are looking for an experimental farm and when you are looking for representation, your stories do not tally.

Mr. OLIVER. I was speaking of the Vermilion district, on the Peace river, and not of the Edmonton district. The hon. gentleman apparently does not like the facts I have given him and is endeavouring to direct attention somewhere else. We will discuss the question in regard to Edmonton later on if the hon. gentleman wishes, but at the present moment we are discussing the question of Vermilion, and I repeat that there is a roller process flour mill operating with the product of the settlement and supplying the trade of that country, which is not second in appointments or results to any mill in the district of Alberta.

Mr. INGRAM. What is the output?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell you what the output is. The capacity is about fifty barrels a day.

Mr. INGRAM. About seventy-five barrels a year, according to the statement made.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, that's all right. I think, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that the absurdity of the statement made by the hon. member is a sufficient answer to it. The idea that a steam mill would be taken by a company such as the Hudson Bay Company to that remote part of the world, and then only have a capacity of seventy-five barrels a year is sufficiently absurd to stamp at its proper value this or any other statement that the hon. gentleman makes.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman say that the mill that is referred to in this report is the mill that he is referring to now?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say, I am sure. I am not responsible for that report.

Mr. INGRAM. There is the report issued by the government, and the government's statement is the statement I have made. If it is not correct, it is not my fault; it is the fault of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. I had occasion to challenge a great many of the statements made by the gentleman who produced that report.

Mr. INGRAM. And you got the worst of it.

Mr. OLIVER. As a matter of fact, there was no effort made to establish his statements, either in the House or in the committee.

Mr. BARKER. You answered my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) that it was the Edmonton mill and not the Vermilion one.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I did not intend to answer him in that way. In regard to experimental farms, may I suggest to my hon. friend from Calgary that there have been applications, and very proper applications, before the Department of Agriculture to my knowledge ever since 1896 for the establishment of an experimental farm either in or contiguous to the district which he represents, and I do not think it is any discredit to the district that it should be so. The experimental farm at Indian Head is situated in a farming district, than which there is no better on this continent. And why is it any discredit to the agricultural capabilities of either the Edmonton or the Peace river district that the people there should be anxious for the establishment of an experimental farm? My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is driven to hard straits in support of his contention as to representation when he sees fit to attempt to discredit the agricultural capabilities of a country that is not subject to be discredited by the source from which the attempt comes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Your paper discredited it. I did not.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no discredit in stating facts, and there is nobody who is

acquainted with agriculture in this country or in any other who would suggest that farming operations are always a success; certainly no person who is acquanted with the conditions in any part of the Northwest Territories, not excepting the Indian Head district, to say nothing of the Calgary or Alberta districts. But this is not the argument which the hon. member is putting before the House. It has the evidence of unfair intent; an intent to prejudice the mind of the House and the country against a fair and square case. The gentlemen who put forward the contention that the representation of Alberta as it was in the local assembly was a proper representation, have established their position fairly well before the House. When eight constituencies only cast the vote of six constituencies, that is sufficient evidence as to the fairness of the distribution that was made on that occasion, I see that my friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) is becoming uneasy to get into this game.

Mr. HERRON. You are very much mistaken; I am trying to keep out of it.

Mr. OLIVER. I expect that in thunderous tones he will soon follow the argument of his friend from Calgary, and also declaim against the unfairness of this distribution, and possibly take his stand upon the fairness of the local distribution of 1902. I find, on looking at the distribution of 1902—that distribution which by the way was arrived at without a commission of judges, and of course was entirely without any partisan bias—that distribution gives the Macleod district which cast a vote of 1,700 or 1,800 at the last election, one representative, while it gives two representatives to the adjoining districts of Cardston and Lethbridge which together did not give as large a vote. Now, we may not have made a division absolutely to the line of a hair's breadth, but we certainly have made a distribution which shines by comparison with that made by our friends of the local assembly in 1902, if the case of the district of Macleod is to be considered. The district of Macleod has had to wait for this distribution in order to get justice.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Were these votes you mention, cast before the distribution of 1902.

Mr. OLIVER. No; last fall.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do you know what was the vote before the distribution of 1902?

Mr. OLIVER. There was no vote cast at the election of 1902; it was by acclamation I believe.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How could they tell then?

Mr. OLIVER. They had the census to go upon.

Mr. HERRON. There was an election held in 1902 in the Macleod district.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I think the hon. member is wrong.

Mr. HERRON. I am not.

Mr. P. TALBOT. I think Mr. Haultain was elected by acclamation.

Mr. HERRON. He was not. He ran against a man named Harris and that man lost his deposit.

Mr. HENDERSON. It was pretty near an acclamation.

Mr. OLIVER. The census was taken in 1901, and the distribution of 1902 was made immediately after the census. If I have been able to get the figures correctly, I find that if we take the census as a basis, the whole of the new province of Alberta south of the north line of township 8 has a population of 33,040, as against a population of 36,398 north of township 38. If we had taken the census in making this distribution, I submit we would have been justified, but we did not take the census because it was not the latest available information. We took the latest figures available and we arrived at the result now before the House. I submit that the contention as to an undue preponderance of representation to the north country which according to the census has a population of 36,398 as against a population of 33,040 in the south country, does not carry with it the imputation of unfairness. Taking the census, taking all the facts, taking the comparative areas, taking the railroad construction now in progress and the further railroad construction in prospect, there has been an eminently fair and an entirely satisfactory distribution of seats in the province of Alberta. It is too bad that the same percentage of undue advantage that was held by the southern country under the distribution of the local assembly, has not been continued. My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has stated frankly to the House that he thinks it should be, and the statement of his views in that regard is sufficient to convince the House as to the fairness with which he approaches this subject.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do my figures correspond with the local distribution?

Mr. OLIVER. I presume they do.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where is the unfairness?

Mr. OLIVER. The unfairness is that eight districts in the south have only as many votes as six districts in the north. We have taken the votes as cast either in the south or in the north as the first basis of calculation, then we have considered the area and we have considered the railroad prospects, and we have given them repre-

sentation accordingly. The assumption that the distribution made in 1902 was a good distribution bears its own condemnation on its face. As to homestead entries, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) thinks the homestead entries are in his favour he accepts them, but if he thinks they are against him he rejects them as a basis of calculation. I have inquired in the department and I find that in the country lying north of the district of Medicine Hat and west of the 4th principal meridian—the part principally occupied by the present district of Vermilion—in which my hon. friend suggests that there is practically no population, the records of the department show 6,000 homestead entries from the 4th meridian to range 18 and from township 38 to township 70. That is the part of the country which the hon. gentleman suggests is not entitled to representation at all.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What new constituency is that in ?

Mr. OLIVER. Vermilion, the greater part of it. That constituency is on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway part of which was graded last fall, the balance of which is being graded now, the iron on which will be laid this fall and any person who understands anything about the progress of settlement in that country and knows the character of that country, every foot of it a good agricultural country, will know that in the nature of things there must have been a very large entry of homesteaders along that line of railroad.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is that all farming country ?

Mr. OLIVER. All farming country, every foot of it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Because I have a report here of Mr. Jackson who sits in that House, which does not bear out that statement.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not particular about Mr. Jackson's report ; I am particular about the fact that people are homesteading along the line in hundreds and thousands.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Actual settlers ? How do you know that ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the reports of people who travel up and down the line in the course of their business and by the returns of the land office. My hon. friend will have to accept some facts bearing against his case even although they are unpleasant. I will leave it to this committee or to any member of the House if it is a possibility that a railway shall be under construction through a good agricultural country and that that country shall not receive a very large accession of population because of that construction. That is an actual fact and there is no gainsaying it. I do not know what Mr. Jackson has reported in regard to that country but my hon. friend must know, or he would know if he had lived in the west a little longer than he has, that there are many parts of his own district and many parts of the adjoining district of Alberta which five, six or seven years ago nobody would have reported as being suited for farming, but these are lands that are to-day cultivated and producing abundant crops so that a report made some years ago in regard to any part of the country is subject to revision. It is not a question of report, however, it is a question of actual fact, the settlement upon the land.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The report I refer to was in 1903, not some years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. That is some years ago. Let me draw attention to a matter which was alluded to by the Prime Minister. The district of Rosebud which is a little north of Calgary and in the hon. member's district cast a vote of 732 at the last Dominion elections, and in the census that district is credited with the population of 1,036. That district at the time the census was taken was not considered by the incoming people as suitable for agriculture, but the hon. member knows and we all know that that district to-day is the home of a very large population, and that the vote actually cast is not a fair index of the total number of people. What has occurred there has occurred in other parts of the country ; because the hon. member has not seen it, because he has not been told it, it does not follow that it is not so. It is a fact that our country has been growing in all its parts and not only in this or that part. In reference to the southern part of the country I have some figures here that I think may bear upon the question. One part of the country is valuable for one reason and another part for another reason. The southern country is valuable primarily as a ranching country, and secondarily as a farming country. A ranching country, in the nature of things, is not suited to dense settlement as is a farming country; that goes without saying and I suppose my hon. friend will not contend to the contrary. Since my hon. friend has been digging into the records of the department I may also, and I notice that south of Red Deer there are under grazing lands in that country one and a half million acres of land and that there have been applied for in the department five and a half million acres of land suitable for grazing and thereby not supposedly suitable for farming.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are you granting them ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is another question.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. That is what I would like to know.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall tell that later.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Do not postpone it too long.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall not be long; we do not keep you waiting long. The evidence that the southern country of which my hon. friend properly speaks highly has received a large accession of population in recent years is not subject, and in the nature of things cannot be subject, to that density of population which the purely agricultural Saskatchewan valley is subject to. That is something that cannot be gainsaid and when we consider this matter we are bound to consider it in the light of facts and not of imagination.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What portion of the country do you mean by the Saskatchewan valley, the mere valley of the river or what? You can throw a cat across the river.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend forgets that he is not speaking in a court just now.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I want to know.

Mr. OLIVER. He does not need to ask to know that when you speak of the valley you speak of the drainage. It is not of the river, not of the mere bed in which the river flows that you speak in that way.

In regard to the points at which there are settlements in the districts of Athabaska and Peace River, I wish to inform my hon. friend that there are settlements in the proposed district of Athabaska at Slave Lake, Whitefish Lake, Waluseau, Calling Lake, Grand Rapids, Mehumay, Red River, Cheyboyan, Fond du Lac, Smith's Landing, in Peace River at Sturgeon Lake, Grand Puine, Spirit River, Quinegan, Peace River, Crossing, Wolverine Point, Hayward, Vermilion, Little Red River.

As has already been said by the premier it is absolutely impossible for any man adequately to represent or intelligently secure the representation of these two districts. It is possible for two men to do so. The two rivers offer means of communication. They represent two diverse interests. Along the Athabaska the country is not supposed to be agricultural; it is a mineral, timber and fur-bearing and fishing country, it has a larger population at the present time. The Peace River is a country of great agricultural possibilities and of great agricultural prospects and looking to the develop- of that northern country it would be most manifestly unfair that the representation of the agricultural Peace River country should be placed at the disposal of the vote of the Athabaska river country. If we are going to do the fair and reasonable thing by this province, we must give representation according to the interests to the affected, according to the development to be secured and to ignore the possibilities and the necessities of that immense area of country on the argument put forward by my hon. friend, because there is only one post office, because it would cost some money to hold the elections there, because the representation can be made just as well by somebody who knows nothing about it as by somebody who does—I say these I think are not arguments that will appeal to this committee or to the House. I think we have made a representation that will appeal to the fair-minded people of Alberta as giving representation according to population and according to the diversity of interest and the area and progress of the province. The contention that an injustice has been done I submit has not been made out before the House. I submit it cannot be made out, and as I said in the beginning it would certainly be a very fortunate body of judges who would give a decision favourable to a proposal now before the House and escape criticism as active partisans by hon. gentlemen when their position had been ignored.

Mr. AMES. As one of those members who have been, with the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), working out calculations from the figures which have formed the basis of this discussion, I desire to contribute my views to this debate on somewhat the same lines. I do not profess to have as intimate a knowledge of the country as has my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, but on the other hand I am not altogether in ignorance of our great west, having on several occasions visited the provinces in question. Deeming it of the greatest importance that this House, in defining the electoral divisions for the new provinces should act with absolute fairness, and being firmly convinced that the proposition of the government is not an absolutely fair one, I wish to point out in what respects I consider it wanting.

We are about to form a new province, we are about to create a local government for that province, and it is essential that we should provide for a fair representation of the popular will in this new legislature we are about to call into being. It is for this ostensible object that the government has submitted the schedule we are now discussing; and in criticising the schedules and the method of their preparation, the opposition are acting strictly within their duty. We propose what we believe to be a much fairer method. We on this side demand that this question be left to a commission of judges, who shall arrange the boundaries of the constituencies, and we do this in the belief that thereby the people will be satisfied and the ends of justice achieved. As I have said, the opposition criticise, in the first place, the method by which this schedule was prepared and submitted to this House. We have the plan, we have the schedule, but there is no official authorization of any kind. We do not know whence it came, as far as that is indicated by anything on the face of it at

least. It bears the stamp of no commission, of no official investigation ; it is simply given to us, and we are told to take it as we will. But if report be true, that schedule was prepared several months ago. If we are to believe current rumour, it was incubated in room 48 of this House, it emanated from under the hands of the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) at that time, and it comes to this House—as they themselves acknowledge—the product of their ingenuity.

Mr. OLIVER. Will my hon. friend allow me to correct him ? I did not say that it comes to the House as a product of our ingenuity. I said that we gave advice to the government and were responsible for the advice we gave, but I did not say that it was followed.

Mr. AMES. Will my hon. friend point out in what respect that advice was departed from ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not see why I should. We are here supporting the Bill and there is no need why we should go behind it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Will you point out wherein your advice in any particular was not accepted by the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is not any part of my duty.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Is the Bill in any particular different from the one originally prepared ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not here to answer questions of that nature. I am supporting the Bill as it stands, and am responsible for the advice I gave with regard to it.

Mr. AMES. I take it that the Minister of the Interior will not entirely deny the soft impeachment that he was largely, if not wholly, instrumental with his colleague from Strathcona in the preparation of this schedule, and that the government, having the greatest consideration for the knowledge and sense of justice of himself and his colleague, accepted their recommendations almost entirely. We may take that for granted. We would like also to know whether any one else was consulted in the preparation of this schedule and to what extent. We have heard that the premier of the Northwest Territories (Mr. Haultain) was present at a meeting, but we do not know that his advice was accepted to any extent. We would also like to know if the advice of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), which might have been given if asked for, was requested by the hon. minister. The hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) seems to have been asked with regard to his own corner of the province, whether he was satisfied, the night before the schedule was submitted to the House. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) seems to have been left altogether out of the deliberation, although he has shown us he has some knowledge of the conditions obtaining in the west and would therefore be one whose opinion should be of some value. It would be interesting to know also whether the local members of the constituencies—the 14 or 15 which fall within the new province—were consulted, or whether their constituencies are to be carved out without their co-operation in any way. We also should know whether any opportunity was given for interested parties to be heard, whether delegations were invited, or any opportunity given those who may have felt agrieved in the matter to make their views known. It would appear that this schedule had been prepared without that wide opportunity having been given interested parties which we might expect in such a delicate matter. In fact it is evident that the hon. the Minister of the Interior, somewhat like Moses of old, has come down with his tables of stone and asks us to accept them as though carved by divine power, and as though they were too sacred to be altered in the least jot or tittle by any profane hand. I only hope that before the debate is through, the Minister of the Interior will follow the precedent of the law giver of old and find it advisable to dash his tables of stone to the ground and get new ones.

But the opposition have been invited by the Prime Minister to point out wherein they think the government are not acting wisely in the words which he uttered at the opening of this debate. On the 8th May, 1905, the right hon. gentleman said : I believe it is the intention of the government to give substantial justice to all parties concerned. Let us then start on that basis. The First Minister has expressed, not only his own desire, but no doubt the desire also of his colleagues, to do justice in this redistribution ; and therefore in the hope that, if we show that injustice is done, he will be the first to remedy it, we shall continue the discussion.

It is not an easy task to divide a province into electoral divisions. Certainly it is not an easy task to do so justly, although we might almost imagine from the extent of the injustice in this schedule that it had been an easy task. The government, in clause 12 of the Bill, have given us two of the factors which they have evidently taken into consideration in dealing with this matter, namely, that the electoral divisions shall be defined with due regard to the distribution of population and existing local divisions, which we take to mean the divisions in the Northwest legislature at present. But there are other factors which should be taken into consideration in making distribution. There are the physical features of the country. It is inadvisable that a mountain range, for example, should separate two parts of a constituenncy, or that an unfordable river should cut it in twain, and it is equally inad-

visable to divide a town so that a part falls in one constituency and a part in another, and so that the citizens shall be compelled to go many miles north for registration in one case and many miles south in the other.

It is necessary also to consider means of communication; for it is advisable that as far as possible the same line of communication should serve those who are found in the same constituency. It also follows that where there are no means of communication and where it is unlikely that there will be any for many years to come, one should think twice before endeavouring to establish constituencies, knowing the grave difficulties that must necessarily follow. Then, it is necessary to consider the representation of interests. We find many and varied interests in this rich province of Alberta—the ranching and the farming, the urban and the rural, the mining, the irrigation, the fur trading, and so on. In these interests there are large sums of money invested, and an effort should be made to see that each of these interests is represented in the new House by some one who is permitted and able to speak for it. And it must not altogether be lost sight of that there are immense amounts of capital in some of the old constituencies, which are to some extent entitled to representation; for certainly investments will form a large portion of the consideration of the new House, and a territory sparsely populated, or practically not populated at all, can hardly have the same interest in the legislation as can a constituency in which large capital is invested. Then, ethnological conditions need to be considered. It is inadvisable to submerge a portion of the population which is to some extent homogeneous. It is advisable that they should be so placed so as to have representation by one of themselves. All these are considerations that have to be taken into account when dealing with the distribution of the representation of a province. We are not inclined to place the same stress on more area that the hon. Minister of Interior does. Vacant land does not contribute to the revenue of a country nor supply votes, and we fail to see how we are justified in the present case in anticipating, in the rosy manner in which the hon. Minister of the Interior has done, the possible filling up at some future date of this northern country. The hon. minister has argued that such representation should be given in the new legislature because of the development that is about to take place in that northern country. Well, I submit that the legislature which will be elected by the people of Alberta will be thoroughly competent to deal with measures for the development of that northern country, whether it has a representative or not. Surely, if there be matters which require the attention of the local legislature, they will be dealt with in the regular way. The hon. minister has also drawn attention to the British Columbia analogy, and has spoken of that portion of British Columbia which lies north and east of the Rocky Mountains. Possibly the hon. minister does not remember that the hon. member who sits in this House for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) has a constituency which is bounded on the south by the American boundary line and on the north by the Yukon, and yet, when he canvasses for votes, he does not go higher than 100 or 125 miles north of the Thompson river, nor does he attempt to canvass or give representation to that part of Yale-Cariboo which lies north and east of the Rocky Mountains. The people of British Columbia take the sensible course of attaching this unorganized territory to an organized territory; and if the hon. Minister of the Interior would arrange to have the unorganized territory of Peace River attached to St. Albert and the unorganized territory of Athabaska attached to Sturgeon, the two western of these districts forming one constituency lying east of the Rocky Mountains, and the others forming one further to the east of these——

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman contend that northern British Columbia is not represented directly in the legislature?

Mr. AMES. I was speaking of the representative of Yale-Cariboo in this House.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman include in his remarks the representation in the local legislature of British Columbia?

Mr. AMES. I would ask the hon. member whether the portion of British Columbia that lies east and north of the Rocky Mountains has a representative of its own in the provincial House?

Mr. OLIVER. It forms part, I believe, of the electoral district of Cassiar.

Mr. AMES. And I will ask another question: Is there any attempt made to organize or get any vote for that portion of British Columbia lying north and east of the Rocky Mountains?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not tell you that.

Mr. AMES. None whatever. For local purposes it may be attached to Cassiar, but no attempt is made to organize it for electoral purposes.

Now, the hon. minister has spoken of the prospective increase, and on that basis has attempted to give us reasons why there should be seven constituencies north of the North Saskatchewan river, where there were only three before. I think we shall have at the outset to say plainly that we are dealing with present conditions and not discounting the future. It may be a popular amusement in Edmonton to decide what town lots will be worth ten years from now; but at the present moment we are dealing with facts and fig-

ures as we find them, and this is the reason why: because clause 12 of this Bill reads: 'Until the said legislature otherwise provides.' Now, the hon. minister knows perfectly well that within six months after the passage of this Bill the people of Alberta will be called upon to choose their first legislature. He knows that that legislature will be chosen on the conditions as they are to-day, or rather as they were last year, because the later comers cannot vote. He knows, therefore, that the powers given by this Bill will be exhausted with that first act of the first legislature, and from that time forward will be null and void; because there is before this House a Bill which states that in the month of June, in the year 1906, there will be a census of the population of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba taken by the Minister of Agriculture. Now, it is perfectly well known that this legislature is to be chosen upon existing conditions, and that one of the first acts of this legislature, after the census of 1906 becomes public, will be if necessary, to carry out a distribution of seats. He knows that hereafter the newly created legislature will be the sole authority to divide the province of Alberta for local electoral purposes. Six months from this time the powers given in this Bill will practically cease to exist, consequently this prospective increase is a matter we have no right to discuss. Then, the minister tells us that one railroad is coming in this year, that another is coming in two years, and another in three years. We have to deal with actual facts as they are, and hence discounting the future is not pertinent to the discussion.

Now, I think I have shown that there are a great many different considerations which have to be weighed when a province is about to be divided into constituencies, and I think we shall realize as a House that we are not adapted for dealing with questions of that character. With all due deference to the knowledge and good intentions of the members of this House, I submit that a division of that character is one that should be made by an independent judicial body which has some knowledge of local conditions. There are 215 members of this House. How many of these have ever been in Alberta or know anything about the local conditions there? Here we have a very important measure affecting the interests of probably 200,000 people. Is there any bar provided before which these people can come and be heard and make their grievances known ? This is a matter which should be given the fullest possible discussion, and the people vitally interested should be given an opportunity to be heard. But no such opportunity is now given them. Further than that, with all due deference to parliament, I do not think it can be characterized as a wholly non-partisan body. I do not think the members of this House are likely to approach this question having absolutely divested themselves of political bias. This Bill has been presented in a very simple way. One man fathers it, his views are imposed upon the cabinet, the cabinet having accepted them, force them upon the party, and the party having a majority in parliament forces it upon the country. That is one-man-rule in a matter so important as this which relates to the future of 200,000 people. Now I submit that is not the manner in which a question of this importance should be dealt with. We desire to have a commission appointed of men of wide knowledge and of legal training, men who have given their lives to weighing judicial questions, and are prepared to deal with them in an impartial way, men before whom these people interested can come and plead their cause ; and when that tribunal has been provided we of the opposition are perfetly willing to accept without a murmur the finding, whatever it may be. The minister has intimated that his finding would pass a board of judges. If it passes a board of judges, there will be nothing further said. But I am very much mistaken if there are three judges in any province of the Dominion who would accept after hearing all the evidence, the schedule which the minister has submitted.

There is another point which comes out in this discussion. We have seen statements made and challenged, figures offered and refuted. Where are we ? Who is right? Who has counted these figures correctly ? Simply the majority. They may be wrong, it is possible for a majority to be wrong. But if there were a commission of judges to weigh the statements of all parties which might be submitted to them, who would be in a position to examine witnesses and documents, and be able to obtain full information, they would then decide where the truth lay, and would act accordingly.

Now I want to submit some evidence to prove that commissions have been tried elsewhere and have proved most successful. We, as a part of the British Empire, cannot do badly in following some of our sister colonies in their manner of dealing with questions of this character. We have been accustomed especially to look to Australia for experiments relating to the ballot law, and all things electoral. We have taken our ballot system from that country. Now suppose we consult them relating to legislation of this kind. Some twenty years ago, in New Zealand, it was decided that the fairest possible way to distribute constituencies was to leave it to a commission. In 1892 New South Wales followed the example of New Zealand, and at that time the Hon. R. E. O'Connor, who introduced a government measure, thus spoke of the way in which the system had worked in New Zealand :

> The principle of the schedule of electorates is open to very great objection, and the principle

which we have adopted is one that has been working very satisfactorily in New Zealand for some time. That is this : three commissioners are appointed who are members of the civil service. They are in no way under political control. They make the subdivision of the electorates. . . . These commissioners have the power of fixing the electorates in that way, and they divide the country into 125 electorates returning 125 members.

In consequence of the success of New Zealand, the government of New South Wales presented a Bill in 1892, which was duly passed, and that is the method now in operation in New South Wales. It may be worth while to indicate some of the main lines on which the distribution of New South Wales is carried out. I will make a few citations from the Act 56 Vic, 1892-3, No. 38, of the statutes of New South Wales.

Within thirty days from the passing of this Act, and thereafter when any distribution of electoral districts shall become necessary under the provisions of this Act, the government shall, by commission under the great seal, appoint three persons, each of whom shall be qualified as an elector in and for some electoral district of New South Wales, according to the law in force at the time of the appointment, to be commissioners for the purposes of this parliament and to be called 'the electoral district commissioners.' The persons so to be appointed shall be chosen by the government from persons then holding some office in the public service of New South Wales. And the names of the persons so appointed, and of all persons hereafter appointed as such commissioners, shall be published in the 'Gazette.'

It shall be the duty of the commissioners, and they are hereby directed, to distribute New South Wales into electoral districts for the purposes of this Act, within three months after the passing of this Act, and thereafter, within three months after the results of every census of the population of New South Wales shall have been ascertained and reported to the Colonial Secretary, which the government statistician is hereby required to do as early as possible after such census shall have been taken, and such distribution shall take effect when approved by resolution of the legislative assembly.

Now that is the way in which the distribution was made, and you will see upon what they base it.

The total number of members to be elected to serve in the assembly shall be 125. The quota of electors for the purposes of this Act shall be ascertained in the following manner—for the purposes of the first distribution, the quota shall be ascertained by dividing by 125 the total number of persons enrolled on the electoral rolls. . . . And the quota for every subsequent distribution shall be ascertained by dividing by 125 the total number of electors on the rolls in force for the time being.

Two very important principles therefore are carried out in this Bill. After they have found the total number of persons enrolled on the list and divided it by the total number of constituencies, and having established the quota, then they make their boundaries.

Mr. AMES.

Every such district shall have such an area that, at the time of making such distribution, the number of persons enrolled therein shall, subject to the margin of allowance hereinafter contained, reach the prescribed quota.

That certainly seems to be as fair a proposition as can possibly be offered. Now supposing that method were applied to Alberta. We have there 25 seats, the quota of electors will be ascertained by dividing the total number by 25. Assuming that Peace River and Athabaska would contain 300 qualified electors each, which we believe to be beyond the mark, there would be 30,550 electors on the list which was used on the 3rd of November, 1904, affording a quota of 1,222. If we were adopting the method prevailing in New South Wales, we would then divide our constituencies so that each one would contain as nearly as possible 1,222 of the names on the electoral lists. If, however, we take the twelve southern constituencies according to the schedule which is laid on the table, we find they have 16,662 qualified electors, they would therefore be entitled to 14 members instead of 12. On the other hand, we find the 13 northern constituencies containing 13,945 electors, and they are to receive 13 representatives, whereas they should receive but 11 representatives. If this eminently fair Australian method were adopted we would have no objection to make. If the total number of names upon the Alberta list were divided by the total number of constituencies, and the boundaries were made so as to include in each one of these constituencies the quota of electors, nothing fairer could be asked for. But unfortunately that is not done.

Now the latest constitution that has been give nto any of the self-governing British colonies is that which was a few days ago granted to the Transvaal. I read from the 'Spectator' of April 29, 1905 :

The electoral districts will be framed upon the basis of the number of voters, and a commission will be appointed to draw their boundaries. Finally the constituencies will be redistributed every four years in accordance with the fluctuations in the number of voters as established by the biennial registration lists.

Mr. Lyttleton, the colonial secretary, in his communication which appears in the London 'Times' of the 26th April, 1905, further describes the method as follows :

A commission will be appointed to create from thirty to thirty-five electoral districts upon the principle of an equal number of voters, and for the purpose of enabling voters' lists to be compiled in advance. An Order in Council has been passed, making the necessary provision for registration of voters. This commission will give due consideration to boundaries of existing administrative divisions, and will have power to adopt, in settling the boundaries of electoral districts, a margin of ten per cent of the quota of voters.

This new Transvaal constitution is considered to be the product of all the experi-

ence of the British Crown in many centuries in dealing with unorganized or sparsely populated sections, and it has been decided that the fairest possible way of making the division is to base it on the number of names on the electoral list, find the quota and afterwards make the boundaries.

I wish, in further support of this argument —that a reference to a commission is the best way in which to perform this task—to quote from American experience. A great many of those who are at the present time coming over the boundary into Alberta are accustomed to the institutions that prevail to the south of us. We do not always imitate our cousins to the south of us but in some cases possibly they might well be imitated, and I think that many Americans coming into Alberta, who have lived in north and south Dakota, on becoming acquainted with this schedule as the method under which they are to cast their first votes, will decide that the method which prevailed at home was the better one.

Whenever it is decided that a territory shall be admitted as a state it is necessary that the sanction of the two parties shall be given, the people of the state and the people of the union. The people of the state are usually already registered on the electoral list for the territory, and it becomes necessary to choose delegates to represent them at a convention. The following extract from the United States statutes at large, volume XXV., chapter 180, shows the manner of choosing these delegates :

> And the aforesaid delegates to form said conventions shall be apportioned within the limits of the proposed states in such districts as may be established as hereinafter provided in proportion to the population in each of said counties and districts, as near as may be, at the time of making said apportionment by the persons hereinafter authorized to make the same, from the best information obtainable, in each of which districts three delegates shall be elected, and so forth. . . . Said apportionment shall be made by the governor, the chief justice and the secretary of the said territories.

The Governor, representing the United States ; the Secretary of the Territories, representing the best informed local authority, and the chief justice, who will add to this commission the judicial element. That is the way in which constituencies in the Dakotas were divided, and nothing could be fairer, inasmuch as it is done by a commission which was entirely removed from any political bias.

Now, the idea of a commission is not altogether a foreign proposition even to the present government. I am sorry to say that the government have reverted from a principle which they at one time advocated. When they had come freshly into power they had many new ideas of reform which were shortly to be put into effect. Some were attempted, but were later abandoned. This is one of these. In 1899 the liberal administration, which we have now, believed it advisable that there should be a redistribution in view of the coming elections of 1900. This was to affect particularly the province of Ontario, and this is the way they proposed that it should be done. Bill 126 was presented in the House of Commons. This measure was to give the city of Hamilton two members, it was to give the city of Toronto five members, it was to give to eight of the counties of Ontario—Brant, Elgin and others—two members each, and it was to give to seven other counties of Ontario—Huron, Bruce and others—three members each. How did the government propose that the five constituencies of Toronto should be divided ? This is what they suggested :

> Where, under the foregoing provisions, any county or city is to be divided into more than one electoral district, such divisions shall be made by a board of commissioners, consisting of at least three persons, being judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario, who, for that purpose, shall be appointed by letters patent under the great seal.

What was the government's proposition ? They said we will decide that the city of Toronto shall have five members, that the city of Hamilton shall have two members ; we will not undertake to divide these cities up into constituencies, but we will leave that to a commission of judges, in whom we have every confidence. At that time the right hon. First Minister himself and the hon. Postmaster General defended this proposition. Said the right hon. Prime Minister, on the 19th May, 1899 :

> The judges, so far as the city of Toronto is concerned, as well as other constituencies, which have to be divided, will divide the municipal city of Toronto into four ridings, taking into consideration the census of 1891, and the convenience of the population, so as to do substantial justice, so far as it is possible to do it.

Again he says :

> The instructions given to the judges, as my hon. friend no doubt knows by this time, are general. It is impossible to divide counties into ridings which will have exactly the same population, but I assume, and I hope also, that it will be the duty of the judges to make the ridings as equal as possible in population.

This Bill was presented to the House by the hon. Postmaster General and supported in a speech by the right hon. First Minister. Why should not the government apply the principles then enunciated on this occasion ? We would not object if the government at this time would put in practice their own doctrine, which they supported in 1899. Let the government give the southern half of Alberta twelve members, let them give the northern half twelve members, let them give to that part of Assiniboia, which is to be taken in, one member, and then let them leave it to a commission of judges to divide these twelve constituencies in the north and these twelve constituencies in the south, and I will guarantee that there will be no trouble.

Now, the people of Alberta, (if we can judge at all from what we read in the newspapers from the west, and particularly from these proposed provinces), the people of Alberta had somewhat got the idea that they were going to have a commission which would delimit these constituencies, and it is not difficult to show by quotations from some of the papers that this is what the local desire calls for. Also we can readily prove, from the same sources, that the people of Alberta are grievously disappointed with the action of the government in this respect. I wish to submit a few of the figures which show why the people of Alberta are disappointed. I have not made my calculations in quite the same way as my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has made his, but they are made, I think, with equal care and effort, and I may say that they are the work of many weeks on the part of the members upon this side of the House. We have not relied on any officials. We have made our own calculations we have checked and rechecked, and I think our schedule will stand the test. We have made independent calculations, which I do not think can be in any way broken down. In the first place, I want to reiterate what I have already said, that we are not discounting the future. We are dealing with things as they are; consequently, the figures which we should look for are the figures as they exist. What is the extent and character of this country that we are called upon to deal with? Here we have a stretch of territory, 360 miles of which is settled, because there is practically no settlement, as there is no survey, beyond township 60. We have this district extending from the 4th meridian to the Rocky mountains, which is populated as far north as 360 miles from the border. This section of country was by parliament, 3 Edward VII., chapter 60, divided, in 1903, into four constituencies.

Obviously the division could not have been unfair for the Liberals because at that time that section of the country was represented by four Liberals in this House. The dividing line of these four constituencies was township 34, and Calgary and Alberta are south of township 34 and Strathcona and Edmonton north. The schedule that has been submitted by the Minister of Interior gives fourteen and a half members in the local house north of 34 and ten and a half members south of 34, while we claim that the natural division would be to give the same number north and south. I want first to submit estimates that are based upon population, and I am of course compelled to resort to figures which are furnished by local authorities and which if they be challenged by the government it is the duty of the government to show are incorrect. In the 'Northern Albertan,' a Liberal paper published in Calgary, on the 11th of May, 1905, there is an attempt to give the population of the constituencies according to the so called Oliver schedule. We find that the ten constituencies which lie south of township 34, viz.: Cardston, Pincher, Macleod, Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, High River, Calgary (city), Gleichen, Banff and Rosebud, have a population of 120,000. In the 14 constituencies north of line 34: Red Deer, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, Leduc, Strathcona, Vermilion, Saskatchewan, Sturgeon, St. Albert, Peace River, Athabaska, and Edmonton (city), there is a population of 100,300. If we take the new constituency of Innisfail out of the calculation because it lies north and south of township 34, we would have 120,000 south and 100,300 north, and Innisfail in the middle with 10,000, would give 230,300 in all which is what the 'Northern Albertan' calculates the present population to be. If we consider Innisfail as a neutral constituency then we have 52 per cent of the population south of it and 43½ per cent of the population north, and yet it is proposed to give 14 members to the north and 10 members to the south. If you take the total population of these constituencies as estimated by the 'Northern Albertan' at 230,300 you find that the average for each constituency is 9,212. I would like to know where the fairness comes in when 120,000 pople in the south get 10 representatives and 100 000 in the north have 14 representatives?

There is another calculation of population which appears in the Medicine Hat 'Times' of the 23rd of May, 1905, which apparently has been prepared with great care because every figure is carried out to the end. Here again we have the 24 constituencies; here again we have Innisfail laid aside for the moment because it is on the boundary line, and the ten constituencies on the south are given a population of 89,834, while the 14 constituencies on the north are given a population of 75,590. It is proposed here to give 14 representatives to 75,590 people and 10 representatives to 89,834 people. Is that fair play? This calculation gives the total population including Innisfail at 172,853. I want to ask, as one searching for information, why should it require 9,000 people in the south to have a representative, when 5,400 people in the north are thought good enough to have a member. I do not know the country very well, but is there such a difference between the calibre of the people of the north and the people of the south that it takes 9,000 people in the south to have one representative while it only takes 5,400 people in the north to have a representative?

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman want an answer?

Mr. AMES. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Because such a large number of the 9,000 are imaginary people.

Mr. AMES. You will have to settle that with the Medicine Hat 'Times.' Let us

take another calculation: let us take up the calculation of the number of names on the lists. I think that is admitted to be the most obviously fair method of making a division; it has been so considered in New Zealand, it has been so considered in New South Wales, it has been so considered in the Transvaal, it has been so considered in the territories of the American union. I never heard before, and I do not think any member of this House ever heard before, of an estimate based on the number of votes cast, because it can be easily seen that the number will vary greatly on account of circumstances peculiar to each constituency. We find altogether that there were about 30,000 names on the voters' lists and the quota is 1,222. Therefore the country should be so divided that each constituency would contain 1,222 names upon its voters' lists. We find that the ten southern constituencies have 14,242 names on their lists, but the 14 northern constituencies—taking it for granted that Peace River and Athabaska by a superhuman effort might produce 300 each—have 15,040 names on their voters' lists. In other words the quota being 1,222 the average of each constituency in the south is 1,424 and the average in the north is 1,074. Might I ask, why it requires 350 more names on the list of a southern constituency to have a representative, than it does in a northern constituency.

Mr. HENDERSON. Because it is not imaginary.

Mr. SPROULE. Because they want to keep the capital in the north.

Mr. AMES. This afternoon figures were brought down by the Prime Minister which did not exactly tally with ours but which were not essentially different. I have taken the government figures in order to make a calculation and I find that in the south we have 10 constituencies with a total of 14,657 voters or an average in each constituency of 1,465, while we have in the 13 northern constituencies 15,271 voters or an average in each constituency of 1,174. The quota is 1,300. Why does it require 1,465 voters in the south for one member while 1,174 is sufficient in the north? We on this side of the House found it necessary to make our own calculation, and we found it necessary for two reasons. First, because we desired to become familiar with the facts ourselves, and secondly because we felt there could not be all the possible confidence in the world placed upon the figures as given by the government. Now let me show you an instance which confirms our suspicions. On the 14th of June, I asked in the House, how many names of qualified voters appeared on each of the lists used November 3, 1904, for the electoral districts of Alberta, Calgary, Strathcona and Edmonton, and the Prime Minister replied: that in Alberta, there were 3,473. It was a little difficult to credit that statement, because in that election Mr. Herron received 1,755 votes, Mr. McKenzie, 1,677, 41 were rejected and 39 spoiled, making the total number of votes cast in the election 3,512. And yet the Prime Minister says that there were only 3,473 names upon the list. If that is the way computations are made we find it necessary to make independent calculations.

We now come to the matter of the votes cast. I find that in the same ten southern constituencies 9,796 votes were cast or an average of 979, but that in the 12 northern constituencies 9,867 were polled or an average of 822. 895 is the mean for 23 constituencies. Why should it be necessary in the south to have 157 more electors than the mean when it is permitted to have 73 less than the mean in the north? The Minister of the Interior has attempted to defend this method of division by the number of votes cast. Of all the methods, that is the one which will come nearest to justifying his proposed schedule and for that reason I suppose it has been selected, but it is so obviously unfair to the south that I think it is advisable we should make this matter also patent to the House. You have only to look at some percentages to see the difference between the number of names on the list and the number of votes cast. For example, the High River constituency which is largely devoted to ranching only polled 63 per cent, and Macleod, another ranching constituency, 64 per cent of the names on the list. Stony Plain of which we have heard, managed to get in 78 per cent, and St. Albert succeeded in polling 77 per cent of its vote. There are some very peculiar features about this which make it still more apparent why this basis of calculation was used. In the northern part they not only voted the whole list but more. In Cracow, a name which shows that it is largely inhabited by Poles who helped to swell the hon. gentleman's majority, there were 113 names on the list and 100 cast. In Sallman, 19 were cast and there are 17 on the list. In Kensington 82 were cast and 52 on the list. In Wetaskiwin there were 282 cast and 266 on the list, in Rosenthal, 52 cast and 44 on the list; at Stony Plain Schoolhouse, 50 cast and 47 on the list; East Saskatchewan, 230 cast and 221 on the list. Poll 22, St. Albert cast 206 votes, although there were only 193 on the list. I can readily see under these circumstances why it should be deemed advisable for the minister to attempt to defend his schedule by considering the number of votes cast, but unfortunately the people of the south apparently had overlooked the fact that a distribution was coming. The minister has mentioned Cardston, which had a small vote in the south. If I understand, this is a Liberal constituency surrounded by several of another character, and there might be danger in the event of Cardston being enlarged that it would no

longer remain Liberal and consequently it is left untouched.

It is sometimes maintained that cities should not be entitled to the same representation as rural constituencies. We are always subjected to such treatment in Montreal and are not given representation in any way commensurate with our population, and so if in this particular case we should deduct from the figures given us in the Medicine Hat 'Times,' the figures for the cities of Calgary and Alberta which as I understand, may be overlooked for the purposes of an estimate, we find that the nine southern constituencies contained, 79,334 or an average of 8,815. We would consider Innisfail again as neutral and would deduct Edmonton from the north which would give 13 constituencies with a population of 67,590 or an average of 5,199. Might I ask why a rural constituency in the south requires an average of 8,815 in order to have a representative while a rural constituency in the north has a representation for every 5,199 ? Why require 3,616 more in the south than in the north ?

A great deal of time has been spent to-night in discussing the relative rapidity with which the north and the south are filling, and the homestead entries are taken as affording the best basis of comparison. It is not advisable to take the homestead entries of the last 20 years. We have a better test of population in the various distributions, so it is only necessary to take the homestead entries for the last two years or parts thereof. It is easy to make this calculation because the present district of Alberta is almost entirely covered by the Lethbridge, Calgary, Red Deer and Edmonton agencies. A very small portion of Battleford is west of the fourth, but on the other hand a considerable portion of Medicine Hat as we know is also west of principal meridian 4. It is very easy therefore, for us to calculate the returns of the Calgary and Lethbridge offices which are found south of township 34, and compare them with the returns of the Red Deer office which are north of 34. We find that in 1903-4 for the southern part, Lethbridge and Calgary, there were 4,386 homestead entries; in the northern part 3,815, a total of 8,261, of which 53½ per cent lie in the south and 46½ per cent in the north. In 1903-4, as judged by the homestead entries, the south increased much more rapidly than the north. The minister spoke of the homestead entries being brought down to the 31st of March, 1905. We will bring them to this date. That adds nine months to the previous calculation. That gives you for the last 21 months for the south 7,277, and for the north 6,978. Consequently the two southern agencies in the list during the last 21 months have had more entries passed through them than the two northern agencies. Reference has been made to Battleford. Some large figures have been given in connection with it, and the other day a return was brought down in this House which stated that up the 23rd of January, 1905, there had been 2,847 homestead entries for the Battleford part. If the populations all told were fairly equal when the parliamentary distribution into four constituencies was made, and when the distribution into local constituencies was made, more especially the former, and if as we see by the homestead entries the population during the last 21 months has been flowing in greater numbers into the southern than into the northern portion why do we now give 10½ members below and 14½ above township 34 ? The hon. member speaks of the prospective increase when the railways come in. Yes, but I would repeat that the first election must take place within six months of the passage of this Act, and after that first election has taken place there will be no more need of this schedule for any subsequent election. What may happen after the present year does not affect the situation in any shape or form.

When the hon. minister begins to speak of offsets, it is perfectly fair for my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) to speak of the irrigation scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which is to bring 3,000,000 acres under occupation—two-thirds for ranching and one-third for farming. Surely the population that will enter upon that 1,000,000 acres will be quite an offset to anything that may come in along the Great Northern Railway ; and the fact that in the next few years there may be 700 or 800 miles of railway through that northern country has nothing to do with the case, because we must base our first distribution on things as they are and not as they may be in the future.

There is another test I would like to apply. That is the test of the local Northwest Territories constituencies of to-day. This division, which gives to the present territory of Alberta, fifteen members, was made by the local Houes in 1902. We have been taught to consider the local House of that day as a non-partisan body. It was so at that time at least. We do not know that politics entered into consideration in this case ; and although we have diligently searched, we have been unable to find that any serious exception was taken to the distribution then made. That gave nine seats south of township 38 and six north of the same. You propose to increase the nine to twelve and the six to thirteen. You add one-third to the south and more than double the representation of the north.

I think I have pointed out what reasons the people of Alberta have for being dissatisfied with the schedule before this House. Perhaps you imagine, Sir, that the people of Alberta are not giving this matter their attention. Well, you have only to read the papers from all parts of southern Al-

berta, and you will find plenty of evidence, that they are very much worked up over the injustice that they consider is being done them. On the 8th May the schedule was brought to this House. Within two weeks there were protests from the Liberals and Conservatives in Calgary. There were protests from Raymond on the south to Red Deer on the north, a distance of 200 miles; from Medicine Hat to Pincher Creek, east and west, a distance of 150 miles. There were protests from 30,000 miles of territory occupied by 130,000 people. For the information of the House, let me read a few of those protests because I think they are pertinent to the discussion. The Calgary 'Herald' on May 11, says:

Every citizen, north and south, understands that the only excuse for this atrocious injustice is the determination of the allied interests to place the seat of government in the centre of the European half-breed population.

That shows that the feeling in Calgary was pretty strong over the matter. Here is what is said by the Calgary 'Daily Herald' on the 13th May:

In the history of Canada no greater political outrage has been perpetrated than that of which the above map tells the story. Nobody in the south wants to harm Edmonton or any other part of the north. All we seek is fair-play, and we have grave reason to protest against the grossly unfair way in which the federal government proposes to hive a lot of small constituencies around Edmonton, and leave important, populous and prosperous communities in the south and centre with outrageously inadequate representation.

This editorial was reproduced and endorsed by the Red Deer 'News' of May 23, 1905. The 'Weekly Albertan' of May 11, 1905, published in Calgary, and a Liberal paper says:

The announcement that the Dominion government had completed the schedule of constituencies for the province of Alberta, and had decided upon thirteen seats north of Red Deer and twelve seats to the south is a bitter disappointment to the people of the south.

The division is unfair and cannot be defended. But the division, unjust as it is, is not as serious a matter as the method adopted by the government to arrive at the division. If the question of dividing the province had been left to an independent non-political body, or even to a parliamentary committee, composed of members of parliament who were personally uninterested in the division made, the people of the south would not have been aroused by the decision, even if we had only received eleven members south of the Red Deer line. We would have been disappointed, but would have felt that though beaten we had been beaten fairly, and that though at a disadvantage we did not have a grievance.

The present division is unfair, and the method adopted to decide upon the division is little short of iniquitous.

The population from the south have asked no favours in this struggle.. They first requested a non-competitive point for the temporary capital. They were unable to get that. They were willing to concede that much to their Edmonton opponents, looking upon it as a tribute from the party to party supporters, granted because it was not considered that it would very materially affect the ultimate result of the capital fight.

But much greater objections can be offered to the method adopted to arrive at the division. It means that the people of the south are not treated fairly, that being at a disadvantage they are punished for it, that the spirit of fair-play, which has characterized the Liberal party, which has in its hands the creation of these divisions, in this case is lacking.

Then the people of Calgary asked that the division of the constituencies be made by an impartial body. That was a wise, fair, just and unselfish request. Can any person point to a single defect in such a method of division? It is absolutely fair and just.

The result of the present policy will be deplorable. It means the lining up in battle array of north against the south.

That comes from one of the strongest Liberal papers in the province of Alberta. The next editorial in that paper is one in support of the government on other matters. The article I have just read was also reproduced and endorsed by the Macleod 'Gazette' on May 18, 1905, and by other papers throughout Alberta. The 'Albertan' of the 25th May, again says:

Whatever the administration at Ottawa may decide upon in connection with the division of Alberta constituencies, it will not be the fault of the local Liberals if some other method of dividing the constituencies is not adopted. The Calgary Liberals have been using every effort possible to induce the administration to have the original suggestion, that of leaving the task to an independent tribunal, adopted. The Liberals have prepared a full statement of the case, and have presented it to the administration in the most forceful manner.

Might I ask whether these representatives have been received and whether the Prime Minister will be good enough to lay this document on the table of the House?

The Raymond 'Chronicle,' far to the south, says:

This distribution of seats is felt to be unfair, as it had been tacitly agreed that the dividing would be left to an impartial commission, and taken out of the reach of a possible gerrymander.

Then follows in the same paper an editorial expression of satisfaction with the government on the educational question, thus showing it to be a paper sympathetic to the government. In the Lethbridge 'News' of Thursday, May 18th, I find the following expression of opinion:

The dividing of Alberta into electoral constituencies has been accomplished, and it amounts to nothing less than a gerrymander. The government's work in this case is certainly of a very coarse variety. It is a well-known fact that there is a keen rivalry between Calgary and Edmonton for capital honours, and that the issue largely depends upon whether or not a majority of the members of the first

legislature come from constituencies north or south of the town of Red Deer. It is the general opinion that if the 'representation by population' principle were applied, the south would win hands down, and the capital would go to Calgary. That this opinion was also shared by those supporting Edmonton's claim is proven by the fact that they have been the first who tried to get the question settled at Ottawa without reference to the people's wishes. That the government should practically grant their unjust request and pursue the unprecedented course of turning the whole matter over to the Minister of the Interior seems an unwarranted proceeding even under ordinary circumstances. But when it is remembered that the head of that department is an interested party, it assumes a decidely 'raw' aspect. We believe the government should have left this whole matter to a judicial committee, to be dealt with impartially on its merits, when justice would have been done. We must confess a keen disappointment in Mr. Oliver, who though elevated to a very high position seems to narrow in the calibre to rise to the dignity of his national field, but keeps on boosting for the village of Edmonton.

The Lethbridge 'News,' of the 25th of May, 1905, says:

This is not a question of capitals, nor axes, nor pulls, but it is simply a question of justice. Every man who knows anything about Alberta, knows that an injustice has been done the south, and whether or not we resent it depends largely upon whether or not we are men.

That does not come from Calgary; that comes from Lethbridge. Again, the Macleod 'Gazette,' of the 11th of May, 1905, says:

That the division of Alberta constituencies is unfair cannot be denied, and is being protested against by both Liberals and Conservatives alike.

An analysis of the schedule is difficult until the full report comes in. It covers sixteen pages, and evidently it is a very elaborate scheme for the practical disfranchisement of a majority of the citizens of Alberta.

We can see no excuse for this division unless the desire is to disfranchise the south and place the seat of government in the midst of an anti-Protestant and foreign element.

Here is an article from the 'Rocky Mountain Echo,' of Pincher Creek, another district entirely apart from Calgary and from its influence:

In another column will be found the schedule of the local electoral districts for the province of Alberta that is to be submitted to the House at Ottawa and incorporated in the Autonomy Bill. Those who read it, whether Liberal or Conservative, will be surprised and indignant at the manner in which the divisions have been made, and will be disgusted at the gerrymander by which our new province is forced to begin its career, with its citizens unfairly and unequally represented.

It is indeed a disgraceful thing, disgraceful both to the men who made the divisions, and the country, and the people that allow such wrongs to be perpetrated.

Then the 'Echo' proceeds to read the Calgary 'Herald,' the Conservative paper, a lecture for its attitude on the school question, showing again that it is out of the mouths of the government's own friends that these strong words proceed. Here again is something from the Calgary 'Albertan,' of May 18, 1905, referring to the town of Olds:

The meeting very strongly protested against the division as at present proposed, and moved that a committee of two Liberals and two Conservatives be appointed to draw up a resolution to that effect, one copy to be sent to the Minister of the Interior and to our member at Ottawa.

So I might go on; but I think I have read enough to show the spirit in which this schedule has been received by the people of southern Alberta. I have quoted newspapers from Medicine Hat on the east to Pincher Creek on the west, distant from one another 200 miles; and from Raymond on the south to Red Deer on the north, about 150 miles apart. There is a territory 30,000 miles in extent, with a population of probably 130,000, and in that whole territory, which comprises the half of Alberta, discontent prevails to-day over the government schedule which lies on the table. I have just one more word to say. I think that I have shown that when the government put into the Bill these words, 'having due regard to the distribution of population and existing local divisions,' they put in something that was not true. There has not been due regard paid to population, and existing local divisions have been absolutely ignored. And the dangerous part of it is that the people of Alberta know and deeply feel the injustice that is being placed on the southern half of the population.

Now, I want to submit this question to this House in, as near as I can, an absolutely impartial spirit. You are about to create a new province; you are about to give to that new province a legislature which will be called upon to enact laws for the government of that province. That legislature, when it first meets, will undoubtedly have much important business which will require its immediate attention. If that legislature is elected under that schedule, do you suppose that it will be able to give to that business its closest attention? If the legislature is elected on that schedule, it will be composed of men a large majority of whom at least will be burning with resentment at the wrong done to them, and will endeavour to right that wrong. Is it wise for this House to launch the new province under such auspices as that? Is it wise to throw apples of discord into the midst of this new legislative body, and practically damn it at the commencement of its career with a quarrel which it will take years to settle? Why does the government endeavour to so juggle the cards that the north will have an advantage over the south in the selection of the capital? Why does it put a

portion of the people under a sense of injustice, determined on revenge and upon getting even if they can? Are these beneficent auspices under which to launch these new provinces? It would seem as though this new parliament had already all the trouble that it would care for in connection with these Autonomy Bills. It would appear as though some of the questions in connection with them have already been settled with a great deal of difficulty. Then why do we gratuitously undertake to bring in and impose upon this new legislature a question which will certainly lead to trouble in the future? It seems to me that the government should carefully consider all the facts and figures which have been laid before them by this side of the House. I do not believe that the Prime Minister appreciates the real situation as the figures reveal it, and I have great hopes that when the government understand what is being done, they will consent to the naming of an impartial commission, which will certainly be the most satisfactory method of dealing with this matter.

Mr. HAGGART. I do not intend to take part in the debate at this late hour. I merely wish to point out that this clause is the most peculiar one that I have ever seen. I do not see the Minister of Justice here. Perhaps the First Minister will explain it :

> Until the said legislature otherwise provides, the legislative assembly shall be composed of twenty-five members, to be elected to represent the electoral divisions defined in schedule 'B' to this Act, having due regard to the distribution of population and existing local divisions.

Why is this limitation inserted, 'having due regard to the distribution of population and existing local divisions'? Do you intend to give the courts the power to say whether this is done or not? You have an enacting clause and a schedule which provides for the delimitation of the boundaries of the different constituencies, and then you add these words as if you were not sure that your schedule was all right.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not for my part see any necessity for these words. They are simply a statement of what we are doing. I look on the words as surplusage. I contend that this schedule is prepared with due regard to the distribution of population and existing local divisions.

Mr. BARKER. It is a good sentence misplaced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Only it is not appreciated in the south, but is appreciated in the north.

Progress reported.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 182) to incorporate the Sterling Bank of Canada.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 183) respecting a certain patent of the Metal Volatilization Company.—Mr. McCool.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, June 21, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

CLASSIFICATION OF DAIRY PRODUCTS FOR EXPORTATION.

Mr. DESJARDINS asked :

1. Has the government received from any dairy association a request for the classification of dairy products, for exportation ?
2. If not, is it the intention of the government to bring in, during this session or the next session, a Bill for the obligatory classification of dairy products, and of butter and cheese especially ?
3. Will the government institute a classification of three kinds instead of two ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. No.
2. No.
3. At a conference of the dairy instructors and experts held under the auspices of the dairying division of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa, in November of 1903, the following resolution in favour of three grades of butter and cheese was passed :

> Whereas cheese and butter are now almost universally classed as 'finest' and 'under finest' when purchased from the factories, making practically only two grades, be it resolved that it would tend to improve the quality of both products if there were at least three grades recognized.

Since then Mr. Ruddick, Dairy Commissioner, has devoted a great deal of time to this matter, and quite recently has formulated a new classification and standards of quality to be observed by the official referee of butter and cheese at Montreal in giving his certificates as to the quality of cheese and creamery butter which he is asked to examine. This new classification embraces three grades for cheese and three grades for creamery butter, namely, 1st grade, 2nd grade and 3rd grade. The Dairy Commissioner has no power to enforce this new clasification, except in so far as it applies to the work of the official referee ; but it has already been adopted by a number of the cheese and butter boards ; and it is hoped that in time all the selling of

cheese and butter will be done on the basis of this classification.

BONUS FOR FARMER IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Does the government pay any bonus for farmer immigrants to this country ?
2. To whom is said bonus paid, and what is the amount paid ?
3. How much has been paid under the above head during the past year ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. In the United States the department has seventy-six agents who are paid commissions on all settlers of the agricultural class who are induced by them to settle in western Canada. The commission is as follows :

(a) $3 for each man, $2 for each woman and $1 for each child.

(b) In Great Britain the bonus or commission is $1.75 for each adult of the agricultural or domestic servant class and half this amount for children of 12 and under ; this bonus is paid to the booking agents of the several steamship lines.

(c) A commission of $2 is paid on children emigrated to Canada by philanthropic societies.

(d) A commission of £1 is paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company of Amsterdam, Holland, on all emigrants of the agricultural class emigration from certain countries on the continent.

3. The amounts paid during the last fiscal year for bonuses to immigrants coming to Canada was as follows :

Bonuses on immigrants from United States	$14,428 25
Bonuses to steamship agents and sub-agents and immigration societies on British immigrants	43,220 33
Bonuses on Icelanders	2,104 81
Bonuses on domestic servants	1,088 00
Bonuses on immigrants from Great Britain at $2 each	246 00
Bonuses to philanthropic societies on children from Great Britain	2,608 01
Bonuses on immigrants from continent of Europe	35,316 66
Total	99,012 35

Mr. URIAH WILSON—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Does the government pay any bonus to transportation companies or booking agents or immigration agents for immigrants coming to Canada ?
2. How much does the government so pay either for men, women or children ?
3. What is the total amount so paid during the past year ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The answer is the same as that just given to the question of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

INDIAN RESERVES AT DONCASTER, COUNTY OF TERREBONNE.

Mr. DESJARDINS—by Mr. Demers—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to abolish the Indian reserve at Doncaster, in the county of Terrebonne ?
2. If so, will the government, before long, for the purchase of the said reserve, enter into correspondence with the different chiefs of the Indian tribes, who are the owners of those lands ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No. The government cannot abolish the reserve without the consent of the Indians, who have declined to surrender.

2. Covered by answer to first question.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to correct a statement made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on Monday last. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his place ; but, as I am leaving the city to-day. I shall not have another opportunity of making my statement. I would also like to say that I was present when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was delivering his speech, but did not put the interpretation on his words that I find in 'Hansard.' I refer to 'Hansard,' page 7932 :

Mr. Chaffey, on April 15, was determined to have his rights, and charged fraud and worse, but on the 25th Mr. Bole intervened and asked that proceedings be stayed until he could come to Ottawa. He then, being in Winnipeg on May 22, after negotiations and correspondence, brings down an assignment of all of Chaffey's rights, claims and interest to Macdonald.

I wish to say that I brought no assignment ; I entered into no negotiations whatever with regard to a settlement between the parties, and had nothing to do with a settlement between the parties. As the minister has promised an investigation, I will not say anything with regard to the merits of the case.

CONDITION OF COMMONS CHAMBER.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). I would like to ask the Acting Minister of Public Works if it is not possible to get some more fresh air into this chamber. I see that the temperature here is about 75. In rooms 16 and 6 it is about 65 degrees or 10 degrees more here than in any other room in the House. It ought to be possible to take off sections of these windows and let them remain that way. In any event some plan should be acted upon in order to get more fresh air into this chamber for at present the heat is simply unendurable.

Mr. FIELDING. I will call the attention of the minister to my hon. friend's sugges-

tion. He will be here in a day or two, and then everything will be right.

MONTREAL HIGHLAND CADET CORPS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Militia if he intends doing anything for the Highland Cadet corps of Montreal. The matter calls for no discussion, but I shall read to the House a portion of a letter sent to me in connection with this matter :

Now the militia estimates are before the House, I think it advisable to draw your attention to the fact that that fine little corps the Highland Cadets of this city are likely to disband, through want of support and encouragement. Allow me to give you a brief outline of their career, in as few words as possible, for your information :

(a) The corps was organized in 1889 by Major Fred. Lydon—then and for some years afterwards adjutant of the 5th Royal Scots—under whom they have ever since been and are to-day.

(b) They hold the Duke of Connaught's flag, having won it on June 5th, 1897, in competition with the Mount St. Louis Cadet corps.

(c) They have never had government assistance, and their work, as you can well understand has been uphill work in every sense of the word, and I think Major Lydon deserves the highest credit for keeping the corps up to the great efficiency it is in to-day in face of strong obstacles.

(d) The corps has at various times been on a visit, at its own expense, to Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Niagara Falls, Ogdensburg, New York, Portland, Maine, and other places.

(e) I myself, representing the Montreal 'Herald' as special correspondent, accompanied them to Portland, Maine, in 1903, and can bear testimony to their great efficiency and good behaviour there and to the grand reception given them during their three days stay in that city.

(f) They have been inspected by various Governor Generals, also by His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught, from whom they got great praise, as well as by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, when here as Duke of Cornwall, &c., to whom they acted as a guard of honour.

In face of all this and the fact that this little corps has supplied upwards of 600 recruits in all to city corps, besides a large number—altogether out of proportion to the size of the corps—to the South African campaign a few years back, Major Lydon has expended some $2,000 out of his own pocket to keep up his corps. Is this right let me ask you ? Besides they have had private subscriptions, which alone have helped to partially sustain the corps, from Lord Strathcona, the late Colin McArthur and others. Now they contemplate a trip to New York city on 30th June to spend Dominion Day and 4th of July, and go in their shabby uniforms, and upon their return will disband at once unless they get some assistance from government or elsewhere, and as you are a Montrealer and must know the corps, that must plead for me in asking you to get a promise from the Minister of Militia in the House that something will be done—and done quickly—to keep up and help this fine little corps to keep alive. It would be a shame and disgrace should they be allowed to die through want of the necessary assistance. In a speech at the opening of the headquarters of the First Cadet Battalion of the Royal Fusiliers last week, the Prince of Wales stated :

That during his visit to the colonies he found the cadet movement further advanced than in this country (England). He favoured it, not with a view of militarizing the population, but to give training, discipline and to make those who took part in it of use should their services ever be needed.

Lord Roberts on Empire Day made a speech in which he said :

I am perfectly satisfied that it is essential for this country (England) that every able-bodied man should be able to use a rifle. If you would teach men how to shoot, you must begin with the boys. For that reason we want rifle clubs in all the schools, and assistance can be given to the schools by neighbouring rifle clubs allowing them the use of their ranges.

I am sure two such high authorities are sufficient to make the government decide to sustain this grand little corps, the Highland Cadets, and I am sure your attention having been drawn to the state of coma they are in, I can, as an old militia officer of many years standing, claim your all-powerful help in striving to get the necessary help for this corps.

It is unnecessary for me to add anything to this communication except to say that I cordially trust my hon. friend the Minister of Militia will see that the request is given his most favourable attention.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In reply I may say that this matter has already been brought to my attention, and that I have had some correspondence with citizens of Montreal and particularly Major Lydon himself with regard to it. Not long ago the secretary of the department wrote a letter in which he said :

The minister regrets he is unable to consider the claims of the Highland Cadet corps for assistance, apart from the claims of other cadet corps. The whole question of assistance will be considered by the minister and the Militia Council at an early date.

In the Militia Act of last year there are these clauses referring to cadet corps :

Section 65. The minister may—

(a) Authorize boys over 12 years of age, who are attending school, to be formed into school cadet corps ;

(b) Authorize boys over 14 years of age and under 18 years of age, to be formed into senior cadet corps ;

(c) Authorize senior cadet corps, or any portion thereof, to be attached to any portion of the active militia for the purposes of drill and training.

Section 66. All cadet corps shall be subject to the authority and under the orders of the district officer commanding.

Section 67. Cadet corps shall be drilled and trained as prescribed, and may be furnished with arms, ammunition and equipment, under conditions prescribed.

So that the powers of the department are limited under the Act, and if any special treatment is to be accorded to the cadets mentioned it would be necessary to take a special vote. It would be more convenient to thresh out this question when the militia estimates are up, and I shall then have a

statement to make with reference to it. I may say however that the department recognizes the very valuable work which this and other cadet corps have done for the militia in Canada.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. minister give us then the amount of ammunition supplied the different cadet corps as well?

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Having had an opportunity twice of seeing the Montreal Cadet corps when they were in Ottawa, and as most of them were stationed at the hotel where I was residing, I could not help but notice the splendid physique of the boys and the manly, dignified, courteous and intelligent way in which they conducted themselves when here, as well as the soldierly appearance they presented. I may say the same of the officers who had control over it. I thought they were the most splendid lot of boys I ever saw, and boys who will no doubt give a good account of themselves in the future. Admiring them as much as I do, I would like to have the Minister of Militia if possible make an exception in favour of this corps and give them the assistance required to prevent their being dissolved. In this he would be doing a good thing for the country, and not only reflect credit on himself but also on that splendid corps which we should take every means to keep alive.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN. The order passed by the Dominion government has been taken advantage of in the province of Ontario to a very great extent. In the city of Hamilton we have an exceedingly fine cadet corps which has been attached to the 13th regiment. The Ontario government have contributed $150 towards their uniforms and the Dominion government have supplied them with rifles. In so far as their drill is concerned I question whether there is a regiment in Canada that can drill any better than these boys can. They are a fine manly lot of boys and they will make first-class officers for the militia. The measure attaching these cadet corps to the regiments is one of the wisest that the department has passed. It has given great encouragement to the boys and we take great pride in them. I may say I was in Toronto some time ago——

Mr. SPEAKER. There is really no motion before the House.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN. I may say I was in Toronto some few days ago and I saw some 6,000 cadets turn out. They really made a magnificent showing and I believe that in the near future the measure attaching our cadet corps to the regular militia is going to improve our militia to a tremendous extent.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. One great advantage in perpetuating——

Sir F. W. BORDEN.

Mr. SPEAKER. If hon. members desire to prolong the discussion there will have to be something before the House.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am speaking on the Orders of the Day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Do not discuss it but call attention to it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was going to speak of the Highland cadet corps in Montreal and I will conclude with a motion. The Highland Cadet corps is an historic institution in Montreal and if the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence could see his way clear to encourage it in any way it would be an advantage to the force generally. I would be sorry to see that corps allowed to go down. Undoubtedly the expense of a corps of this kind is very abnormal because of the uniform. It is largely sustained by subscriptions and I think the hon. minister should take some steps to bring this senior cadet corps into a more active existence than it has at the present time by giving it the support of the department. This corps furnishes a great many men to the regiments in Montreal, especially the Royal Scots, and a very large number of the men in the Royal Scots who enlisted to go to South Africa were boys who had been trained in this Highland cadet corps. I wish to add my testimony to the value of this corps. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Motion negatived.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) if he has forgotten to bring down the treaty in connection with Japan. I noticed that in a late communication from our agent in Japan he cites special instances of where products from Canada are charged two and three times as much duty and sometimes more than those from other countries, thus making it absolutely impossible, it would seem, to carry on trade in these products with Japan. He points out very strongly how detrimental it is to Canadian trade. I spoke of the difficulty about three weeks ago and the hon. minister said that he would bring down the treaty or make a statement as to the way and in what particulars it was considered that the adoption or adherence to the treaty by Canada would be prejudicial. Here are actual prejudicial effects in commerce. What are the supposed difficulties or prospective troubles we may anticipate providing we do adhere to the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) who has a more intimate personal acquaintance with that question has been giving the matter attention and will be able to make

a statement on the subject, or he will bring down the papers at an early day. He has been looking into the matter since the former discussion.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 12,—distribution of seats—

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that there is to be no reply at all to the statements which were made by members last night? Has the government concluded to keep silence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understood, Mr. Chairman, that we adjourned yesterday because of the request of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who intimated that several hon. gentlemen intended to speak upon the question.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We waited to see what further arguments would be advanced before making a reply.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend think nothing has been brought up by my two hon. friends who spoke yesterday afternoon, my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) and my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), which requires an answer?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think that anything that has been brought up can be met very successfully, but we thought that more arguments were coming from the other side and that we would wait and hear these arguments.

Mr. FOSTER. With all deference to my right hon. friend, I think it would tax himself and perhaps some of his supporters to answer what has already been given, and it might make it altogether too burdensome if others were to speak on this matter before the arguments which have already been advanced have been answered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not agree with my hon. friend on that. I do not think any argument has been advanced which will require any great effort to answer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. It was not my privilege to hear the very eloquent explanations which appear to have been given yesterday, but I have glanced over 'Hansard' and I fail to find that very lucid explanation that one would naturally expect in relation to the establishment of Peace River and Athabaska. I cannot say that I have been convinced by anything that was brought forward in the House yesterday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We do not expect to be able to do that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I cannot say that I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is convinced and I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Justice is not convinced by the arguments advanced in reference to Peace River and Athabaska. I would be very pleased, if the hon. Minister of the Interior has any additional data, to hear him.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, if there is none I have other questions to ask. In the first place, there were three different statements given as to the population of Athabaska and Peace River. Although this is a small matter and in the opinion of my right hon. friend is not worth while taking notice of probably, yet I think that when two ministers of the Crown and two lay members of the House make statements in reference to the population all which differ from each other we ought to have an authoritative statement. Is the minister able to give us an authoritative statement as to the white, the half-breed and the Indian population of the Peace river?

Mr. OLIVER. I expect that information from the Census Department shortly and I will present it to the House.

Mr. FOSTER. That is an instructive comment. This Bill has been before the House for two or three months, and when we come to ask the most elementary question with reference to two constituencies, the minister tells us that up to the present time he has not the information.

Mr. OLIVER. I said no such thing. Yesterday I gave the information from the Census Bureau with regard to this matter; the hon. gentleman questioned the information I gave; I sent it to the Census Department to have it verified, and as soon as I get the benefit of the verification he will have it.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the House to be delayed now because the minister has not been diligent enough to get the information which presumably he could get in an hour's time if he asked for it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is trying to magnify a very simple little difficulty. Yesterday the population of Athabaska was given as follows: Peace River, 1,724; Athabaska, 1,676.

Mr. FOSTER. What are those?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understood whites and half-breeds, exclusive of Indians. These figures were questioned and immediately the Minister of the Interior gave orders to have them verified, as there was a discrepancy between them and the figures quoted by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley). It has not been possible to have the information returned yet.

Is there anything unusual in that or is there any cause for an insinuation ? It happens often that a discrepancy in figures can be explained, and this explanation will probably be had in a few minutes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In the statement annexed to the schedule which was sent to the leader of the opposition there is the following foot note :

Total population of census of 1901 in the two following constituencies, part of the district of Athabaska : Peace River, 800 ; Athabaska, 1,430.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is nothing very extraordinary in that. Probably these are the figures in 1901. I gave the figures which were furnished to me, and I assume them to be the population to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the right hon. gentleman say the figures he gave are the population to-day or the population of the census ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought it was the population of the census but probably I am in error.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, after the quotation from the document, my right hon. friend has to come down from his high horse and to acknowledge now that what he told the House yesterday was not a fact. Yesterday he said that the figures 1,724 and 1,676 respectively, was the population at present, but now he revises himself and gives adhesion to the figures which are written down and to which, of course, he must adhere.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What did I say yesterday ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday the impression the right hon. gentleman gave was that these were the populations at the present time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What did I say to-day which is not according to that?

Mr. FOSTER. I understood my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to say that the figures which he read were the populations as given in the foot note sent over to the leader of the opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. From the census ? Is that any contradiction of what I say to-day?

Mr. FOSTER. Were the figures which the right hon. gentleman gave yesterday the actual population ? How does he know the actual population to-day, and what means were taken to get it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said my impression was that the figures were for the population at present. I cannot carry these things in my mind from day to day; I received the information some time ago from the Census Department, and I sent it to the hon. the leader of the opposition. Subsequently other figures were placed in my hand, which I gave yesterday, and my impression is that these figures are the population to-day. As, however, these figures have been challenged, we have taken the precaution to have them verified in the Census Bureau, and as soon as the figures come here I will give the exact information.

Mr. FOSTER. So that after three months and some days, we may possibly now get at one of the most elementary sources of information necessary for discussing the basis of redistribution. Yesterday the Minister of the Interior promised to bring down his statement of populations from the Census Department. The populations he gave yesterday were, he said, prepared in the Census Department and signed and sent to him with a map, which he promised to bring down. Is that ready ?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not understand the question in that way, and I regret that I have not given that order, but I will give it.

Mr. FOSTER. That is another sample of Ethelred the Unready. I quote from 'Hansard' :

Mr. OLIVER. A map was prepared showing the local constituencies and the census department was asked to take that map, compare it with the returns and give us the result, the number of people in each constituency.

Mr. FOSTER. And the minister has that statement from the census department ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister bring that down as one of the items ?

Mr. OLIVER. I will bring it.

Of course, twenty-four hours is not long, but after three months and a half and nearing the end of the session, twenty-four hours might have been sufficient to get that statement into the hands of the minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I understand my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) now. There is the map there on the table, and he apparently is not satisfied with the information which he received from the department, but wants to have the identical document signed by the census officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Exactly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly; I understand what he means now.

Mr. FOSTER. We should have the details.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no; there is more than that; the hon. gentleman must not take refuge in that; he wants to compare whether or not the figures are correct.

Mr. FOSTER. And there is no better reason for that than these tergiversations we have had an example of to-day and yesterday.

Mr. INGRAM. I listened very carefully to the statement made yesterday by the First Minister as well as to the statement made by the Minister of the Interior. I

have also listened to the statements made by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames), and I am bound to say that no hon. gentleman can read the statements of those four hon. gentlemen and come to any other conclusion than that the figures given on the two sides are as far apart as Australia is from Canada. And yet the right hon. First Minister tells us that he wants to listen to other arguments from this side of the House before he answers the arguments advanced yesterday. If the right hon. gentleman wishes to shorten the debate on this question, the best plan he can adopt is to answer early in the debate the statements made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House in order that other hon. gentlemen may not find it necessary to prepare themselves to prolong the debate. Surely the government ought to be ready to point out to the opposition in what respect the statements made by the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for St. Antoine are wrong. That can be done if the government is right; but any one reading the statements of the four hon. gentlemen who spoke cannot come to any other conclusion than that they derive their information from entirely different sources; therefore it is necessary that some explanation should be made by the government. This is an important question; and the idea of the government coming down with these two important measures, and having only the meagre statements made by the right hon. the First Minister and the hon. Minister of the Interior, is something I have not noticed in this House before on a serious question of this kind. In the case of our general distribution, we had more satisfaction than this. We are treated in a contemptible manner by the government on this question, and I am surprised at the course taken by the right hon. the First Minister on this occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The surprise of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), who is generally fair, is my own surprise. I am very much astonished at the surprise he manifests. When he says that there is a serious discrepancy between the figures furnished by the government and those furnished by my hon. friend from St. Antoine, I take direct issue with him. I say there is no serious difference at all between the figures furnished to the House by myself and my colleague of the Interior and those furnished by the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for St. Antoine. This is a very plain statement; let us verify it. I said yesterday that we based our information upon the number of votes recorded at the last Dominion election, the number of votes registered for the same, and the figures of population in the census of 1901. These were three, not all, of the sources of information upon which we proceeded. The number of votes recorded, as I obtained it from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, was 20,962. These figures were not disputed. According to the statement given to me by my hon. friend from Calgary, for which I acknowledge his courtesy, the number of votes recorded in the last election in the different constituencies of Alberta, with the exception of Peace River and Athabaska, is put at 20,700, a difference of 262. Is there any very serious discrepancy there? With regard to the number of votes registered in those constituencies, the figure I gave was 29,950, while the figure given to me by my hon. friend from Calgary was 30,077, a difference of 127. The addition in the one case was made by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery from the books of the votation furnished to him; the same books were furnished to the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and they made their own addition; yet the results correspond, with only the small discrepancies I have mentioned. Another source of information is the population according to the census of 1901. I gave the population for these various constituencies at 69,441. Up to the present moment I have not seen these figures challenged. Therefore, I say there is no difference or dispute as to the figures on which we base our division. I shall have further remarks to make on this subject, but for the moment I simply call the attention of my hon. friend from East Elgin to the fact that practically there is no difference between the figures given on one side and on the other.

Mr. INGRAM. My right hon. friend has been good enough to state the difference between the figures given by himself of the number of votes polled and the figures given by my hon. friend from Calgary. But the figures in regard to the number of post offices, the number of homestead entries and the number of school districts, have not yet been explained.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I want to keep to the discrepancy which my hon. friend alleged. He said we had given false information, which had been disputed. I said we had not. There is no discrepancy whatever. There are other sources of information. We proceeded to make up our minds also on the basis of the number of school districts, the number of post offices and the number of improvement districts. I have not seen the statements or the accuracy of the figures disputed; different conclusions have been drawn from them, that may be and I will come to discuss that directly. At the present moment I want to say—and I want this fact clearly put before the House—that so far as the figures brought down are concerned, there has been no dispute between the members on the two sides of the House. We have drawn conclusions from different sources. For instance, I said yesterday and repeat to-day one source of information which we took in order to arrive

at the conclusion to which we arrived, was the number of post offices and the number of school-houses. The reliability of such information was questioned ; it was claimed that it did not give a fair, accurate statement of the population, and as another source of information the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) quoted figures of the trade of the north and south and also the number of chartered banks which had offices in the north and south. From such sources of information he was led to his own conclusion, but I repeat again that so far as the information we have given to the House is concerned, it has not been disputed.

Mr. INGRAM. The right hon. gentleman draws his conclusions from the number of votes polled. The Minister of the Interior claimed that that is a proper source from which to make the delimitation. Evidently that view is supported by the First Minister. The statement made by the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) is that owing to certain difficulties amongst the ranchers in the southern part of Alberta at the time of the general election of November 3, 1904, many men engaged in ranching were obliged by reason of an order issued by the government to absent themselves from the polling divisions at which they would have a right to vote and by reason of this thus absenting themselves the number of votes polled in the south was less than it ought to have been or otherwise would have been, had it not been for the order issued by the government. But, on the other hand, in the north we have the statement made that more votes were polled than were on the voters' lists. Therefore the northern part of Alberta derives a greater benefit from calculating from the number of votes polled, by reason of the fact that more ballots found their way into the boxes than there were names on the voters' lists in the north while the percentage of votes cast in relation to the number on the list in the south was less than it should be, as I have said by reason of the men having to be absent to obey the order of the government or lose their cattle. Is that a correct statement of fact? If it is then if you take the number of votes polled you are not doing a proper thing for the south as against the north. That is unfair if that statement is true and I have not heard it contradicted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not dispute the statements which the hon. member has made ; I know nothing about it. There would be something in the argument if the source of information and the only basis which we had before us in coming to the conclusion had been the recorded vote. When my hon. friend says there have been more votes cast than were on the lists that may be but there is nothing illegal in that.

Mr. INGRAM. It is true all the same.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. These men were entitled to vote all the same ; it is perfectly lawful, and we therefore took the number of votes recorded. It may be that in the south as alleged some ranchers did not record their votes. That could not be a large number, I do not know the reason but I am prepared to look into the question from a broader point of view than that. It seems to me that is a small way of looking at it. I am willing to give to the hon. gentleman the benefit of everything there is in those figures which I have quoted. I have taken these figures and they tell against us in some instances and against the hon. gentleman in some instances ; we have to take them as they are and to come to the best conclusion with such information as we have. I stated yesterday at the opening of the discussion that we took as the basis of the distribution which we made, the condition of things existing at the present time, the number of seats assigned to the province of Alberta in the present legislature of the Territory which amounts to 16. First of all we had to increase that by 10, we had to give to Alberta 10 more seats than there are to-day in the legislature of the Northwest Territories within the limits of Alberta. How are we to come to that conclusion ? We come to that conclusion upon information derived from three sources which we submit to the House to be challenged. We take first the number of votes recorded. We do not say to the House that this is the only thing we should take into consideration ; we say that is one thing which ought to be taken into consideration but not alone. We take next the number of votes registered ; we do not say that is the only thing to be taken, that is only one of many things on which we should form our judgment. Then we take the census of 1901. That is the best thing of all. If we had a census for 1905 we would not have to consider the number of recorded votes nor the number of registered votes, nor the number of post offices, school districts or improvement districts ; we would take only the census for 1905. But we have no census of 1905 and therefore we have to make up our minds as to what is the actual population at the present time. We know that the population at the present time is double what it was in 1901, and we have to make our calculation accordingly. But though the population has doubled, I think it is only a fair suggestion that we must find a wealth of information in the census of 1901. We say moreover that we think this is something to go on, not the number of post offices, school districts and improvement districts. I will try to deal with the question as fairly as I can and give to the hon. gentlemen the benefit of these figures wherever they tell in their favour, and I shall ask them to give us the benefit whenever they tell on our side. I followed the speech of my hon. friend from

Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) with great attention yesterday. He made a very earnest speech from his point of view, but when we have simmered the underlying thought of the speech of more than two hours which he made yesterday—and if I say two hours it is not by way of reproach ; he had a task to perform on behalf of his constituents, and I do not blame him, quite the contrary—but the underlying thought which you find in every line, every word and every syllable of that speech is that this objection is taken to the distribution which we have placed upon the table of the House from one point of view only ; not because the constituencies are unfair towards each other, not because there is an unfair advantage given to one over the other, but simply because there is not in the south the number of seats which ought to go to the south. That is my hon. friend's point.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I see I have properly interpreted it. My hon. friend has taken the division of Red Deer, township 38, as the point of division between the north and south. There are 23 divisions in old Alberta according to our new plan of distribution. Eleven are north of Red Deer, and 11 are south of Red Deer, and the point my hon. friend has made was that there should be 15 south of Red Deer and 10 north of Red Deer, that is including Red Deer. Let us see whether there is anything to justify that or not. First of all I am very, very sorry that in a matter of this kind it should be reduced simply to a point of argument whether or not the seats should be put in the north or the south. For my own part I discard all that ; I do not consider whether they are to be in the north or the south ; they are to be placed wherever the population warrants it. That is the only argument, I think.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is that accepted ? I am more than delighted to hear it is accepted, and if it is there should be no more discussion.

Mr. LAKE. I understand the minister to mean that there should be a fair distribution of population between the different seats ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is what I mean.

Mr. LAKE. How much margin would the Prime Minister allow ? There must be always a certain margin, would he say 5 per cent or 10 per cent.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what my hon. friend means by 10 per cent. I am willing that he should take all the comfort he can out of the figures I am going to place before him. He wants the division between the north and the south—apparently a sort of Mason and Dixon's line, in the Northwest.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was the first to suggest the north and south division by proposing township 38 as the dividing line.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I believe it was neither the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) nor my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) who first suggested that division. It was suggested, if I may say so, from other quarters. Some time ago, when the question of the selection of the capital was brought to my attention, I was asked to take Red Deer, as a point midway between north and south. This is an idea that is running in the minds of my hon. friend and others. He is but re-echoing that which is in other minds. But, for my part, I am sorry that any matter of so great moment should be looked at in so narrow a way. Again I repeat, the divisions should be as warranted by population.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very good. Now, let us look at the figures. Take first the number of votes recorded in the eleven constituencies south of Red Deer and in the other constituencies north of Red Deer. On this point there is no serious discrepancy in the figures as given to me.

Mr. INGRAM. How about Athabaska and Peace River ? How do they come in ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will come to that—I am speaking now of the old constituencies. The eleven constituencies south of Red Deer are : Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, Pincher, Gleichen, Calgary, Rosebud, High River, Banff, Innisfail and Medicine Hat. The number of votes recorded in these constituencies in the last Dominion election numbered 10,566, or an average of about 960 votes to each electoral division. The eleven constituencies north of Red Deer are the following : Vermilion, Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin, Leduc, Strathcona, Stony Plain, and Edmonton. In these constituencies the number of votes recorded was 9,553. This is almost 1,000 less than in the other group and makes an average of about 867 votes for each constituency, or almost 100 less. So, I give that at once to my hon. friend (Mr. Lake). Now, when we take the number of registered votes we find in the eleven divisions south of Red Deer there were 15,895 registered votes, an average of 1,444 for each constituency. In the constituency north of Red Deer, the number of votes registered was 12,863, or an average of 11,696. The total population of the eleven constituencies south of Red Deer, according to the census of 1901 was 31,034, an average of 2,821 for each constituency. The eleven constituencies north of Red Deer had a population of 36,398, an average of 3,308—in that respect a decided advantage to the north. So, it will be seen that, while on the votes polled, the advantage is, as I have stated, in favour of the south, when

you come to the population which, after all, is the great test, the advantage is with the north.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does that include Indians ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know. But the Indians would be either included or excluded in both cases, so that, for purposes of comparison, there would be no advantage either way. Now, there are more post offices in the north than in the south. According to the figures placed in my hands there were 140 post offices in the north and 125 in the south, making a difference of 15. I may be told that this is not material to the issue. I do not pretend that it is absolutely material, but it should be given its due weight.

Mr. INGRAM. The Prime Minister's figures with regard to the post offices do not agree with those of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to be sure about those post offices. Do I understand that the number south of Red Deer is 140 ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will give the figures exactly as I have them. In the district of Edmonton there are 60 post offices and in Strathcona of 95—a total of 155. In the district of Calgary there are 54, in the district of Alberta 46, Medicine Hat 10—a total of 110. Taking 15 from Strathcona and adding them to the south, I get 140 for the north and 125 for the south.

Mr. FOSTER. Either the right hon. gentleman confuses the north and south or I do.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall not discuss that point with my hon. friend, but will leave it to the Minister of the Interior. The object we had in mind was this. Since we must have a division north and south, is there a greater population in the former than in the latter ? I say that all the facts that I have given go to show that there is more in the north, except the recorded and the registered votes. As to these, I admit the advantage is with the other side, but every other source of information goes to show that there are more people in the north. Let me give further information upon that point. I shall take the statistics which have been given here on another subject. My hon. friend yesterday took the trade of certain sections and compared the trade of the north with that of the south. Let me compare the agricultural products of the two. In 1903 the wheat produced in the north was 675,576 bushels and in the south 533,000 bushels ; oats, 3,200,000 bushels in the north and in the south 1,921,000 bushels ; barley, 746,000 bushels in the north and in the south 325,000 bushels. This shows a decided preponderance of agricultural products in the north.

Mr. COCHRANE. How does the production of cattle compare in the two ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought my hon. friend would put this question and that his own friends would be sorry. The number does not compare at all ; it is altogether in favour of the south, because the south is better adapted to the production of cattle and not so well adapted for the production of cereals and other agricultural products. If my hon. friend wants to give votes to cattle, let him do so ; but if he wants to give votes to men, he will have to give the preponderance to the north. Wherever you find a great many cattle, you do not find many men. The south is peculiarly a ranching and grazing country, and consequently has more cattle and less population than the north. I do not take the cattle into account, because they are not a fair indication of the population, whereas agricultural products are. All these things go to show that there are more people in the north than in the south.

Mr. HERRON. What year is the right hon. gentleman giving the statistics for ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. 1903.

Mr. HERRON. Have you the yield per acre ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I have not.

Mr. HERRON. I have it here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If there is an argument in the yield per acre, my hon. friend will have all the benefit he can find in it. I now come to another point put by the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), the point with regard to the two constituencies in the north. There is a small population in the north, I admit ; but are they to be represented or not ? We were told yesterday to annex it to some existing constituency. But are you to annex to constituencies, which are as large as a man can serve, a territory three or four times the size of any constituency in the Northwest ? You must give these people representation. They are British citizens, and have a right to be represented. In fact, the whole thing hedges upon the selection of the capital. If it were not for that, we would not have this discussion at all. If there were in the south a preponderance of numbers so as to discredit the comparison we make between the north and the south, not a word would be said against these men having representation. It has always been the policy in this House to give representation to large districts, even though their population be small and sparse. Take the county of Gaspé, which has been given representation since confederation, even when it had but a small population of fishermen. Take Chicoutimi and Saguenay, which has been given representation since sixty years ago, when it had not a population worth speaking of. Take the very Northwest Territories, which were given representation in 1887 that they

ought to have had long before. Were they given representation because of the population they had ? Why, they had a population hardly sufficient to send two representatives to this House, yet they were given four, and properly so, in order that the voice of these distant people should be heard on the floor of this House, their wants made known, and the legislation given them to which they were entitled.

Mr. AMES. The right hon. gentleman has referred to the county of Saguenay. Is it not a fact that when additional territory was annexed to the province of Quebec, that territory was united to the county of Saguenay, although it was almost double its size ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There was this difference, that in that part of the country, which was declared to be a part of the province of Quebec, there is not a soul to be represented.

Mr. AMES. Are there not people all along Hamilton inlet ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there are, except Hudson Bay people ; but the hon. gentleman knows that the people in Hamilton inlet are transients who come from Newfoundland, which is not a part of this Dominion.

Mr. AMES. Does the right hon. gentleman say that there is absolutely no population in the eastern half of Athabaska ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand there is not. If he can show that there are people in eastern Athabaska as there are in the northwestern part, they should be given representation.

Mr. AMES. According to the statistics given us, the two constituencies that are to be formed in western Athabaska do not take up the entire population of Athabaska, so that there must be some residue in eastern Athabaska. If you are to form a constituency for 300 in Peace River and another 300 in western Athabaska, when you get down to as small a number as that, does not the same reasoning apply to eastern Athabaska ? Why should this part be attached to Alberta and not to the province of Saskatchewan ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because, according to my information, there are no people represented in eastern Athabaska.

Mr. INGRAM. Who represents Mackenzie and the other territories in this House ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Nobody.

Mr. INGRAM. How do Athabaska and Peace River compare in area with Edmonton as regards representation in this House ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not inform my hon. friend off-hand, but I am satisfied they are two or three times the size of the constituency of Edmonton. Does he mean the constituency of Edmonton ?

Mr. INGRAM. Yes, for Dominion purposes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no constituency of Edmonton, except the city of Edmonton.

Mr. INGRAM. I am speaking of the constituency of Edmonton for Dominion purposes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from the west will be able to answer that better than I could.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In regard to your estimate of post offices a considerable portion of the constituencies of Edmonton, Strathcona and Calgary is east of the 4th meridian. Are the post offices east of the 4th meridian included in your calculations ? I understand you mean the electoral districts as they are constituted in this House.

Mr. P. TALBOT. No. I think that calculation was made on the basis of the proposed province of Alberta. The district of Alberta that is represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Herron) contains 46 post offices, Medicine Hat district which is to be added to Alberta, 10, and the Calgary district, 54.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What do you call the Calgary district ?

Mr. P. TALBOT. The district represented by you.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Calgary, Strathcona and Edmonton district are east of the 4th meridian.

Mr. P. TALBOT. These are only in the proposed province. Edmonton district contains 60 and the Strathcona district contains 95. Then, there are some 15 in the constituency of Strathcona that are south of Red Deer and will consequently have to be added to the south.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask the right hon. gentleman how the figures which he has read to us to-day are made up ? Are they made up by any department which is responsible for them ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The figures I gave in regard to the votes recorded and in regard to the votes polled I got from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. The figures in regard to the population are taken from the census of 1901. The other figures which I gave about the grain grown and the post offices were given to me by my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. FOSTER. If my right hon. friend will look at page 8012 of yesterday's 'Hansard' there is an explanation I would like to ask of him. What I am trying to get at is the basis upon which the distribution has been made. Yesterday, in the discussion, the hon. Minister of the Interior was

speaking about the basis of this division and he made the remark that the voters' list was not so sure an index in the west as the voters' list in the east would be. There are certain reasons which make it not so good a guide. My right hon. friend said :

I think the basis is as fair as it can be.

Here is the proof of it. This is what I cannot understand and I would like my right hon. friend to explain it. He says :

The population by the census of 1901 was 69,441, or let us say in round numbers 70,000.

I agree to that.

That would give, if you divide the population by twenty-three constituencies, a unit of a little over 3,000.

I agree to that. That is the first fact stated, that 70,000, divided by 23, gives 3,000.

The number of registered votes was 29,950, or let us say in round numbers 30,000. By dividing that number by 23, you would get a unit of about 1,300.

I agree to both of those statements. Thirty thousand divided by 23 gives you 1,300 in round numbers. Then :

The number of votes polled was in round numbers 21,000. Dividing that by 23, you get a little over 900.

I agree to that. The three statements made are these : 70,000 of a population divided by 23, the number of constituencies gives you 3,000 ; 30,000, the number of votes registered, divided by 23, gives you 1,300 ; and 21,000, the number of votes polled, divided by 23, gives you 900. I grant all that, but when the right hon. gentleman draws this conclusion from it, that is what I do not understand, and I would like an explanation. The conclusion which he draws is that :

So that on the whole I think that there is a fair correspondence between these figures, that no injustice has been done to anybody, and that the endeavour has been made to have as fair a division as was possible, especially if you consider the character of the population, which is sometimes in compact groups and sometimes very sparse.

I cannot follow the deduction from the premises laid down. It may be there, but I cannot see it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The deduction is simply this : We have proceeded upon the figures and divided them by 23 without any ultimate thought as to what would be the conclusion. We say : There are the figures, the total population, the total recorded vote, the total number of votes cast ; divide them by 23 and the result is as I have stated. But now, we go further and we have gone further. If these figures were taken by themselves and if there was nothing else than these figures the adjustment between the north and south would not be challenged by anybody. They show that we have this population, and if we give so many seats they produce such a result, but since I spoke yesterday and since my hon. friend spoke yesterday we have had the speech of my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) who says this division is absolutely unfair, because it gives more to the north than to the south. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) who, I think, was not in the House last evening, although in the afternoon he heard part of the speech of my hon. friend from Calgary, heard him say that according to the figures which I gave to the House of the registered votes, the votes polled and the population, 10 members ought to be given to the south and 5 to the north. That is the point which we have to elucidate. I say that the figures which I gave yesterday and the figures which I gave to-day do not warrant that conclusion. In so far as I can make anything out of these figures there is absolute justice done to everybody. How do I make that out ? I do not know whether my hon. friend followed my argument to-day, but I make that out by showing that if you have 11 constituencies north of Red Deer and 11 south of Red Deer there are more registered votes in the southern constituency than in the northern constituency. The difference is not great, but I grant that. If you take the population you find that there are 5,200 souls more in the north than in the south giving there the advantage to the north. Under such circumstances, can my hon. friend come to the conclusion that any injustice has been done to the south to benefit the north? I am sure that the figures which I have given do not show that conclusion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The statement I made yesterday was that the local distribution of 1902 was 9 in the south and 6 in the north. I said that on that basis there should be 15 in the south and 10 in the north. I did not make the statement, or if I did I did not intend to make the statement, that the division should be as 15 to 10 according to the census of 1901. But the figures show that since the distribution of the local house in May, 1902 the influx of population had been south. That was my intention ? Then, as to the census the population has more than doubled since 1901 and as I understand the right hon. leader of the government admits that there are considerably more voters—I did not catch the exact figures—and a considerably greater number of names on the list south than there are north. The census being practically five years old it would be a manifestly unfair guide to take.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If we had a census in 1905, we would rely on it and there would be no necessity to look at these other facts. But we know there is an increased population since the census, and how are we to proceed. The hon. gentleman says that upon the basis of the

distribution in 1902, there ought to be ten in the south and five in the north. I say that is not a correct contention. It may be a basis but you cannot depend on it alone; you must take other things into account. Taking it together with the recorded votes, and taking it with the census, I have come to the conclusion that the distribution which has been made is fair to the south and to the north. I believe that distribution should warrant the approbation of everybody and I challenge the criticism of my hon. friend. If you take these figures which cannot be disputed, it shows that the distribution is fair.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. It would be unfair to the south if based on the vote cast and unfair if based on the votes on the list; but you prefer to adopt a census which is five years old.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. You cannot take one thing alone; you have to consider a series of things and considering these we have come to the conclusion that the distribution is fair.

Mr. FOSTER. There is not an agreement between the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As to what?

Mr. FOSTER. As to the basis upon which the distribution has been made. Their statements are as far apart as the poles. The Minister of the Interior said that while you might look at the registered vote as a matter of curiosity and may be as a little aid; that while you might take the population of 1901 as a matter of curiosity, as a guide it was worthless, that while you might take the number of post offices you simply did it because information was asked for and it might show a certain trend of population; that while you might take the improvement districts; taking all these together when you had done that you absolutely throw them away as far as a determining factor was concerned, and you took one thing and one thing only, and that was the actual number of votes polled. The Minister of the Interior said:

> The definite division of the constituencies is based on the vote actually polled on the 3rd November, as we believe that was the closest and most recent date upon which we could get information we could rely upon. The information with regard to post offices, homestead entries and other matters of that kind was arrived at in order to bear, not upon the question of division of constituencies, but on the question as to whether the bulk of the population was in one end of the country or the other. That information therefore would not have any direct bearing on the propriety of the actual division made, but would be merely corroborative evidence to show whether the trend of population was in this direction or that.

There cannot be a more clear-cut statement than that made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) who in conjunction with one other gentleman from the west is said to be the father of this schedule, to have brought it down ready made and fresh from the mill; to have got the imprint of the Minister of the Interior upon it and got it into the Bill. If any one ought to know the child it should be the father; if anybody has a right to speak definitely upon this it should be the Minister of the Interior. In view of that statement of the minister, all this airy talk about the number of post offices, agricultural productions, homestead entries and the like is simply stuffing and padding. According to the Minister of the Interior the basis upon which you have cut out these twenty-five constituencies is the actual vote polled in each district except two where there was no poll. That was stated not only once by the Minister of the Interior, but reiterated. At another time yesterday he said:

> There are many others in confirmation, but I think my hon. friend is in error in suggesting, as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has already said, that reliance was placed on the number of post offices or local improvement districts or upon anything except the actual number of votes polled because this is the actual basis of distribution. All the rest is in confirmation.

There is the basis of your distribution, and the distribution was made on this basis before any attempt was made to get information to buttress it up. I venture to state, see whether it will be contradicted, that that schedule of distribution as it is now was practically finished before the government had before it any information as to improvement districts, as to the number of school-houses, as to agricultural products, and these other things about which they have been talking. The Minister of the Interior contends that that is the actual basis, that, the other is for confirmation, and when the matter came to the point of discussion and you had to sustain your position you look around for these other things. What reliance can the First Minister place upon the number of post offices in the north as compared with the number of post offices in the south to show why there should be a certain number of constituencies in the one and a certain number in the other? Will the number of post offices be any index to population? There is one post office in Calgary and there is one post office serving a district in Stony Plain; but is that very fact any indication that one place has a larger population than the other. If you took the revenue of these post offices, if you could know the letters received and sent or the number of people actually served by each post office, then you might have an index to the population, but the ministers say they have not that information and they did not attempt to prepare it in answer to questions put. I put it to the Prime Minister as a

man of common sense: what reliance can be placed upon the argument which because there are so many post offices north of a certain line and so many south, that therefore these indicates the population in one as compared with the other. My right hon. friend can talk from now until doomsday about the number of post offices, but the more he talks the more he will show the weakness of his case. And as to the number of schools. Will the Prime Minister say that the number of schools north of the line and the number of schools south of the line is any indication of the population north or the population south? What are the practical facts? A district which can muster no more than ten children organizes itself into a school district and erects a school-house. Another district which is thickly populated, which has fifty children, organizes itself into a school district, and erects its school-house. According to my right hon. friend's argument, one school-house counts as much as another; but the population of the district represented by ten children would be thirty or forty, perhaps much less, while the population of the other district would be five or six times as much.

Now, what reliance can be placed on a mere recapitulation of school-houses as an index to the poulation north or south? It would have been an argument pertinent and confirmatory if my right hon. friend had given the school population north of the line and the school population south of the line, because in either case it would bear a fairly equal proportion to the adult population or the population of adults and children. In no other way is it worth a thought as an argument. Take again the improvement districts. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) yesterday showed very clearly the case from that point of view. In certain districts of the country, where the roads are poor, where the circumstances make it necessary that the people shall put their shoulders together and their pockets together in order to get fair roads for themselves, they are more apt to have improvement districts. But leaving aside the citation of particulars, how can you argue that because in the north there are so many improvement districts and in the south so many, therefore you have a basis from which you can deduce a greater or a less population for the one part than for the other? These are three of the considerations upon which you say you rest your distribution. The Minister of the Interior says he does not rest the division on these things. He is not driven by his assertion to argue an absurdity. The right hon. the First Minister is driven to argue an absurdity, and the absurdity is by making it appear that mere numbers of school-houses, numbers of post offices and numbers of improvement districts are any indication at all of the population. You can take anything else. My right hon. friend has cited the agricultural products. Does he think these are an index of the population? Does he think they are the same index of population in the Northwest that they are in the eastern provinces? In the eastern provinces, the grain-growing areas on the farms are restricted to a few acres comparatively, whereas in the Northwest one man may have a grain area of one square mile or two square miles or a half square mile, with all the concomitants of agricultural machinery, which takes the place of population and does the work of the naked hand. Does my right hon. friend want this House to think for a moment that there is any connection between the bare number of bushels of agricultural products raised in one section of the country and the number raised in another section as an index to the population that may be in each? The argument, if anything, is against him. But he says, when you come to the south, it is rich in cattle, and cattle require great areas. But the south is not confined to cattle entirely; my right hon. friend ought to know that. Gentlemen who come from the Northwest know that. Go down to the border, and you find large ranching interests, but you find other interests as well. Is it the one or the two kinds of products that you take as indicative of population, or is it the value of the whole mass taken together, and the value of the trade current in and out? That is the kind of figures my hon. friend gave. In that there is some force; but in the argument used by my right hon. friend, I put it to himself whether there is either logic or good sense. Let me press it home to him once more, so as if I can to make him understand what I am after. A school-house is standing in a certain place and a school-house is standing in another place. From the mere fact that a school-house is standing in each place, how can you deduce the population which supports the school-house in each place? Is it possible? Give the school population in the one case and the school population in the other, and any well instructed and informed man will give you a pretty close guess as to the total population in each. Let me go a little further. My right hon. friend talked learnedly and discursively about the three bases of this distribution. What was the first? The first he declared to be existing conditions. Does any one know what he meant by that? I followed him very closely to get at the conclusion he was going to deduce by saying that they had taken existing conditions into account. The only thing I could find was this. Under existing conditions you have fifteen local members in what is the present province of Alberta, and you must add ten more in order to make up twenty-five. I cannot see the argument in that. None of these fifteen representatives are for the new province. The moment the province is formed, these members disappear, and you will

make twenty-five new constituencies. In what way does the fact that there are now fifteen constituencies for the local legislature enter into the formation of the twenty-five constituencies which you have to create ?

It evidently did not enter into it thus far that you adopted the fifteen that are there and did not change them. You did not let it enter into your considerations when you carved out ten others so as to make your number up to twenty-five. You went by the country that you had to divide and by the number of constituencies that you wanted, and you cut and carved, divided and added and subtracted to make up the distribution that you have now. How did existing circumstances find themselves as a factor, and in what way did they enter as a factor into this ? Neither gave you the basis, because you have disturbed the basis. What did it give you ? That I tried to find out from my right hon. friend from time to time, but I am quite certain I was unable to do so, and I may be uncharitable if I say I do not think he has been able to find it himself, except as a mere matter of declamation. What were the factors taken from existing circumstances that have entered into this ? The Minister of the Interior gives the answer. He says that the only thing that has entered into it was the vote that was polled. He says what entered next was population, and he says that was a guide; what they wanted to get as near as possible was equality of population in the different representative districts. That is what my right hon. friend put forth as his strongest argument, and to-day he reiterated the same thing. He said: I do not care for north or south or the dividing line, I only want to see that the population is equally divided in these constituencies, and that consequently every elector has his proportionate share in the government of the province. Who raised the point of north and south ? It was certainly not the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). The first mention I heard of that line of north and south in this House was by the Minister of the Interior himself. It was not mentioned as a division which should be sectional or anything of that kind, it was taken as a dividing line to show the population north and south and show if possible that the populations had been equally diyided. But does it not strike the right hon. gentleman and his supporters and all the members of this House that when you have exhausted the argument as to twenty-three constituencies you have brought it down to this agreement amongst gentlemen on the other side of the House that as far as these twenty-three constituencies are concerned there is not any very great inequalty shown. We have given fourteen to the north. You have given eleven north of Red Deer and eleven south, which makes twenty-two, and you have Red Deer in the centre. Consequently you have divided it you say pretty equally. Even in that division the hon. gentlemen took care that they would get a political advantage. They get on that division more members than the south get. After that has been done, my right hon. friend comes in gratuitously and says: Over and above that we will just chalk off two other constituencies in Peace River and Athabaska River and we will add them to the north as well. Without these two it could not be shown that there was equality between the north and the south, but when you come to shave as near as hon. gentleman can to it, then they take away from the whole of their profession of fairness by injecting the vast districts to the north with a voting population of from 300 to 500 and making them equal to a voting population in each case of 960 in the south and in other parts, and they call that equality. They appeal to the principles of fairness and justice, they call on all Canada and high heaven to witness that they are doing exactly what is right. There is no insuperable difficulty with reference to the northern district. One thing I would like to know, is as to the distribution of population in the Peace River and Athabaska River. Are the people who are living there, the voters who will be, in settlements, and if so, in what settlements ? There must be some knowledge with reference to this. I do not imagine that although the distance may be great you have a widely separated rural population up there. If you have a nomadic population that is one element that makes it very difficult to give them representation, but it may be that not so great an injustice would be perpetrated by not giving the nomadic part of the population representation as by giving them triple or quadruple representation. If you have a sedentary population residing in settlements what are those settlements ? Your Interior Department ought to give us that information, and we want that information from them if it is possible. The Prime Minister says you cannot have a Canadian in this country and not have him exercising the rights of a free-born Canadian and a British subject. We have many people in this country who cannot exercise their rights. Circumstances alter cases, and the circumstances of distance and space and sparseness of population make it so that there are hundreds and thousands of people in this country who cannot practically be represented. This is due to the circumstances of the life which they have chosen for themselves, and the only duty upon a government is to follow that class of people as far as you reasonably can, and when they get into anything like a settled condition, into stated settlements, as far as possible to give them the rights of representation. To-day we have constituencies represented in this House within the limits of which constituencies there are living hundreds of British and Canadian citizens who cannot and do not exercise their franchise. Sup-

pose it were a little difficult for a man who wants to be a representative, within a certain space of time, to visit these settlements in Peace River and Athabaska. Suppose that we annexed it to some constituency further south, even if it were a little difficult to carry on the election, there are resources in the legislation of this country to meet the case; it is possible to accommodate the machinery of elections to that kind of circumstances. It is done to-day in our present election law, and in our constitution. It could be done there in just the same way. More time can be given and special machinery can be put into operation in order to give these more distant settlements the right to exercise their franchise and poll their votes. It is not necessary, and it is not fair to go to the opposite extreme and to argue that because there are two or three posts 300 or 400 miles distant from the nearest constituency that therefore you are to give unequal representation. No one would grumble at unequal representation to a certain extent.

But will the government give unequal representation to an unreasonable and absurd extent merly to sustain the argument that every Canadian, every British subject, who has the franchise should have equal right in the exercise of the franchise ? No, it is done because it makes uneven the due balance between north and south ; it is done in order that two men may be placed in the new parliament to exercise authority in moulding its initiatory legislation in order that party advantage may be gained. In other words, there is no doubt, I believe, that this is simply a gerrymander. This is an attempt on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to control the legislature of Alberta in their own interest. There are reasons why they wish to do this. The very campaign we have been going through here for the last five months furnishes the reason—the necessity hon. gentlemen opposite feel of having a majority in the legislature to throw the mantle of their approval over everything that is done by this government. Now, is it well to proceed to the formation of a new province on such lines as these ? Is it well for even a powerful government to afford ground for suspicion of such a thing? Commence with a gerrymander, and with what measure ye meet it shall be measured to you again. A gerrymander perpetrated by the father and founder of the province will be measured back again—but without profit to the new province. The feeling caused by such an act rests deep in the hearts of the people and is not easily overcome. Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) read the newspapers from the Northwest ? Will he collate the utterances of the Liberal newspapers from the province of Alberta and try to understand what that voice is telling him ? Is it not reasonable to suppose that these newspapers have the interest of their country at heart ? Is it not reasonable to suppose that they represent as good Liberal doctrine as does the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) ? Is it out of malice, out of mere cussedness that they are giving utterance to the sentiments that they express ? Or is it because they have a feeling that they must express ? They afford my hon. friend food for reflection. The course he is pursuing must inevitably implant in that new province, at the beginning of his political life, a suspicion, a sense of injustice, a desire of revenge—feelings that do not help in maintaining the peace, order and good government of that country. Why should the government incur suspicion ? Is there not a better way ? More than that, the government's supporter from Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot) may be a fair and sensible gentleman ; the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) may be the same ; they are credited with being the master hands in drawing up this schedule. I have been given to understand that, if the Minister of the Interior had not been unreasonable in pushing this proposal, some better way would have been resorted to. Is it, or is it not a fact consonant with common sense that you might go to a non-partisan body in the Northwest ? I am not making any imputation against the hon gentlemen I have named. But they are partisans. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) could not live if he were not a partisan ; he could not be Minister of the Interior if he were not a partisan. And his friend beside him (Mr. Peter Talbot) could not get the good things that are going, and could not support what the Minister of the Interior wants him to support, unless he were a strong partisan—and sometimes, I dare say, he feels that he must be mighty strong to support it all. The plain common sense of it is,—here are two partisans with an interest in the complexion of this representation, a money interest, a party interest, a political interest, to go no further. Are these gentlemen presumably able to prepare for this parliament a fair and reasonable distribution of these seats, or is there some other body that could do it better ? It seems to me that the better course has been suggested by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). What objection can there be to having these men who have been appointed to the highest judicial position in the gift of the government in that country do this work ? They are men of trained legal minds, men who have been elevated to the bench and so live outside the atmosphere of partisanship, in a place, where, as it is popularly supposed, these old scales fall from their eyes and they can see the facts as they are and act judicially. Certainly, they are free from the trammels of politics and have nothing much more to hope for in political advantage. And they have their reputations at stake. More than that, they live in all the constituencies ; they travel through them all. The principle is declared here that these constituencies should be formed with a due regard to population. Who are the men who can most

fairly and with the best knowledge of the facts apply this principle ? Who could do it better than these six men who to-day are your Supreme Court judges in the Northwest ? What possible argument can be used against their delimiting these constituencies? Leave the matter to them and you will immediately do away with oppposition so far as this clause is concerned. Is that a thing which it is worth while to consider ? High precedents can be quoted for such a course. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has vaunted himself a Liberal of the English school. If he were a member in authority in the British parliament, would he dare to propose a scheme for the redistribution of seats in any of the divisions of Great Britain according to a scheme framed by two partisans of his own from the extreme corner of that division ? Would he venture to force that plan, without reasonable argument, upon parliament ? No English statesman has ever tried to do such a thing ; no British government has ever been guilty of doing it. Whenever there was redistribution of seats there, the first point was agreement. We do not want Liberal or Tory, we do not want Whig or Radical, in the redistributions of seats—we want a fair redistribution.

We do not want a Whig or Radical distribution. What we want is a fair distribution; and a proper government and a proper House of parliament has always acted upon that rule, and avoided the rock of trouble which my right hon. friend is steering against. May I recall to my right hon. friend his own favourite utterances of years ago, how he stood on this side and pleaded for an equal division of the constituencies. He will answer me that he did not get his request, so far as he himself viewed it, but that does not matter here nor there against the rightness of the argument. It does matter, however, to my right hon. friend. It shows whether he was in earnest then or not. If he was in earnest, he wished that to be carried out, not for party advantage, but in justice to the electors themselves. If he was in earnest then, these great principles have not changed since, and we must presume him to be equally in earnest now. There he stands at the helm of legislation. Will he do to-day, as Prime Minister, what he held for and argued for years and years when on this side ? Why not ? I am not going any further in the argument than this, but this one thing I will say. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) and my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames)—the latter of whom I did not hear, but whose speech I have read—bestowed more blood and brain and muscle expenditure on the information that they have procured, and procured at immense toil to themselves, than has been shown by the whole of the government on the other side, and they have put information before this House which is reliable, I believe; which must be held to be reliable until it is controverted; and the whole trend of that information goes to show that an injustice is being perpetrated. They might very well say: Your distribution is wrong ; here is ours, put that on. But they did not go that far. They sense this idea that there is partisanship on both sides, and that there might be partiality even in their own proposal. They do not ask that theirs be adopted, but they present their side of the case and say : For reasonable fair-play and justice, for the stilling of bad passions, and for the setting out on a smooth sea the new sail which is to break from harbour on the 1st July, let your only impartial board in the Northwest, whom you yourselves have appointed in part, who are looked up to and trusted, against whose honour, justice and fair-play no man will breathe a single word—let them be trusted with the duty of giving to the new electors of that new province their new scheme of distribution. Why cannot that be acceded to ? What interest would suffer if it were, and what good would not be brought about if it were acceded to by my right hon. friend ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman saw fit to draw attention to an alleged discrepancy between the position taken by the First Minister and myself as to the basis of calculation upon which the distribution was made. I think he rather missed the point in what I said, as I think the House will bear me out, having heard him read it. The basis of the division of the constituencies was necessarily, I said, the vote cast. That was not the question that he was arguing about at all. That question has not yet arisen. I said that we took the actual vote cast, because it was the latest and most accurate information we could get for the purpose of drawing a dividing line between the constituencies. But that was not, if he followed my remarks of yesterday, the sole basis, from my point of view, of the general arrangement that was made. He speaks of my having introduced the question of the dividing line at township 38. I do not know whether it is to the purpose in this argument to shut our eyes and ears to what we have seen and heard ever since these Autonomy Bills came up for consideration; but I instanced the increase of population, the number of post offices, the number of statute labour districts, the number of school districts and other matters connected with the northern country, as evidence that there has been a large increase of population in that country such as would justify the large increase of representation that is being given to it. I gather from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that, having availed himself of all the information which was collected at so much labour and pains, most commendable, by the hon. members for Calgary and St. Antoine, and having applied his own intellect to the matter, he came to the conclusion that, so far as the

new province of Alberta is concerned, as far north as the southern boundary of Athabaska, a fair, reasonable and equitable division had been made. If I did not gather that from his remarks, then I certainly missed the point.

Mr. FOSTER. Then you missed the point.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly the hon. gentleman entertained the House for a considerable time, and I will go so far as to say that I do not think there is a member in the House besides himself who saw the point if that was not it. He has not challenged the division of the constituencies in that part of the new province of Alberta. If my memory does not fail me, he acknowledged that it was a fair division, an approximately fair division.

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose the hon. gentleman is bound to assert that over and over, and I shall have to rise in self-defence. He will have to take my assertion that I did not intend to, and, in my humble judgment, I did not ; but if I did, I take it all back, as far as that is concerned. I did not intend to, and I tried to make my words explicit enough to convey my meaning.

Mr. OLIVER. We must admit that the hon. gentleman is certainly able to make out a case if he has one, and he certainly did not spare his time in dealing with this question ; and I say again that if he had any evidence of unfairness to give the House, he certainly did not show it.

Mr. FOSTER. If it be any help to my hon. friend, I will tell him one other thing. It is a secret between himself and myself. I am going to take the liberty of making another short address on this before very long. I dealt to-day entirely with the principles of the thing. I do intend to deal later on with the details. But that is a secret between my hon. friend and myself.

Mr. OLIVER. I think my statement has been unchallenged that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has not indicated the point in which this division has been radically unfair. As my right hon. friend the leader of the government says, if we accept the position taken by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) that there is a question between the north and the south and that this Red Deer district should be the dividing line, it has been shown that on that same argument by the census figures, which are now the only absolutely reliable figures we have, that the north is at a disadvantage of something like 5,000 people, that on the votes cast the south is at a disadvantage of something like 1,000 votes and that on the number of votes on the list the south is at a disadvantage of something like 2,000 votes. We submit that the difference in favour of the north, as indicated by the census, equalizes beyond question the difference in favour of the south in regard to the number of registered votes and votes cast. If there is any balance either way it must be admitted to be so small that it never before was taken into consideration in a redistribution Bill where 20,000 votes were at issue. The hon. gentlemen have come down to absolute hair splitting on this question in order to make out a grievance, and they will have to split hairs still finer before they can succeed in making out a grievance as far as Alberta is concerned up to the southern boundary of Athabaska. We will be glad to hear the argument of the hon. member for North Toronto when he comes to deal with this question in detail. So far he admits that he has not made an argument on that subject, but he says and says eloquently that there is unfairness and injustice and he threatens revenge just as some time ago he threatened disruption of the constitution in regard to another question. He is very strong in threats, but we have to get used to these things. He is going to avoid all difficulty by referring this question to a commission of judges. I will admit that if it were a question of dividing the constituencies so that no harm should be done to this or to that political party a commission of judges, or an impartial outside commission, might very well be appointed. But so far as this argument has gone that question has not arisen. Nothing has been placed before the House to show that any question has to be decided that can be decided by people outside of this House better than by people inside of this House. When we come to the actual division of the constituencies, then, I will admit, it will be time for such an argument to be made if ever. The question that is before the House at the present time is not a question of law. It is a question of policy. The question to be decided has no more right to be relegated to an outside commission than any of the responsibilities which have been placed upon us by the people of the country have a right to be relegated to an outside commission. The question is : Shall the district of Athabaska be represented or not? I submit that this is not a question of law. It is a question of policy. It is not a question for judges to decide. It is a question for this House to decide. The time for the hon. gentleman and his friends to have dealt with that question was when it was faced squarely by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). He moved a resolution in the House, or proposed to move a resolution, that the district of Athabaska should not be included in the new province of Alberta, but when it came to the time to vote on that resolution, to make a declaration of policy on the part of the party of the opposition in regard to that dis-

trict, the hon. gentleman withdrew his motion, I presume, because he could not get his friends on the other side of the House to support it. I think they showed a very considerable degree of wisdom in securing the withdrawal of the hon. gentleman's motion. If they agreed then, as they did agree, to the inclusion of the district of Athabaska in the new province of Alberta, they must face the question squarely whether they are going to give that district representation or not. This is not a judicial question. They may call it a partisan question, but it is a political question, using the word in its highest sense, a question of policy on the part of this parliament and we must make a decision and be responsible for that decision. My hon. friend has spoken of principle. Does he take the ground before this House and before the country that this country containing more than half the total area of the new province shall not have representation in the new parliament? If he does we take issue with him on that point and we say that taxation shall have representation, that when we include the district of Athabaska in the province of Alberta that district shall be subject to all the responsibilities of provincial government and that it is entitled to all the advantages which will result from sharing and taking part in that government.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why was the hon. gentleman not very solicitous to have that district represented in the Dominion parliament? I understand that at the present time these people are not represented in the Dominion parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I think my hon. friend should not be absurd. He knows that during the two parliaments I represented the district of Alberta, which is now represented in parliament by four members. I felt, for my part, speaking of the matter personally, that I had enough on my hands without urging the addition of other territory, but as the representative of the district of Alberta adjoining this district of Athabaska and living in a locality which was in close communication with that district, it was necessary for me to spend a considerable part of my time and energy in representing the interests of the people of that district as far as I could. I certainly was under a very great disadvantage by reason of the fact that I had no authority, and I think that the people of that district should be represented from this time forward. The fact that they have not been represented, I hope, will not be urged as a reason why they shall not be represented in the future.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No. The hon. minister took part in the enactment of certain legislation a few years ago. I do not know that he was so solicitous at that time that taxation should carry with it representation or that these people should have their rights asserted as he is now.

Mr. OLIVER. That is quite another question. The district of Athabaska was not included in the organized portions of the Territories?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why not?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the time had not come. It is going to be included now. The Northwest government had never asked to have it included and there was no particular reason why I should at that particular time urge its inclusion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Had not the legislative assembly at Regina the administration of affairs in Athabaska?

Mr. OLIVER. They had a certain right of administration, but they had not control over the district of Athabaska as they had over the organized Territories. They had a right of administration such as the government of Manitoba has over the district of Keewatin, but the district of Athabaska was not part of the territory over which they exercised full control and they did not ask to have it added to their territory. Probably the time had not arrived when it should be added to the territory. But an idea that hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be able to grasp is that there has been progress in the district of Athabaska as there has been in other parts of the Territories, that these conditions require to be met and that this legislation is for the purpose of meeting the conditions as they exist and as they are in immediate prospect. The fact that the district of Athabaska is not a part of the organized Territories and did not receive representation in the Dominion parliament is no more a cause of complaint against this government, than it is a cause of complaint against the Creator of the universe that the world had to be created at a certain period of time.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. That's pretty good.

Mr. OLIVER. That ought to settle the question. The representation of the district of Athabaska in the new provincial legislature is a question of policy, and that question of policy is : Shall a district which contains population, which contributes largely to the trade of the country, which is on the eve of being opened up to the fullest extent; shall this parliament take the responsibility of including that district in the new province and not provide it with adequate representation ? If gentlemen on the other side take that position, I can assure them that we on this side take issue with them

on that point here and now. There is another consideration. The subsidies which the new provinces will receive have a nominal basis of calculation at any rate, upon the amount of ungranted land available for revenue purposes. It is because of the large areas of the new provinces that it is possible to give them the liberal subsidies we have accorded. Were it only the old districts of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Assiniboia, that were organized into two new provinces, they could not have claimed, and I believe they would not have obtained, that liberal treatment which it is proposed to give the new provinces. Is it to be said that we are to give the new provinces a large subsidy proportionate to their large area, and then cut off that very area from representation in the legislature? A few minutes ago my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was almost threatening rebellion, or revenge anyway, in the Territories, because of this injustice that he said was about to be perpetrated.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. A musket on the Athabaska.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) should modify that language a little. I did not threaten any personal revenge. I said that action of this kind was apt to breed feelings of revenge, and there may be a slight difference in meaning between these two forms of expression.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Only a shade of difference.

Mr. OLIVER. I will accept the apology of the hon. member (Mr. Foster), and I will say that he was threatening revenge and not revolution. Last night the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Ames) was almost eloquent in informing us of how little importance this division was because it was momentary, and immediately the legislature met it could make its own redistribution. I say that this parliament has responsibility in this matter irrespective of what action the provincial legislature may take. We propose to create these provinces with these areas, the duty is laid upon us of distributing the seats, and our responsibility is to see that that area is represented properly and adequately. It is for that reason we propose to give this representation to the district of Athabaska. It is entitled to representation as a part of the province, and this parliament would be doing less than its duty if it did not provide representation for that district. Is it to be said that the district of St. Albert, or the district of Sturgeon, or the district of Saskatchewan, which border on this district of Athabaska, and which already are two or three times the area of any of the districts in the southern part of the country; is it to be said that these districts shall also have the charge of representing the district of Athabaska? Surely that suggestion would be as unfair as the suggestion made by the hon. member (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) that south of township 38 there should be fifteen representatives and north of that township there should be only ten representatives.

Mr. AMES. Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the constituency of Sturgeon was two or three times the size of the constituency of Medicine Hat, for example?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not intend to say that; I meant to say it was two or three times the size of some of the southern constituencies, for example, Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, Pincher, Banff, Rosebud, and others.

Mr. AMES. Are any of these as small as the constituencies of Strathcona and Leduc?

Mr. OLIVER. They are not, and the population of Strathcona is quite as large as any of these I have mentioned. This province lies along British Columbia; the area of the northern part of British Columbia is just as isolated as the district of Peace River is to-day; the prospects of opening up Peace River are as good, or better, than the prospects of opening up the northern parts of British Columbia; the Cassiar district has been represented in the legislature of British Columbia for twenty years or more, and there is no reason why, on our side of the mountains, a country of very much greater agricultural and other value, should not be represented in the new legislature. If the province of British Columbia deems it proper to have its outlying districts represented, the new province of Alberta has just as much right to have its outlying districts represented in its legislature.

Mr. AMES. Suppose Peace River and St. Albert were united, would they have any greater area than the constituency of Cassiar, in British Columbia?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say.

Mr. AMES. Figure it out.

Mr. OLIVER. However that may be, I am satisfied that the representative of the district of St. Albert will have greater responsibility in representing that district than will the representative of Cardston, according to the population. There is no right or justice in suggesting that in addition to the present responsibility which he discharges—equal to that of the representative of one or two or three of the southern constituencies—he should have added the responsibility of representing a district which is as large as a European empire, and as valuable.

Mr. LAKE. Is there any necessity for running St. Albert within six miles of Edmonton?

Mr. OLIVER. It runs within nine miles of Edmonton, and I would say there is. These districts of Athabaska and Peace

River are traversed by two great rivers; they contain possibilities of equal value to the possibilities of more than equal areas in other provinces in this Dominion; they have a present population and they have a valuable trade; it is in the interest not only of these districts but of this whole Dominion that the methods of civilized government should prevail throughout the length and breadth of these provinces; and the only means that we recognize for the application of the forms of civilized government in this country is adequate representation. That is all that we ask at the hands of this House, and we ask it, not as a matter of judicial decision, but as a question of public policy, upon which we are prepared to take issue with our friends on the other side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand that it is proposed to have the commission of judges decide as to what parts of the country shall or shall not be represented. Their duty is a duty of delimitation based upon the decision of this parliament as to what country shall be represented.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is in error. The amendment moved by the hon. member for Calgary makes no such distinction. It proposes to refer everything to the judges. Here it is:

That section 12 be struck out, and that the following be substituted therefor:

Until the said legislature otherwise provides, the legislative assembly shall be composed of twenty-five members, to be elected to represent the electoral divisions hereinafter mentioned.

Such division shall be made by a board of commissioners, &c.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my right hon. friend mean to say that it proposes that the judges shall mark the boundaries of the province of Alberta?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not the boundaries of the province, because that is done by parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. If then the boundaries of the province are marked by parliament, what the judges would have to do would be to delimit the area so bounded into twenty-five constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And they would say whether the present district of Athabaska should be represented or not—whether it should be annexed to a neighbouring constituency or have representation of its own. I say this is not a question to be determined by the judges. It is a question to be determined by parliament.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has any one in the House suggested that the northern regions should not be represented? I have not heard it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I heard it not later than yesterday evening—that they should not have representation by themselves.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ah!

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is a question which should be determined here. It is essentially, as my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior says, a question of high politics, the highest kind of politics. The question whether these matters should be determined by parliament or by the judges is never a question in England. My hon. friend refers to the policy of the Liberal party in Great Britain. It is always pleasant to hear my hon. friend talking of Liberal principles and never applying them paying them the tribute of empty compliments and nothing more. In England the duty of delimitation is not assigned to judges, but to a board of commissioners, and they are restricted to the duty of delimitation. They have to consult old charters to ascertain the limits of towns, boroughs, and so on, which we have not to do here. What we have to determine is what should be the basis of representation and how it should be applied. I must say that I am a little disappointed at the conduct of my hon. friends on the other side of the House. When two months ago we gave them the actual numbers of the constituencies and the manner in which we intended to divide the province, I expected that if they had any objection to the division, they would offer a counter proposition. But nothing of the kind has taken place. If they had come with their list of constituencies, we might have seen how far we could agree, and then there might have been something to refer to the judges. But nothing of the kind has taken place. Our proposition has been met with a naked negative and nothing else—with the statement that our distribution as between the south and the north is not fair. That is the only point our hon. friends on the other side of the House make. Have you heard a complaint that any of these constituencies are unfair, or that there is any attempt at what is known as a gerrymander? You have not heard anything of the kind. The only point made up to the present time, after twenty-four hours of discussion, is that our distribution is not fair to the south, that it is in favour of the north. My hon. friend from North Toronto argued a moment ago that we had not any basis of representation, although we have shown that we have taken as a basis all the records that are at our disposal—the population as given by the census, the recorded vote and the registered vote, and to these we have added the number of post offices. My hon. friend says there is no argument in the number of post offices. He says that in the town of Calgary there is one post office and in Stony Plain one post office, and that the former has an urban population of some magnitude while the latter is an insignifi-

cant place with a small population. Is it fair to make such a comparison—to compare a city with a village? What tells a tale which bears on this question is a comparison of the number of post offices in two sections of the country such as the northern part and the southern part of Alberta. The number of school sections in one part as compared with the number in another part is also a fair test. Of course, it would not be fair to compare one post office with another; but it is a fair comparison to take two sections with the same areas and inhabited by the same kind of people, and compare the number of post offices in one section with the number in the other. The logical conclusion from such a comparison is that where there are more post offices there are more people. My hon. friend cannot draw any conclusion from the argument, which he made very insidiously, I will not say ingeniously, in which he compared a rural population with an urban population. Then, I instanced the production of grain in the northern district as compared with the production in the southern district. My hon. friend says that is not a fair comparison, because if we compare the east with the west, we shall find much more machinery used in the east than in the west, and therefore the production does not indicate the relative populations. Very true, but we are not comparing the east with the west. We are comparing two western populations which have similar methods of doing their work; and if you find that there is a greater production of grain in one section than in another, you have a right to conclude that there are more people to produce that grain. I have never contended that these tests were strictly accurate, to the point, peremptory and paramount; but my argument is that all these put together tell a uniform tale, and show that there are more people in the north than in the south; and that if so, there ought to be more representation there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If he is going by the people in the north and the south why not go by population entirely?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend rest his case on that?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On the basis of population.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well. I will say to my hon. friend then that by the census of 1901 there were in the 11 districts north of Red Deer 36,398 people and in the 11 districts south of Red Deer 31,034, showing a balance of population in favour of the north of 5,000 by the census of 1901.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the population now taken from the voters' lists, returns of homesteads and everything of that kind?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take the voters' lists, the homestead entries and everything else of that kind and I will conclude that there are more in the north than there are in the south. Of course the figures cannot be given with absolute accuracy owing to the circumstances of the case but they tell that there is not a sufficient discrepancy between the north and the south to make it the basis of the discussion we have had up to the present time.

Mr. HAGGART. The right hon. gentleman twitted my friend here in reference to the statement that he was always professing to follow principles which were advocated by the party opposite and that he never followed them himself. The hon. gentleman says that we are following the same course as is followed in England, that in England there is left to the judges only the power of delimiting the different constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. HAGGART. The question of policy was not decided by the parliament at all; the question of policy was decided by a conference of both parties. That policy was agreed upon and then the matter was submitted to the judges for the purpose of delimiting the constituencies according to that policy. What does the hon. gentleman propose? He says that the admission of Athabaska and Peace River district is a question of policy. That question would not be decided in the imperial parliament at all. That is a fair question for a conference or for the judges to decide. The principles upon which a delimitation is made is a subject for a conference, because the delimitation is made upon principles which are given to the judges for that purpose. In England it was entirely different. Mr. Gladstone meets Sir Stafford Northcote and Lord Salisbury. They agree upon principles upon which the delimitation is to be made or in other words the two parties have a conference and agree upon the policy, but the right hon. gentleman forces down the policy upon the people of this country nolens volens. He says: why not give representation to these two territories? No person in this House denies representation to them, adequate representation if necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was denied yesterday.

Mr. FOSTER. Who was it?

Mr. HAGGART. Who was it? I never heard a person in the House deny it, that these two portions of the country might be added to the other constituencies and given representation. That would be a fair representation but what we deny is, and what we think is the anomaly and the curiosity in this is, that there is a division between the north and the south; every one knows the reason of that division, each wants the capital, they want a fair show in reference

to it, and they want the question left to the country. It is not left to the electorate at all because in making what he calls a fair division the Prime Minister brings in the question of policy and gives to two constituencies which by their population are not entitled to a third of a member, two members. That is the position. The hon. gentleman to be fair and to be right, should follow the principles adopted in every other English speaking country in the world: in the United States, in New Zealand, in Natal, in New South Wales. He should follow the principles adopted in Great Britain, that is to remove it from the area of pure party politics altogether. They are big enough in every other place to leave these questions to an independent tribunal.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did the hon. gentleman follow that policy ?

Mr. HAGGART. The first to propose this policy was Mr. Gladstone——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you follow it ?

Mr. HAGGART. The party who proposed that policy in the House and advocated it again and again, were the leaders of the hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, Mr. Blake, and Mr. Mills. The policy was endorsed, was inscribed in an Act of parliament introduced by the present Postmaster General. It has always been the policy of the Reform party to adopt this principle, but it is like the other promises made and many of them made by the present government from end to end of the country, it was all talk and when they had the power to perform it they were led by political reasons in order to get a little political advantage, in a small manner, in one section of the country, to swallow their principles and adopt others when the opportunity offered.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did you adopt it, when you divided the constituencies ?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY moved the third reading of Bill (No. 115) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). I was present when this Bill was before the Railway Committee, but was not in my place the other evening when it was discussed in the Committee of the Whole. I believe that on the latter occasion some remarks were made by the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding). I had hoped that he would be here to-night, because I wished to ask him some questions about the changes that have been made by the forms of agreement in the Bill, which, in effect, amend and alter the Acts passed last session. I do not know whether it is desirable to go on at the present moment, or whether we may expect that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will be soon in his place. But I am prepared to state the question I raised before the Railway Committee, and perhaps the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will be able to tell us exactly what the effect of the change is. In the Act passed last session provision was made for the issue of interim bonds by the railway company, which bonds were to be guaranteed by the government, and, in the event of such bonds being issued, provision was made for their retirement and the substitution for them of permanent bonds. It was found—and I think very probably it was correctly found—that the interim bonds would not serve the purpose. I never thought it was a very happy expedient, and I think the company are quite right in coming to the conclusion that interim bonds would have been a mistake. But the question I raised in the Railway Committee was this : The original contract was drawn with the view to the issue of these interim bonds, which, at the conclusion of the work, would be replaced by permanent bonds ; and when that substitution should take place there would necessarily be an adjustment of the whole construction account. Therefore, the government would know, at the end, precisely the amount to which its guarantee applies. It will be evident to any person at all acquainted with such matters that there is always some risk in issuing, on progress estimates, interim bonds, as the amount may far exceed the value of the work as finally ascertained. As I say, I pointed this out in the Railway Committee to the Minister of Justice and in the presence of the counsel for the railway company. It was not disputed. I pointed out that it was almost impossible to avoid some risk in this respect, because the chief engineer of the work was absolutely dependent upon his subordinates for the progress report. A young gentleman with very little experience might have charge of ten miles of some very important portion of the work. He, of course, would send in his estimates month by month, and the chief engineer would have to make up his accounts on the basis of these reports. With every desire on the part of each person concerned to be absolutely correct and honest, errors might creep in from time to time. These, of course, would be repaired on the final adjustment. There would be no trouble in this under the Act we passed a year ago, because, whatever the interim bonds might be, the permanent bonds would not issue until the account was finally made up.

But, finding it inconvenient to issue interim bonds, the solicitors drawing these forms agreed that permanent bonds

should be issued forthwith. Therefore, the bonds issued from time to time on these progress estimates become an absolute obligation upon the government of Canada; and there might be some difficulty in the final adjustment. I asked the counsel for the company, Mr. Chrysler—who was very fair and, so far as I can see, desired to give every information to the committee—what protection was provided in this contract to the public against error which might creep in in the progress estimates. I asked him also whether, under this contract, there was a reservation or drawback of a certain percentage on the estimates for which bonds would not be issued. People who are acquainted with such contracts know that this is a very common provision—that 15 or 20 per cent of the progress estimate is often reserved for final adjustment. Mr. Chrysler answered that there was no such provision. But he also said that the government had the matter in his own hands, and it would only guarantee the amount of bonds that it considered would be safe. But I asked him if there was anything in the contract that would entitle the government, if, for instance, $100,000 was certified on the progress estimates, to issue only $80,000. His answer was: No; I take it that the government will do just what it thinks necessary in that case. And he went on to say that Mr. Schreiber, Chief Engineer of Government Railways, or whoever happened to occupy his position, would take care to certify for only such an amount as would allow full protection to the government. But, as I pointed out, Mr. Schreiber, on the face of the contract, has no right to do anything of that kind. That there was no provision in this contract for the reservation of any percentage until the final adjustment of the account; and if the government did reserve part, they would be doing something that no private contractor would have a right to do.

They would be breaking the contract, but Mr. Chrysler said the government is not like an ordinary contractor for they can do as they please. But that did not seem to me a very satisfactory explanation. He went on to say that Mr. Schreiber—he only used Mr. Schreiber's name because he was there before us—the chief engineer of the government, in issuing his progress certificates, would take care to be within the mark. To that I pointed out that the chief engineer is absolutely at the mercy of his subordinates. We need not speak of any subordinate as dishonest. All of us know the young gentlemen who superintend the construction of sections of eight and ten miles of railway. These young gentlemen are very anxious to do right but they make a great many mistakes. Mistakes are frequently made for many thousands of dollars on a small section, and the chief engineer is absolutely dependent on those young gentlemen for the bulk certificates he issues as the maximum amount to cover them all. It did seem to me that some provision should have been made, either in the agreement or the mortgages or the Act, to enable the government, as a matter of legal contract—not as a matter of arbitrary conduct—to reserve 15 to 20 per cent as a safeguard, so that at the end of the contract the final adjustment would find the government on the right side of the account. My hon. friend, the Minister of Justice, took a note of the remarks that I made. Mr. Chrysler was unable to give any explanation except that he supposed the government would always take care of themselves. I would point out to the right hon. the First Minister that that is not business. What is not business for an ordinary railway company cannot possibly be business for a government, unless the government are going to assume that they will do arbitrarily what no company would be allowed to do. I do not think that would be a proper position to take. There may be ample protection in these contracts. The day we met in the Railway Committee to discuss this Bill, it was placed in our hands for the first time. We had an Act of about two or three pages and schedules of over 100 pages of a printed contract, and we were asked as a committee, taking care of the interests of the country, to act to the best of our ability in criticising that Act. I have not the slightest fault to find with the conduct of any gentleman on that occasion. I believe that Mr. Chrysler endeavoured to give the fullest and clearest explanation in his power. I am quite sure the Minister of Justice wished to have every protection, but it was patent to everybody in the committee that he was not fully advised. I do not think he could possibly have acted personally in the matter. It had been entrusted to Mr. Shepley, of Toronto, a very able legal gentleman, who gave a written report, in very general terms, that the contract was settled satisfactorily, but I do not think his report dealt with these particular questions. He was satisfied at large with the terms of the contract; but it occurred to me, in the short discussion we had in the committee, that the government, having since last year, when parliament agreed upon the terms of the contract, in effect altered its terms by providing that instead of interim bonds, which could be recalled, the company were at once to issue and put upon the market final permanent bonds, the effect of that change might not have been sufficiently considered. No gentleman on the committee could have pretended to criticise the contract in that respect. I speak for myself quite frankly when I say I do not think the Minister of Justice on that occasion at all professed to answer, of his own knowledge, that everything was satisfactory. I am quite sure he decided to have it satis-

factory in every respect; but this Bill is of such vast importance, so many millions are involved in it, that unless some explanation has been given the House since the meeting of the committee, beyond what took place in that committee, I do not think, we should pass this Bill as it is. I do not mean to say that there is anything wrong in it; but in a matter involving so many millions, and especially as we are not going to close this session for a week or two, it would be well, unless the right hon. gentleman has satisfied himself on those points, not to pass this Bill too hurriedly.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The question raised by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) was in a measure discussed in the committee on Monday last and was answered by the Minister of Finance, who quoted from a printed report of Mr. Shepley, who acted on behalf of the government in the preparation of these documents. Mr. Shepley did not pass this over in general terms at all as the hon. gentleman suggests, but devoted a large portion of his report at page 4 to the subject of these interim bonds. He said:

(a) The guarantee of interim bonds during the period of construction to be compulsorily convertible into the guaranteed permanent bonds on the completion of the work of construction, which was the scheme for interim aid contemplated by the agreement of 1903. During the negotiations it was found impracticable to devise a workable scheme on the precise lines of the agreement, and there were found to be formidable market objections to bonds issued on the terms contemplated. The method adopted in the mortgage submitted is to provide for the immediate issue of permanent bonds, adding to the fifty-year period of currency of such permanent bonds, which period was under the agreement to begin on the completion of the division, the seven years limited by the agreement of 1904 for such completion, making the bonds at once fifty-seven year bonds. The mortgage provides that the proceeds of these bonds as they are marketed from time to time are to be placed at the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General in approved banks, and paid out from time to time with certain safeguards, as they are earned by construction work.

So the hon. gentleman will see that Mr. Shepley did discuss these bonds—I refer him now particularly to page 15 of the Bill, articles 3 and 4, which I think must have escaped the hon. gentleman in considering this question, because he will there find it is provided that these bonds are to be sold but are not to be handed over to the purchasers until it is certified that they have paid to the credit of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General the full amount of these bonds to be held by him in trust and to be paid out only on the certificate of the chief engineer that the money has been properly earned. That apparently is what Mr. Shepley referred to in the words I have just read, namely, that the mortgage proceeds, as they are marketed from time to time, are to be placed at the credit of the Minister of Finance and Receiver General in approved banks and paid out from time to time with certain safeguards, as they are earned by construction work. The safeguards are provided in articles three and four of the mortgage, whereby the engineer is protected and so is the government. The schedule goes on:

During the period of construction the interest paid upon these bonds is added to and forms part of the cost of construction. During such period of construction, therefore, being presumably the seven years limited by the agreement of 1904, the permanent bonds now provided for perform the identical functions which the interim bonds would have performed under the original scheme.

When the work of construction is completed, these bonds inherently ripen into the fifty year permanent bonds contemplated by the agreement of 1903, and from that date all the provisions of the two agreements relating to permanent bonds begin to operate upon them. The difference is in my opinion merely formal, and does not in any degree alter the substance of the rights and obligations of the parties.

Consequently, I think that the objection which the hon. gentleman makes is met by Mr. Shepley's report and is met by the articles that I have referred to on page 15 of the Bill. This question was discussed in Committee of the Whole and answered partially in the way which I have answered it. What took place before the committee, I am sorry to say, I do not know as I was not present, but if this is the only objection I would ask that the Bill be allowed to pass to-night. It was held up on Monday night simply for the purpose of allowing the hon. gentleman to discuss this point, and I am not complaining at all, but I am informed by the railway company that they are very anxious to get their Bill through owing to the necessity of completing the financial arrangements which are in contemplation.

Mr. BARKER. I certainly would be very glad to facilitate the passage of the Bill. I have no desire to obstruct it in any way whatever.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I do not mean to suggest that the hon. gentleman desires to obstruct the Bill.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think the hon. gentleman imputes that. I repeat I would be very glad to facilitate the passing of the Bill, but there is not a word in this report and there is not a statement of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that adds anything whatever to what appeared at the Railway Committee. This report of Mr. Shepley had been in the hands of the Minister of Justice. It had also been in the hands of Mr. Chrysler before the meeting of the Railway Committee, but neither the Minister of Justice nor Mr. Chrysler was able to give an answer to the question I put. Mr. Chrysler admitted frankly and very properly that there was nothing in

the contract enabling the government to reserve any portion of the progress estimates until the final completion of the work. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are entitled, under the contract, to call for a progess estimate of all the work they have done. There is not a word from beginning to end of any reservation of any percentage for the final adjustment. Mr. Chrysler admitted that. I do not think my hon. friend who has just spoken will say there is one word in the schedules, Mr. Shepley's report, or in the Bill before the House inconsistent with that statement. I am quite sure if there had been anything to the contrary, Mr. Chrysler, who is thoroughly informed on the subject and who is, I believe, a very able lawyer, would have at once met the point I made and told me there was every protection to the government. There is no question whatever that in the original contract the government agreed to guarantee interim bonds, which bonds would ultimately be exchanged for permanent bonds on a final settlement of account. But, from beginning to end there is not one word to show that the interim bonds were to be issued for anything less than the full amount of the progress estimates.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have been trying to look it up, but I have not been able to find it; perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell me from recollection or from having looked it up: Did the original contract between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the government provide for the retention of any percentage before the issuing of the interim bonds?

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Chrysler says expressly not. As I said before, I do not profess, with all the other things we have here, to have read through 108 pages of contracts in addition to the two Acts we already have on the statute-books with all their schedules for the purpose of searching out all the details. But, I asked the question of Mr. Chrysler: Is there any provision in the contract whereby a certain percentage of the progress estimates is reserved until the completion of the work. He said: No. I therefore pointed out, that, while in the original contract, the government might have been willing and might safely have issued an interim bond which was subject to adjustment and would have to be taken up before it got into the hands of the public, it would be a very different thing to at once issue instead of that interim bond a permanent bond that went on the market and bore the guarantee of the government. Mr. Chrysler met that in only one way. He said: I assume that the government will not issue more than they feel safe in issuing. But, that is not the contract.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. That is not the answer. The answer is that the proceeds of the bond go into the hands of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General when they issue it.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman may wish to deal with the proceeds of the bond; I am dealing with the liability of the government after the bond gets into the hands of the bank or somebody else.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. If the government has the proceeds of the bonds that are outstanding they have the proceeds to meet the bonds so that there is no difficulty there. If the proceeds are not paid out improperly, if the engineer does his duty and if the proceeds of the bonds are in the hands of the Receiver General or the Minister of Finance in trust no harm can come to any one.

Mr. BARKER. I think the hon. gentleman does not quite understand my point. When the chief engineer issues certificates amounting to, say, $1,000,000, the company calls upon the government to guarantee bonds for $1,000,000. These bonds go out on the market, pass into the hands of the bank or some one else who will pay for them a certain amount of money, say, $1,000,000 less the bank discount. But these bonds are in the bands of the public and the government has undertaken to pay $1,000,000.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The money does not go into the hands of the company. It goes into the hands of the Receiver General.

Mr. BARKER. You do get the cash for the $1,000,000 worth of bonds, but you apply the cash in payment of the progress certificates.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The government has got the cash and the bank the bonds.

Mr. BARKER. The government issues bonds for $1,000,000. It may be that you get $950,000 for these bonds. The government is liable for $1,000,000 although there may be less than $950,000 worth of work done.

Mr. L. G McCARTHY. They have not paid that out.

Mr. BARKER. They have signed the guarantee and the government are good for whatever they sign. I am not proposing to criticise this contract. It is not my business to do it. It is the business of the government of the country and if the hon. Minister of Justice or the right hon. Prime Minister says the government have considered that question and they are satisfied, I have nothing more to say. But, I consider it my duty to point out to the government that there is no safeguard here, that there is no limitation, as is usual with all contracts entered into by railway companies, reserving a percentage until the final completion of the work. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company may issue bonds

for $50,000,000. The proceeds of these bonds may be $45,000,000. Of what advantage it is to the government that they are to receive and pay out theh $45,000,000 when perhaps less than that amount of work may have been done. The bank or somebody else who has advanced the money has their guarantee for $50,000,000? The government cannot say they are not responsible for it. They cannot confine their responsibility to the amount of the cash advanced on these bonds or make their responsibility conditional upon a final settlement of construction account. The moment the government put their guarantee on an issue of $1,000,000 this country is liable for the whole $1,000,000. In the ordinary course the government of Canada with $100,000,000 certified by its engineer would only advance $85,000,000, or it would not guarantee more than that sum. But, under this arrangement the government guarantees the whole $100,000,000 unless there is something in these contracts that neither Mr. Chrysler nor the Minister of Justice was able to point out.

Mr. HAGGART. The old form of agreement with the contractors was to issue interim bonds, but they found it difficult to negotiate these and they asked to exchange them for permanent bonds to which the government consented on the condition that when the bonds are issued they will get the cash for them.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The government gets the cash.

Mr. HAGGART. The government gets the cash for the whole of the bonds before they issue one dollar, and the obligation the government enters into is to pay them out as the work proceeds. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) asks what guarantee they have that the work is done when they issue the money, and he says that the certificate of an under engineer is all the authority there is to issue the bonds. But the fact is this: the Grand Trunk Pacific enter into a contract with contractors to build the road, and the government only advances 75 per cent——

Mr. BARKER. Where do you find that?

Mr. HAGGART. Then the government have the security of the contract which the Grand Trunk Pacific makes with the contractor, and very likely that contract is that they will advance everything upon the work done except 15 per cent. Anyway if Mr. Shepley's opinion is correct at all, the government may make the advance on such conditions as they please.

Mr. BARKER. He does not say that.

Mr. HAGGART. He does, he says:

> The mortgage provides that the proceeds of these bonds as they are marketed from time to time are to be placed at the credit of the Minister of Finance and the Receiver General, and paid out from time to time with certain safeguards as they are earned on construction work.

Mr. BARKER. It does not say what the safeguards are.

Mr. HAGGART. Mr. Shepley says there are safeguards. After all, the government guarantee 15 per cent, and they get the whole money from the bonds into their hands. Then they pay out on the contract as it advances. The probability is that the Grand Trunk Pacific will not advance more than 85 per cent of the cost of construction to the contractor, and if Mr. Shepley is right, they can even then only advance it on such conditions and safeguards as the government may think fit.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. The fears of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) as to what the contract may permit are not well founded. Section 4, at page 15 of the Bill, states:

> In proportion as the construction of the western division is proceeded with to the satisfaction of the government, according to the specifications agreed upon or to be agreed upon between the government and the Pacific Company, the government shall, out of the said proceeds and interest, pay to the Pacific Company or its nominees, in monthly payments as far as practicable, such sums as the chief engineer appointed by the government or such other officer as the government may appoint for that purpose, may certify are earned, having regard to the cost, at the date of such certificate, of construction work as hereinbefore defined, and having regard to the proportion of the cost of construction which, under the scheduled agreements, is to be met by the proceeds of bonds guaranteed by the government.

That is consistent with what Mr. Chrysler said in the committee, that the matter was entirely in the hands of the government. The suggestion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) is that there ought to be some words in the contract leaving it in the hands of the government, but in the contract are these very words: That these contracts are to proceed according to specifications to be agreed upon between the company and the government, and the money is not paid out upon the progress estimates upon the certificate of a junior engineer, but 'on certificate of the chief engineer or some other officer specially appointed by the government for that purpose.' The matter is therefore entirely in the hands of the government to make the specifications in the form which they see fit. The chief engineer has it then absolutely in his own hands to see that too much money is not paid out. He is responsible to the government and the government to the people, that more money than is earned is not paid out. I believe that this is even more safe than the retaining of 15 or 20 per cent, as is usual when interim bonds are issued. Therefore, I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) to allow the Bill to go, if that is the only objection he has.

Mr. BARKER. Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. BARKER. The hon gentleman from York (Mr. Campbell) may call 'carried' as usual, but before it is carried I want the responsibility of the government on this question, and not the responsibility of the member for Centre York.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Spoken.

Mr. BARKER. If the First Minister is satisfied I have nothing more to say. I do not propose to accept the statement of the hon. member who introduces this Bill on behalf of the company as an answer to my question with regard to the protection of the country. I have no fault whatever to find with the hon. gentleman; he introduced this Bill on behalf of the company, not on behalf of the public. If the First Minister, or the Minister of Justice, or the Minister of Finance, says that he is perfectly satisfied, I have nothing more to say. If I am a guarantor, I want to see that there was $100 worth of work done in respect to every $100 I guarantee. If some responsible member of the government says he is satisfied, I do not raise any further question. It is not fair to the members of this House to throw into their hands on the morning that the question comes before the Railway Committee, 108 pages of agreements, and ask the members to pass upon them. I asked the question of the Minister of Justice and of Mr. Chrysler at the time, and I got no answer, but I am willing to accept the statement of the First Minister in that regard.

Mr. FIELDING. I accept the view of my hon. friend (Mr. Barker) that it is not reasonable to expect any individual member of the House to make himself familiar with all the details of this very elaborate document. All that we can do in a case of that kind is to see that the various points involved in the matter are considered as they arise, and that upon them we have the advice of competent legal authority that the rights and privileges of the country are protected in every respect. My hon. friend wants some one to say on behalf of the government that we are satisfied that the interests of Canada, as represented by the government, are properly protected. The members of the government have been advised by very careful and competent authority, and we are perfectly satisfied that at every point the interests of the government under this contract have been properly protected, and that the mortgage carries out to the fullest degree the intentions of parliament as expressed in this legislation.

Mr. BARKER. The counsel expressly said that the terms of the contract as passed by parliament were being altered.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY.

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respects the obligations of the government. They were amplified in certain respects, but the obligations of the government have not thereby been altered at all.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 12—distribution of seats—

Mr. PERLEY. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has suggested that we ought to try to go into this question with what he calls an open mind. Now, I have endeavoured, with the figures given to us by the government, to make up my mind as to whether the division proposed by the government is a fair one or not. This is a very grave and important question. We are forming two new provinces in the Northwest, which are practically the wards of this Dominion, and I am sure that my hon. friend the Prime Minister, if he had two wards of his own, would try to clear up everything before he launched them on life on their own account. He would not leave them in such a position that when they came of age they would be sure immediately to have trouble before they learned to take care of themselves. Our object should be to avoid friction—to avoid causing to any portion of the people of these provinces a feeling of injustice, which they may spend their first session, and perhaps their first years, in trying to rectify. They will have their hands full taking care of their own family affairs, trying to set their house in order and get started on the business of life; and they should not have thrust upon them any trouble of this kind. I do not see that this is a question of Dominion politics at all. It seems to me that all we ought to try to do is to have this first election in the province of Alberta conducted in as fair and equitable a way as possible, so that every man entitled to vote shall have just as much to say about forming the new government as any other man in the province. Surely a question of this kind is above party politics. Surely we can lay aside all feelings of partisanship, and try to ensure to every man in the new province fair-play. I for one do not think the Prime Minister of this country would lend himself and the strength of the great Liberal party behind him in helping any section of people in the new province of Alberta to control that province. The question of the location of the capital of the province will probably be settled by the first election; and I do not think this government should lend their influence either to help the people of the north to establish the capital permanently

at Edmonton, or to help the people of the south to establish it at Calgary. Now, I have gone as carefully as I could into the figures given by the Prime Minister yesterday, and I hope to be able to convince him from his own figures that he has not given every man in the province the same right that he has given to every other man in regard to this first vote. But before coming to that, I wish to say a few words about the side issues, as I may call them. The government have laid before us certain figures with regard to post offices. I submit that the number of post offices has nothing whatever to do with this question. If the government had brought down the amount of revenue derived from the post offices north and south of township 38, I think it would have been some index of the population and of the business carried on in the different sections.

But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the number of post offices is no index whatever to the number of people who live in the different sections of the country. A comparison was made to-day between the city of Calgary and one of the rural constituencies. Some hon. member from the other side found fault with this comparison, but I submit that a comparison between two rural constituencies would show, not as much difference, but still a vast difference. I know from my own section of the country here that we certainly have some townships eight or ten miles square which have five or six times as many post offices as will be found in another township of the same area, but that does not prove that there are not more people in the second township. That proves nothing, but I would acknowledge that the revenue would have something to do with the question. I would say the same thing in regard to the school district. The government bring down the number of school districts, but they do not bring down the number of the school population. The school population would show a good deal in regard to the population of the district but the number of schools in any given township affords no indication whatever of the number of people in the district. I therefore submit that these two sets of figures brought down are of absolutely no use on either side of this argument.

With regard to the population according to the census of 1901, I think the Minister of the Interior will agree with me that it is no index to the number of people in the country to-day or in any part of the country. In other words the stream of immigration varies. The minister himself gave us an instance the other day of a certain part of Alberta where there was an exceptionally large stream of immigration going in. I therefore cannot see that the census figures of 1901 are any more indication as to the proportionate number of people in north and south Alberta than if the census had not been taken, or had been made up by a clerk in the Agriculture Department here without going into the country at all. The reason I say that is because the difference between the votes polled and the census population in some constituencies is very startling. In Rosebud there were 733 votes polled, and in the census of 1901 only 1,036 people; evidently that township has increased very rapidly. In High River, the one next to it, the votes polled were 1,021 and the census population in 1901, 2,472, showing that it had not increased nearly as fast as Rosebud. In the same way I might go down the list and find many other discrepancies of a similar nature. It therefore seems to me that, in view of the fact that the Northwest has been growing so rapidly and that the growth in different sections has not been equal, it is absolutely impossible to form any judgment whatever from the census of 1901 as to the number of people in the different sections of the proposed province of Alberta to-day. I submit that there are only two sets of figures that are of any value to any practical man in determining the number of people in that province to-day and the chief one is the voters' list of last fall and to a certain extent the number of votes cast. Any other figures, it seems to me, are absolutely useless and only tend to confuse the minds of hon. gentlemen on the matter.

As some side matters have been brought into the discussion I propose to give to the committee some figures which I have here with reference to the receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway during 1903-4 on their lines of railway in the proposed province of Alberta. These figures were prepared by an official of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Northwest, and may therefore be considered as authentic. The first set of figures I have, show the percentage of passenger receipts in 1904 at the six largest places in the proposed province of Alberta. The percentages were as follows :

	Per cent.
Medicine Hat	8·08
Banff	4·87
Macleod	6·83
Calgary	53·88
Lethbridge	8·54
Strathcona	17·78

The only place in the north of Alberta is Strathcona which includes Edmonton and which had 17·78 per cent of the passenger receipts of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the proposed province of Alberta in 1904. If hon. gentlemen opposite are going to bring in outside figures in support of the distribution of constituencies which they propose, I submit that these figures with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway are of far more value than the

number of post offices, the number of school districts, or the census of 1901.

The Canadian Pacific Railway tonnage for the years 1903-4 added together, including goods forwarded and received at the different stations on the Canadian Pacific Railway in the proposed districts are as follows :

	Per cent.
In the south—	
Medicine Hat section	6·5
Calgary section	1·9
Calgary	21·4
Calgary to Laggan	5·5
Bellington to Red Deer	7·0
In the north—	
Blackfalds to Ellersley	7·0
Strathcona	7·5
In the south—	
Calgary to Macleod	5·5
Lethbridge section	2·6
Lethbridge	26·2
Cranbrook section	8·4

Thus the north contributed 15 per cent and the south 85 per cent. In order that there may be no misunderstanding, I wish to say that about one-half of the length of the Medicine Hat section, from Swift Current to Walsh, will not be in the future province of Alberta, but all the other lines for which the figures are given will be entirely within its boundaries. I claim that the fact that 85 per cent of the tonnage of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the future province of Alberta is south of this mysterious township 38 is some indication, at all events, that there are more people in the south than in the north which provides only 15 per cent.

The present division of constituencies for the Northwest Territories in the future province of Alberta, is, as has been stated many times, nine in the south and six in the north. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has rather found fault with my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) because he said yesterday that if it were divided in the same way, there would be 15 in the south and 10 in the north. I do not propose to argue that there should be 15 in the south and 10 in the north. At the same time, I believe that the people in that country knew something of what they were doing when they made this division of 9 in the south and 6 in the north. I have heard no serious complaint about it, and, as I understand it, the government of the Northwest is not a party government, and never has been, but is made up of both sides of politics. I therefore feel that the present division of 9 to the south and 6 to the north must have had some merit—there must have been some reason for it. While I do not argue for it, because I have seen the figures, yet there must have been some reason for it, and I do not think the Minister of the Interior should have found fault with my hon. friend from Calgary for referring to it. The minister fights his own battles pretty hard, and I think the hon. member for Calgary should use every effort to maintain his own case. But I believe a division of 15 to the south and 10 to the north would be far nearer right than would the suggestion brought down by the government and so heartily approved by the Minister of the Interior. It would be nearer fair play to give the people of the south 15 seats out of 25 than to give them 12 out of 25, and I hope to give some figures presently to prove it. The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has been working on this matter for a long time to my knowledge and has got out many facts and figures about it. I think he deserves the thanks of both sides for the labour he has undertaken. I do not know how long the government have had these figures, but I think they might have brought them down and saved members of the opposition much personal work, for we are entitled to have the figures from the government. There are two parties in this country, notwithstanding that the government seen inclined to keep information to themselves to the last moment as though they were the only party.

What does the Minister of the Interior reply to the facts and arguments of my hon. friend from Calgary ? He begins by talking about partisans. He accuses the hon. member for Calgary of being a partisan merely because he has taken a lot of care—which as far as I know, nobody can find fault with—and tried to show his side of the case. It seems to me that if the minister had any real answer to these figures, he would not have spoken about partisans. This is a question that ought not to be argued on such a basis. My hon. friend from Calgary offered an amendment, that this matter should be left to the judges. I submit that, while the question of referring to the judges is one for parliament to decide, it is clear that the arrangement of the constituencies is a matter that could be readily determined by the board of judges proposed by my hon. friend from Calgary. The Minister of the Interior yesterday made a most extraordinary remark with regard to this proposition. He said :

> The contention that an injustice has been done I submit has not been made out before the House. I submit it cannot be made out, and as I said in the beginning it would certainly be a very fortunate body of judges who would give a decision favourable to a proposal now before the House and escape criticism as active partisans by hon. gentlemen when their position had been ignored.

If the hon. minister is so satisfied with this case, why does he object to leaving it to the judges ? Hon. members on this side have stated that if it were left to the judges we would be satisfied. I do not think it was a wise criticism on the part of the Minister of the Interior to say that there was no possibility of our being satisfied with any decision arrived at by the committee of judges.

In trying to arrive at a conclusion in my

own mind on this matter, I have taken this line of township 38 not because I know the country—for I do not, I am going entirely on the figures—but because other hon. gentlemen have taken it. As well as I can figure it out from the population—that is the votes cast and the voters' names on the lists—the south should receive 14 members and the north 11 members, instead of the south 12 and the north 13. If the south received 14 that would be 56 per cent of the whole and the percentage of the north would be 44. The hon. minister stated yesterday that the number of votes cast taken as the basis for each constituency would figure about 800. To clear up the discussion somewhat, I may say that, after looking into the details, I am quite satisfied that the figures as provided by the government and as submitted by the hon. member for Calgary are practically the same—in working out, the percentage of difference is so small as to be of no importance. In my calculations, I have adopted the figures of the government. It makes no difference in the number of members north and south which figures are used. Yesterday, the Minister of the Interior stated there would be 11,406 votes cast in the twelve proposed southern constituencies—I think that they should be 11,410, and that 'Hansard' is mistaken —and 9,553 in the eleven northern constituencies. The trouble with the figures, and the reason why there seems to be a difference in the argument on either side, is that the two proposed constituencies in Athabaska are left out of the calculation. The minister says there are 12 constituencies in the south with 11,410 votes and 11 in the north with 9,553 votes. As a matter of fact, there are 13 in the north with 9,553 votes cast in the last election. There are a few other people in Athabaska, but they are so few—as I shall show before I get through—as to make practically no difference. That makes a total of 20,963, out of which the north has only 45 per cent.

I submit that the proper way, however, is to take the number of votes on the list. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman whether, if he had been sick and unable to vote at the last general election, he thinks he should not have the right to vote at the next? Does he think that because, from any reason, he was unable to vote, his name should not be counted as a voter? I happened to see in one of to-night's newspapers that in North Oxford, at the general election last fall, there were cast 4,034 votes, and that at the election a few days ago the number who voted was 5,361. Would any man who was adjusting this question on a business basis claim that the votes cast last fall were the ones to be taken into account in determining the revision of that county? Would not the voters' lists in any part of the country be the only fair and proper way of determining the population in the different constituencies, if you have no census to go on? I appeal to the right hon. the First Minister if the number of votes on the voter's lists is not a fairer test of the population of a county proportionateiy than the number of votes cast? If I am in a constituency with 5,000 votes on the list, and an hon. gentleman opposite is in a constituency with an equal number of votes on the list, and if at the last election there were 3,500 votes cast in his constituency and only 3,000 in mine, surely that would be no proof that there were less people in mine than in his. If I have 5,000 on my list and the hon. gentleman has the same number on his, in default of other information, it must be conceded that these constituencies are equal in population.

The number of votes on the lists, if taken instead of the number of votes cast, would tell against the hon. gentleman. I would not care to say that that is the reason why the hon. minister takes the votes cast, but I would like to hear some good reason why the number cast should be taken in preference to the number on the lists. The twelve constituencies south of township 38 last fall had on the voters' lists for the Dominion 17,087, according to the figures of the First Minister given yesterday. North of the said township the number was 12 863. This made a total of 29,950 altogether. The number cast north was 43 per cent of the whole and the number south 57 per cent, and my idea is that the number of seats north should be 44 per cent and the number south 56 per cent.

Before passing on to another branch of the subject, I wish to refer to a few figures given to-day by the right hon. the First Minister. In his calculation to-day he left out the constituency of Red Deer. He said there was north of Red Deer eleven constituencies with 9,533 votes cast at the last election, and that south of Red Deer there were eleven with 10,566 votes cast. The figures are quite accurate as far as I am informed. But he said, surely that is near enough for anybody, and the south ought to be satisfied with eleven seats. But, according to these figures, there are 1,033 more votes in the south than north, and, taking the vote cast in some constituencies last fall—in one there was 645 and another 589—you find that this 1,033 of discrepancy is equal to one and a-half constituencies. With regard to the numbers on the voters' lists, as given this afternoon, the discrepancy is even worse. Take these figures on whatver basis you like, it will be found that the votes cast were more in favour last fall of the north than the number on the voters' lists.

A reason has been given why there was not a larger vote cast in the south last fall. But I do not think it is necessary to give any reason. I do not think any judge would say it matters whether the votes were

cast or not. But the right hon. gentleman said that there were on the voters' lists in these eleven proposed constituencies south of Red Deer 15,895 and in the eleven north 12,863—a mere difference of 3,032. But if the average of each constituency on the lists is 1,200, which I understand it to be practically, there are two constituencies and a-half given to the north, even taking the figures of the First Minister, more than to the south. Therefore, the north is apparently getting an advantage which I for one would like to see somewhat rectified. In these figures Athabaska has been left out again. The right hon. gentleman says that in the north there are 12,863 votes on the lists for eleven constituencies—but they are to have thirteen constituencies. It does not seem fair to discuss this matter with regard to the old province of Alberta and leave out the proposed new constituencies which have so few people in them entitled to vote.

I propose to say a few words with regard to Athabaska. In the first place, the suggestion of some hon. members on this side that Athabaska should be added to another constituency has been taken up wrongly by hon. gentlemen opposite. There has been no suggestion on this side that these people in Athabaska should have no representation. We have gone beyond the time when we think people should be deprived of representation if that can possibly be avoided. But what hon. members on this side do say is that Athabaska should not have two constituencies given it for comparatively few voters and the constituencies on the south be deprived of their rights. By being added to another constituency the people of Athabaska would have their representation, but they would only have what is due them and not the extraordinary representation proposed by this Bill.

Now, in reference to Athabaska, first of all, I want to read the words uttered by the right hon. Prime Minister yesterday. In speaking of this subject he said:

> I admit at once that the suggestion that would at once occur to any man's mind under some circumstances would be to join such districts to existing districts.

Of course, that is the very first thing that any one would think of. Then he goes on to tell about the size of the country and how impossible it would be for anybody to visit the whole of this country in election time. I would like very much if I could get an answer from every hon. member in this House as to whether he visited every part of his constituency at the last election or not. I would like to know what percentage of the country members of parliament were able to visit the whole of their constituencies during the last election. In certain constituencies they can do it, but there are many constituencies in both Ontario and Quebec, to say nothing of British Columbia, where it is impossible to visit the whole of them. The constituency which I have the honour to represent is one of the smaller constituencies of Quebec, and still I was not in all parts of the constituency during the last election simply because there was no time to cover the whole ground. I have here a small map of the province of Quebec showing the counties of Montcalm, Joliette, Berthier, Maskinongé and St. Maurice. These counties extend from the St. Lawrence to the original boundary of the province of Quebec. The people who live at the back end of these counties are never visited in election time. Probably a member would never, during the whole of his life, be able to visit these people and still can anybody say that these people have no representation? I submit that Athabaska is exactly in the same position and that the constituencies should be carved out giving representation to the north and giving representation to these people but that they should not have any more voting power per man than any other voter in the proposed province. Further than that there is a stronger case in Quebec than this one I have cited. When the northern boundary of the province was changed a few years ago no representation whatever was given to the part taken in north of the original boundary. It has no representation now. It has no recognized constituencies and it is administered as an annex of certain of the old constituencies. These people in Athabaska have got along for many years without any representation at all, and it seems rather strange that there should be such solicitude at the present moment that they should be represented are very much overrepresented. It seems to me that if they are given proper representation by population now, they will be very well satisfied, and that is all they can possibly expect. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) spoke in a slighting way yesterday in regard to the large business and wealth of the people in Southern Alberta. He says that money does not have votes, that it is the people who have votes. Well, that is what we want them to have. We want the people to get votes, one vote for one man and no more, but if the government give to the unoccupied part of Athabaska two constituencies to elect members it seems to me that the minister will have to register a lot of white fish and spruce trees up there to get the proper number of voters for these constituencies. The hon. minister has made a strong plea for the representation of the northern part of this new province on account of its great future. We will grant that it is going to have a great future. I do not think it was necessary for the hon. minister to set forth this argument about the future of the country because I do not think any one will say it is not going to be a great country. We all hope and expect it will and we will all be very much disappointed if we are mistaken. But, I submit that the future of

the northern part of the province has nothing to do with its representation to-day. This legislation is for to-day only. An election has to be held within six months of the passing of this Bill, and I have yet to learn that it is customary or wise for any government or parliament, in dividing a province up into constituencies at a given time, to give any part of it special representation, because of what the future is going to be. When this country was divided up into Dominion constituencies, the province of Quebec was given 65 members, and the province of Ontario the number it was entitled to by population, but there was no argument made that there is going to be a great state developed next to Hudson bay some day and we should carve out a constituency up there and give them a member because they may need one in ten or twenty years. The needs of to-day are the only proper and fair basis to go upon in dividing up Alberta for a purely local election which must take place during the current year. I further submit that the hon. minister has made out no case to show that the north has increased any faster in the last year or two than the south. We have the good fortune of knowing that they have both increased, but last year the homestead entries at Lethbridge and Calgary south of this mysterious township 38 were 4,554 while the homestead entries last year north—that is at Red Deer and Edmonton—were 4,057. In other words last year there were 497 less homestead entries north of this line than there were south. Further than that my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) yesterday gave some figures taken from a map which had been prepared from government sources showing the thickly settled townships and the sparsely settled townships, which figures go to show that there has been no proportionately greater increase in the north than in the south because there were 325 thickly settled townships south of this mysterious line and 247 north ; that is to say 44 per cent north and 56 per cent south. The sparsely settled townships are even more in favour of the south. I find from my hon. friend's figures that there are 64½ per cent of the sparsely settled townships south and 35½ per cent north. I merely quote these figures to show that the northern part of this province has certainly not increased more in proportion during the last year or two than the south has. In regard to the future increase the hon. minister dilated yesterday in glowing terms.

Let us grant that the north is going to increase ; we hope so and we think so. But is the south not going to increase ? What reason is there to say that the south is going to stand still ? Are the people of the south less progressive than the people of the north; are they less business like and less industrious? It seems to me that the statement is beyond refutation, when I say that the present condition of affairs in that new province must be the true consideration in this purely local and temporary matter. It is unfair to import into the consideration of the question guesses as to the future.

How many people are there in the part of Athabaska that will be included in the province of Alberta? Yesterday the Prime Minister stated that there were 1,724 people, according to the census of 1901 in the Peace River new constituency, and 1,676 in Athabaska according to the same census, a total of 3,400. I asked the right hon. gentleman if this included the Indians and he said he did not think it did, but I am sure the right hon. gentleman was mistaken in that. The Indians must be included in those figures and for this reason. According to the census of 1901, the population of the whole of Athabaska was 6,615, including whites, Indians and half-breeds. Out of this number there were 3,716 Indians or 58·5 per cent of the whole, and these Indians would have no vote. There were 2,395 half-breeds or 37·7 per cent of the whole, and there were 242 white men, being 3·8 per cent of the total population. In addition to these there were 262 given as unspecified as to race. I have applied the same basis of percentage to these 262 unspecified, and the result would give 253 whites altogether, or 2,746 half-breeds and white men together in the whole of Athabaska in 1901. Therefore when the Prime Minister said he thought there were 3,400 people in this half of Athabaska, not counting the Indians, he made a mistake. I have made inquiries from people who know something about it, and I am told there are no more white men in Athabaska to-day than there were in 1901 ; in fact I am told there are probably less, because expeditions started out for the Yukon by way of Edmonton which were unable to get there, and a good many of these men remained in Athabaska for a time. The 2,746 half-breeds and white men in Athabaska divided by five, would give 549 voters in the whole of Athabaska. How many voters there are in this half of the territory which goes to Alberta nobody knows ; the government do not seem to know. However, if we take one-half of the whole vote in Athabaska, it will give us 275 voters in this part. For the sake of argument I will say that there are 300 voters in the part of Athabaska that will belong to Alberta. I submit, that considering there are only 2,746 half-breeds and whites in the whole of Athabaska altogether, an allowance of 300 voters for the western half is quite liberal. The Prime Minister's figures of 3,400 as the population must have included Indians, and taking the same percentages as above. I have figured out that there are 1,411 out of that total of 3,400 who would be

white men and half breeds, and dividing that by five, it would give 282 votes for the western part of Athabaska which is put in Alberta. This calculation is made on the figures given by the Prime Minister himself. It seems to me that it is a fair calculation to allow 300 votes for the part of Athabaska that will be in the new province of Alberta. Before I go further I appeal to the Minister of the Interior if it is not correct to say that some of these 300 voters who live in Athabaska are on the voters' lists and vote in old Alberta, in the constituency of the hon. minister. These men are wanderers, they do not live in any particular place, they scatter about, and I have been told that many of the half-breeds that really live in Athabaska and are counted in the census there voted in the constituency of Edmonton at the last election. Now I have come to the figures which it seems to me are the only figures that any reasonable man can say ought to be the basis of the proportion of the different constituencies in this new province of Alberta. In the first place I take the number of votes cast at the last election which is the basis the Minister of the Interior relies on. I have taken the trouble to sift the figures given by the Prime Minister yesterday, and I find that out of the votes cast at the last election, the constituencies numbered No. 8 to No. 7 in this schedule :—Medicine Hat, Cardston, Lethbridge, Macleod, Pincher, Gleichen, Calgary city—these constituencies cast 7,265 votes. The eleven constituencies in the middle numbered No. 1 to No. 18 are fairly dealt with in this Bill. They are given as nearly as possible the unit of the vote cast, and the unit of 1,200 on the voters' lists. At the last election these 11 middle constituencies cast 9,063 votes or an average for each constituency of 824, so that we may dismiss them altogether from the argument.

When the first seven constituencies in the south cast 7,265 votes, how many did the last seven northern constituencies cast—Nos. 19 to 25—Stony Plain, Edmonton City, Saskatchewan, St. Albert, Sturgeon, Peace River and Athabaska ? They cast 4,635 votes. Each of the seven southern constituencies cast an average of 1,035 votes, and each of the seven northern constituencies cast an average of 662 votes. Will any man say that that is fair-play—that 7,265 voters in the south should have only as much to say as 4,635 in the north ? Now, I may say that the number of voters on the list last November is absolutely the only information before this House that is worth a button with regard to the number of people in the province. According to the figures given by the Prime Minister, which I accept, and which are practically the same as those of my hon. friend from Calgary, the eleven middle constituencies, Nos. 8 to 18, are fairly dealt with. In these eleven constituencies there were on the voters' list last November, 13,264 votes, an average of 1,206, almost exactly the proper unit for the division of these constituencies. But the first seven in the south had on the voters' list 10,784 votes, an average of 1,540, and the last seven in the north had on the list 5,902, an average of 843. In other words, 10,784 voters in the south are supposed to have only as much to say as 5,902 in the north. Surely no man can claim that that is fair-play. Adding to the north the greatest number of votes that can possibly be expected in the western half of Athabaska, even then the average in the seven constituencies in the north will be only 886, as against an average of the seven constituencies in the south of 1,540. Now, I would like to ask why one vote in Stony Plain is just as good as over two in Pincher. I would like to ask why 156 votes in the city of Calgary are only as good as 100 votes in the city of Edmonton. And, worst of all, by the proposal made in this Bill, it is intended that 300 voters in Peace River and Athabaska shall have twice as much to say as 1,701 voters in Edmonton or 2,653 in Calgary. Are the people in the north so much more intelligent, so much more powerful, so much more wealthy, so much more active, that they are entitled to undue consideration in comparison with the people of the south ? I think it is a patent fact known to everybody that the bulk of these people in the north are half-breeds, and people from the south of Europe. In fact, the figures I have read show that only about 10 per cent of the votes in Athabaska are white people, and all the others are half-breeds. Now, it is proposed to give to these half-breed voters in Peace River and Athabaska all this extraordinary and undue predominance in votes. Each of these half-breeds is to wield eighteen times as much power as a man in Calgary, and ten or twelve times as much as a man in Edmonton. It seems to me that if intelligence is to be taken into consideration, it ought to be the other way—the white man should have the greater power of voting, and not the half-breed. I understand that most of these half-breeds can neither read nor write, and that a large number of the people in that country from the south of Europe, know nothing of the sanctity of the franchise—do not understand what it means at all; and I submit that to give a greater proportion of voting power to people of that character is a course that no reasonable man would suggest or expect. My idea is that a fair way of settling this purely local and temporary matter is to give as nearly as possible the same power to every voter in the country in this election. If this new province wishes to give these northern areas undue representation after it becomes a province, that is its own business; but so far as we are concerned,

surely the proper thing for us to do with these infant children of ours is to give each voter in them the same voting power If you have 30,000 voters and 25 seats, give every one of the constituencies 1,200 votes as nearly as possible. These people in the north should not get any more representation than the others, so far as we are concerned. That is a local matter. In settling their local affairs, whether the people of the province put their capital at Calgary or at Edmonton, I do not care; but I think that one man should have as much right to say where the capital should be as another man, and I do not think the half-breed in the northern country should have ten, twelve or eighteen times as much to say as a man in Edmonton or Calgary. Now, I have endeavoured to go into this matter as fairly as I know how. I know nothing about the country except from reading; I know nothing about the local disputes, except that I understand that they are largely about the location of the capital; and surely we do not care sufficiently where the capital is put to stultify ourselves by giving the people in a certain part of the province a pull over the others. It seems to me that the only fair and proper way for us to do is to give to every man who has a right to vote in that new province as nearly as possible the same powers as any other man in them, whether he is in Athabaska or Calgary, in the north or in the south.

If there is a dispute as to the capital in the province let them fight it out themselves. Why should a half-breed in Athabaska have ten or twenty times as much to say about the settlement of this first question in the new province as a good white man in Edmonton or Calgary? If there are 25 seats and 30,000 voters then as nearly as possibly every constituency should have 1,200 votes, and it is unfair to compare the 11 constituencies north of Red Deer and the 11 south, overlooking the two constituencies away in the north with practically no voters. If this were a business matter, a dispute between business men, we would get together and agree on it; even among bitter enemies in business an agreement would be reached. It is a local matter of which we should get rid. I therefore appeal to the Prime Minister for fair-play to all the people in the proposed new province of Alberta, I submit that the schedules should be so altered, if the government cannot agree to the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), that no voter should be at an undue disadvantage or think he was prejudiced in his rights in this first subject for consideration in the new legislature.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. As one of the representatives from the proposed new province of Alberta, and as I have studied this question to a great extent since it was decided to place the boundaries of the proposed province, I wish to give my views to the committee. When a portion of the territory of Athabaska was added to the old district of Alberta, forming the proposed new province of Alberta, we all became very much interested, or at least I did, in learning as much as could be learned about the southern portion of the whole of that portion of Athabaska. By reference to the map you will see that the portion of Athabaska added to this province is about 350 miles from east to west and somewhat more than that from north to south. The southeast portion of it you will notice is drained by the Athabaska river and the southwestern portion by the Peace River. As a resident of the Northwest Territories for a number of years I know that those two portions of that territory have been attracting a good deal of attention. I know that large numbers of people are going up to the valley of the Athabaska river and that still greater numbers are going to the valley of the Peace River. They are attracted there by the encouraging reports of people who have been there for years. I endeavoured to get all the information I could relative to those two portions of Athabaska, and I have some information that perhaps has not yet been given to the committee. The valley of the Athabaska, that is the proposed district of Athabaska in this new province, I found, after making careful inquiry and getting information from various sources has at present twenty-four stores, thirteen churches, eight schools, four sawmills, three shingle mills, two plaining mills, one flour mill, seven steamboats, and three Royal Northwest Mounted Police Posts. Those of us who live in the Northwest know that that country has been attracting a great deal of attention and there is an immense trade between Edmonton and the Athabaska valley or the proposed district of Athabaska. Any district in the new province in which so much money and energy are expended is certainly entitled to a representative. The Peace River district I found in even a more flourishing condition. I found there eighteen stores, ten churches, six schools, four sawmills, five shingle mills three plaining mills, five flour mills (one of which is a fifty barrel roller mill and four of them stone mills), three steamboats, one Royal Northwest Mounted Police Post and three steam threshers. It is well known that what is called the Grande Prairie, a portion of the Peace River valley is one of the most productive and fertile districts in the west. I maintain that that district also is entitled to one representative in the new legislature. In addition to that I found there was a considerable amount of money invested by traders in that country. The Hudson Bay Company alone have invested over $350,000; Braden & Cornwall have invested $150,000; there is another outfit with $25,000, another with $50,000 and six others with $5,000 each, making a total of over $600,000 invested in trading in that country at the present time. After coming to the conclusion that that

portion of Athabaska is entitled to two representatives, as I did, I set to work to see how we would divide the remaining twenty-three constituencies in the rest of the country. Unfortunately we cannot ascertain the exact population of that country. We all believe, I know the hon. members on the other side, as well as on this believe in representation by population. Unfortunately we cannot get the exact population and there are no means by which we can get it. I contend that the nearest thing will be to take the vote that was actually polled in the late election in November and along with that any other evidence of settlement that we can find. That is what I did and I came to certain conclusions. I found south of Red Deer 10,556 votes and north of Red Deer 9,563 votes.

Now, there are five cities in the Northwest—Regina, Moosejaw, Prince Albert, Edmonton and Calgary. Some of these cities are slightly larger than others, but there is no great difference in their size. We believe that each of these cities should have a representative of its own. I have said there were 10,566 votes south of Red Deer. Take away the vote polled in the city of Calgary, which, I think, was 2,186. This leaves, for the rural part south of Red Deer, 8,380 votes. I have said that north of Red Deer there were 9,563 votes. Take out the vote polled in Edmonton—1,343, and we have 8,320 votes remaining. That will leave for the 10 rural constituencies south of Red Deer an average of 838 votes, and for the 10 rural constituencies north of Red Deer an average of 822 votes. I maintain that nobody could make a division fairer than that.

I wish to draw attention to the figures prepared by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). I maintain that there is not a very great difference between his and ours. At the same time, I think I can show where he has made some slight mistakes. According to the hon. gentleman's calculation there were 10,833 votes cast in the south, and 9,394 cast in the north. Take from the vote cast in the south 2,180 for the city of Calgary, and you have a remainder of 8,653. Take from the votes cast in the north 1,343 votes cast in Edmonton and you have a remainder of 8,051. So, according to the hon. member's figures, there is an average for the ten rural constituencies of the south of 865, and in the rural ten constituencies in the north, of 805. Therefore there is only a difference of 60 or, for the 10 constituencies, 600—not enough for an additional representative.

Well, I must find fault with some of the figures prepared by my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy). From him, I learn that a portion of my constituency, Strathcona, was deprived of some of the votes that should have been left with it. In the north-eastern part of my constituency is the town of Lloydminster. There was a polling subdivision there extending for six miles, or one range of townships, west of the 4th initial meridian. That portion is thickly settled. The polling booth is practically on the 4th meridian line. The votes polled there number 170. By the hon. member's (Mr. M. S. McCarthy's) calculation, they were all handed over to the other side of the line, our constituency not getting the benefit of any of them.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What proportion does the hon. member (Mr. Peter Talbot) put on either side of the meridian ?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I count half on the west and half on the east. But the hon. member (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) does not give us any of them. I know that was not done intentionally—I know the hon. member for Calgary too well for that. There is another calculation of his that is somewhat faulty.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Would the hon. gentleman permit me to say that at Lloydminster poll, No. 23, there were 20 votes cast and 48 votes on the list.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Oh, my !

Mr. AMES. I might state that we took these out, name by name, in the voters' list in the range and township in which they were described.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. The hon. gentleman has certainly taken the wrong polling subdivision. I have here a map of my whole constituency with the polling subdivision numbered. Lloydminster is poll No. 23. I got 97 votes, one of my opponents got 72, and another got 1, a total of 170 votes in that polling subdivision.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The hon. gentleman will understand that the town of Lloydminster is east of the 4th meridian.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. But the polling booth is within one hundred yards or, at most 200 yards of the 4th meridian line.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Peter Talbot) will look at the map——

Mr. PETER TALBOT. But I have been there—I was out canvassing those people. Now the other error the hon. gentleman has made in the same way was in the local constituency of Red Deer, which he says contained only 608 votes. I have here the polling subdivisions throughout that constituency, and, according to my calculation there were 808 votes. If it is necessary, I will read over the polling subdivisions. But it should be remembered that it is somewhat difficult to get at the exact figures because the lines run through the polling subdivisions and we cannot tell how many votes belong to each side.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. If the hon. gentleman will read the polls, we will soon find out where we vary.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. They are as follows—Carrott's polling subdivision, 14 votes; Evart, 67; Merkerville (in part), 36; Pollette, 5; Martin's Place (in part), 47; Burnt Lake, 33; Poplar Ridge, 28; Penhold (in part), 46; Red Deer, 334; Brockfield, 13; Valley Centre, 22; Willow Dale, 64; Windham (in part), 30; Ross Place, 14; Mound Lake, 19; Content, 40; Leckie, 6; total, 808 votes.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to put on 'Hansard' the way we made that same calculation? We took the names one after another following the list and located them in the townships to which they belonged and thus found whether they fell within the one constituency or another:

Poll.	Cast.	On list.
64, Evart, entire..	67	119
114, Merkerville, the southern third of township..	8	11
115, Pollette, the northern third of township 37..	1	2
111, Martin's Place, northern third of township 37..	7	11

Mr. PETER TALBOT. How many votes cast at Martin's Place?

Mr. AMES. One only. The northern third of township 37 is included.

65, Burnt Lake, entire..	33	51
66, Carrett, except part lying north of Blindman river.. ..	13	48
67, Blind Man, part lying south of Blindman river..	33	32
68, Poplar Ridge, entire..	28	52
69, Red Deer, entire..	184	406

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Those are the votes the other fellow got. I got more than that. There were 334 votes in Red Deer town.

Mr. AMES. There are 406 names on the list.

103, Penfold, except sections 13 to 24 of township 26, range 27; and except sections 24, 25, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35 and 36 of township 36, range 28..	50	76

Mr. PETER TALBOT. The principal discrepancy is in the town of Red Deer. I have 334 votes cast and the hon. gentleman only has 180.

Mr. AMES. If they are not in that constituency they will be in the next one.

79, Brookfield, entire..	13	27
80, Valley Centre, entire..	22	29
81, Ross Place, entire..	14	28
106, Willow Dale, entire..	54	65
105, Northern third of section 36, including Edmell town..	11	14
107, Windham, except southern two-thirds of township 36, range 24; and except southern two-thirds of township 36, range 25..	4	5
92, Mound Lake, entire..	19	28
109, Lackie, entire..	6	27
110, Sparks Place, sections 24 to 36 in township 36, ranges 11 to 23 inclusive..	No population.	
97, Content, entire.. ..estimate	40	50
98, Baird, that portion in township 38, ranges 11 to 19 inclusive..	6	14
	608	1,095

Mr. PETER TALBOT. The discrepancy I see in that is not only in Red Deer where the hon. gentleman gives 189 instead of 334, but there are other discrepancies. I happen to know the locality fairly well and I find the hon. gentleman has put only two or three votes in some polling subdivisions when the votes were as high as twenty or thirty. The next point I wish to draw attention to is the area of those districts north and south of Red Deer. The area south of Red Deer and including the Red Deer district, would be 55,831 square miles. The area north of Red Deer, excluding Peace river and Athabaska, is 74,592. Although I do not claim that we should have representation according to area entirely, I maintain that that should have some weight when making this division, provided there is a scattered settlement through it. I would not base a great deal on that, but I think it should be considered.

I next wish to call attention to the homestead entries. The homestead entries, up to the 31st March, 1905, throughout the whole province of Alberta were as follows: In the Edmonton land office or district, there were 18,773 entries. In Beaver Lake land office, which is closed now but was in existence for some time, there were 436 entries. In Battleford we claim one-fourth of the entries made, for about one-fourth of that land district is to the west of the fourth meridian. Our friends opposite do not allow us any of that, although all this Barr colony—or a great portion of it—is in that locality. That would make 1,243. We claim one-half of the Red Deer district, which would be 4,630, making a total in the north of 25,042 entries. Now, in the Calgary land office there were 12,278 entries, in Alberta, 3,875; in the half of Red Deer, which we allow to the south, 4,630, making a total of 24,803 in the south against 25,042 north of Red Deer.

I have not the homestead entries made for the several years. I have one year here, 1903, but I am not sure whether that is the one some of the hon. members opposite gave. But if they did and left out a portion of the Battleford district, they were certainly wrong, for there is a considerable portion of that district west of the fourth meridian.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. gentleman tell us over what space of time he has computed the 1,243 entries in the Battleford district?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Right from the beginning. I do not know when they started the Battleford land office, but there were four times 1,243 entries in all. I may say that quite recently, there have been about 7,000 entries in that office and a good many are in this particular part, our side of the fourth meridian.

Mr. AMES. The hon. gentleman cannot say how many of the 1,243 were made in the last two years?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I think most of them, for we know that in that particular locality there were no settlers until the Barr colony went out there, and now we know, that every available quarter section, for many miles around Lloydminster, is homesteaded.

I made a little different calculation on the post offices to that which was furnished by the Post Office Department to the Minister of the Interior. I shall give my calculation, and I think you will agree with me that I acted very fairly. I found that in the constituency of Alberta there were forty-six post offices; in Medicine Hat district, which is to be added to Alberta, there were ten; in Calgary, fifty-four; in Edmonton district, sixty, and in Strathcona, ninety-five. A portion of the Strathcona constituency runs south of township 38. I made a careful calculation of the votes polled north and south of Red Deer in my constituency, and I concluded that one-fifth of my constituency was south of the river. Going on that conclusion, the part of Strathcona constituency south of Red Deer would have nineteen post offices. That would leave south of Red Deer 129 post offices and north of Red Deer 136 post offices. Although I am well aware that post offices are not a sure indication of population, I submit that in a farming country they do indicate whether that country is fairly thickly settled or not. If we find in a certain district ten post offices and in another of the same size only four, we would naturally conclude that there was a much larger population in the former than the latter.

I also claim that the local improvement districts that were organized north and south of Red Deer are an indication of population, although not one that can be entirely relied upon. The people are not compelled to form local improvement districts, but if they do form these local improvement districts, they spend their own taxes in their own way. If they do not form these local improvement districts they pay their taxes to the government at Regina, and their money is expended for them. But we know that the great majority of the people want to see how their taxes are going to be spent, and the result is that they have formed these local improvement districts wherever there is sufficient population in the different localities. I may mention that these local improvement districts are of a uniform size—12 square miles. We have north of Red Deer river 62 of these local improvement districts, while south of Red Deer district there are 42. Now, some hon. gentlemen argue that the presence of schools and school districts is no indication of population.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Before the hon. gentleman passes from the Battleford homestead entries, I would like to say that I have here a map published by the Department of the Interior on 1st January, 1905, showing the townships which are ready for settlement. I will pass this map over to my hon. friend, and he will see that there are very few of such townships which are included in Battleford west of the 4th meridian. I merely mention that fact because the hon. gentleman has added one-fourth of the homestead entries of Battleford to his calculation of homestead entries. I do not think he would make the statement if he would look at the map.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I do not know anything about that map. These are the figures I got from my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, and I know from driving through that locality and having spent several days there that the country is settled.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Could not the hon. Minister of the Interior place before the House the actual homestead entries?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I dare say he could get them. I am sure that the Minister of the Interior has given the total as four times 1,243. I think you will find that is right. I may be mistaken in saying there are a fourth of them west of the 4th meridian, although I believe there are. On this question of schools, I maintain that if there is anything outside of an actual census that would tell the population of a district or a country, it would be the number of schools in it. People do not form schools until they have to. They do not organize schools and pay taxes for fun. They are compelled, by our laws up there, when the child population of the locality reaches a certain number, to organize schools, and school districts are of a uniform size. I find that in Edmonton constituency there are 92 schools, in the part of Strathcona north of township 38 there are 234 schools, making a total north of Red Deer of 326. South of Red Deer we have in Alberta constituency 74 schools, in Calgary district 116 schools, in part of Strathcona south of Red Deer 58 schools and in Medicine Hat district 20 schools, making a total of 268—326 schools north of Red Deer and 268 south of Red Deer. I believe I am correct in saying that that corresponds with the number of teachers for each room is called a school in the report of our Commissioner of Education. Some one sought to convey the idea that a lot of these schools might be vacant. I want to con-

vince the committee they are not. In 1902 there was an examination of teachers in various parts of the Northwest Territories. In the town of Strathcona 29 teachers were examined and got certificates, and in the city of Edmonton 25, making a total of 54. In the city of Calgary there were 9 teachers granted certificates and in the town of Lethbridge 7, making a total of 16. At Red Deer, which I have not counted as either north or south, there were 9 teachers who received certificates. In 1903 we had examinations held in some other places. In Strathcona town there were 19 teachers examined and granted certificates, in Edmonton 22 and in the town of Lacombe 8, making a total of 49. In the south we had in Medicine Hat 9, Lethbridge 6 and Calgary 30, making a total of 45. Then again we had teachers' conventions held in several towns in the Northwest in the year 1902. There was a teachers' convention held in Calgary and 30 teachers attended. There was a teachers' convention held at Red Deer, which is located about centrally between the two, and there were 31 teachers present. There was a teachers' convention at Strathcona and there were 98 teachers present. Next year the teachers held conventions in different places. At Lethbridge, in 1903, there were 19 teachers present, Banff 23, Calgary 49, Innisfail 14, making a total of 105 teachers attending conventions south of Red Deer. In Red Deer alone there were 18. But leaving that out, as it is a central point, I will say that at the town of Lacombe there were 24 and at Edmonton 94, making a total of 118 teachers attending conventions north of Red Deer as against 105 attending south of Red Deer. There is no doubt we have more teachers north of Red Deer than to the south. Yesterday, last night and again today, I think on five or six occasions, speakers on the other side have held out to us as a model division that which was made by the local legislature of the Northwest Territories in 1902, and I want to show to the hon. members opposite especially what kind of a distribution that was, and to ask them if they think it was a fair one. In 1902, just before the election—the election was held in May, 1902, and it was in April that this distribution was made—there were 6 constituencies north of the town of Red Deer, 8 constituencies in the old district of Alberta, and since has been added the Medicine Hat district, making 9 constituencies south—6 constituencies north of Red Deer and 9 constituencies south of Red Deer.

Now, I want to give you the vote that was polled at the election immediately after that. In the districts north of Red Deer, Lacombe had 871 votes; Strathcona 645 votes; St. Albert 695 votes; Victoria 641 votes ; Edmonton 801 votes. In Wetaskiwin, one of the largest and most thickly settled districts in the Northwest, the member was elected by acclamation and there was no vote, but the vote there would certainly be larger than in any of the others. The total was 3,653 votes for the five constituencies, and remember there was one by acclamation. It would be fair to put Wetaskiwin the same as Lacombe; each constituency is six townships wide, and any one from the west will agree with me that the Wetaskiwin district is certainly more thickly settled. In the districts south of Red Deer, the district of Banff had 364 votes; East Calgary 784; West Calgary 621; Cardston 285; High River 285; Innisfail 359; Lethbridge 489; Macleod 676; Medicine Hat 671, making a total of 3,877 votes for the nine constituencies south, while the five constituencies north polled 3,653. The average vote polled for each constituency in the north was 730, while the average vote polled in each constituency in the south was 430. And that is the distribution that our friends on the other side of the House hold out as a model.

Mr. HERRON. Will you explain to the House the cause of the small vote in the south at the last election ? Do you remember the floods in southern Alberta on the day of the election ?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Were there no floods in the north ?

Mr. HERRON. Not the same.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Oh, my dear man, I was forced to walk the day of the election eighteen miles because the railroad was swept away.

Mr. HERRON. This government granted $500,000 to repair bridges that were swept out mostly in the southern district on the very day of the election.

Mr. LAKE. Where does my hon. friend (Mr. Talbot) get these figures ?

Mr. HERRON. From Magurn's Parliament Guide.

Mr. LAKE. I have the figures from the Northwest government, which I think are official, and they do not correspond with your figures in several particulars.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I do not wish to make any statement that is not correct, and I will be glad to compare the figures in the guide with your figures.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman give the names on the voters' lists for the nine constituencies south and the six constituencies north ?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. I have not got that information, but I will explain how the names are put on our voters' lists. The hon. member for Calgary and another hon. member opposite tried to convey the impression that as more votes were polled in some divisions that there were on the voters' lists, and that as he alleged that occurred in the north especially, there was something crooked about the last election.

Let me point out that we do not prepare the voters' lists, as they do in other provinces.

Mr. AMES. May I be allowed one interjection? I did not claim that there was anything crooked in that election. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman not to put it in that way.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. For what other reason was the statement made at all?

Mr. AMES. Because it is true.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Then why was it not also stated, because it is true, that three instances of that occurred in the district of Calgary, and three instances in the district of Macleod, as well as three instances in the Edmonton district, and one instance of it in Strathcona. I want to explain why a thing like that could occur. The preparation of our voters' lists is entirely different from the system in the other provinces. We are never particular in preparing our lists because we know that a man can vote whether his name was put on the list before polling day or not. Some carelessness was exhibited no doubt by the enumerators, and they omitted several names, but these men came forward on polling day and got their votes as they were entitled to do. The statement that more voted than were on the list before the day of election applies not only to the Edmonton district but also to Calgary and Macleod.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Where did that occur in Calgary?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. In the Calgary district at poll number 14 there were 59 votes polled, while there were only 53 on the list before polling day. You will bear in mind that when a man votes with us his name is put on the list and it need not necessarily be on the list until the day of polling. In the Calgary district, poll number 32, there were 81 votes polled and 64 on the list; in poll number 66 there were 11 votes polled and there were 10 on the list. The first poll I mentioned in Calgary district was in Calgary city, the second poll was at Pine Creek and the third poll was at Kamanaskis. Just one other matter and I am through. It has been stated here that the press in every portion of the Northwest Territories was condemning the government because of this legislation. I quote the following item from the Strathcona 'Plaindealer':

> The Calgary papers, particularly the 'Herald,' are in a terrible state of excitement about the distribution of constituencies in Alberta. The fact that thirteen constituencies out of twenty-five are north of Red Deer has caused the 'Herald' to fume and foam in a most extraordinary manner. They consider the arrangement the most iniquitous gerrymander ever perpetrated. They present a map to illustrate their point, and really the appearance of the map proves the utter fallacy of their argument. Calgary people seem to imagine that all the immigration of the last five years has been into the south country, whereas as a matter of fact the north country has been filling up at an equal if not greater rate. Calgary's eagerness for capital honours has got away entirely with the prudence and good judgment of the 'Herald.'

Mr. INGRAM. How far is that Strathcona paper published from Edmonton?

Mr. PETER TALBOT. It is published about 200 miles north of Calgary.

Mr. INGRAM. Across the river from Edmonton.

Mr. PETER TALBOT. Yes, it is close to Edmonton. Now, we will see what the Edmonton 'Journal,' a Tory organ has to say on this same thing. It says:

> Here is a fine sample of the arguments Calgary is using against the arrangement of the Alberta constituency: While it is possible under the proposed distribution for Edmonton with its 7,000 people to elect at least five members, Calgary with 12,500 can have but two at the outside. Another sentence explains this strange statement. 'Equally outrageous is the gerrymander of St. Albert, Sturgeon, Saskatchewan and Strathcona, all of which corner on Edmonton.' The evident purpose of these statements is to leave the impression that Edmonton is able to exert some mysterious influence over the electors of adjoining constituencies. The constituencies will resent this reflection on their independence. And the adjoining constituencies are as completely separated from this city's influence as if the Saskatchewan river marked the boundary, which it does in the case of Strathcona riding. It is by such poor arguments that the Calgary press hope to affect a change in the arrangements, favourable to the capital hopes of that city.

I do not think it is necessary for me to detain you longer. I have prepared these facts mostly independently, without consulting anybody, and in the main they agree with what has been prepared by other hon. members. I am perfectly satisfied that this division is as just and fair a one as could be made.

Mr. LAKE. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to take up the real business part of this question, I would like to make a remark with reference to the question of more votes being polled than there were voters on the list. It struck me as a peculiar circumstance that that should have happened in certain cases, and I came across an example of it in a return which was brought down to this House giving the names on the voters' lists in the Northwest. It appeared that in one of the districts, the electoral district of Mackenzie, there were two lists for polling division No. 20. One of them is not signed at all. The other is signed by a man named Bisli J. Bildel. The former is evidently the correct list, and it contains sixty-one names. I was startled by this fact and began to look through the list, and I found that the names were du-

plicated pretty much all through. The name of this gentleman, who evidently drew up the list, appears twice. In one place it appears as Gisli J. Bildel, and in another place as Gisli J. Bildpett. Both names are for the same section. Then the name of John Jamieson appears, and further down the list appears the name of John Jameson—certainly the same man for the same section. Then there is the name of Stefan Olofron for section 16-32-11 and further down the name of Stephen Olopson for the same section ; and so on. This accounts for the fact that while there were twenty-nine names on the real list, a larger number voted. It is a matter of speculation how many of these men voted under different names.

Mr. CASH. That is a poll in an Icelandic settlement and in these Icelandic settlements there are a great many men of the same name.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. On the same section ?

Mr. CASH. No. I think that shows that there was nothing incorrect in the list except a repetition of names by accident. It also shows that it is not very good evidence as to population in that section of country, because it indicates that only one was on the quarter section. It would not be fair to take that as an indication of the population of that section of country.

Mr. LAKE. Or an indication that these voters' lists were drawn up in a proper manner. I just throw that out as a suggestion which may account for the fact that more men voted than those whose names appear on the list.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How many votes were cast at that polling subdivision ?

Mr. LAKE. Twenty-nine voted, the same number as the names on the original list. With reference to the figures given by the hon. member for Strathcona as regards the developments which are taking place in the Athabaska district, I noticed that he did not give the postal statistics of that district, as he did those of the districts further south ; and I do not think the statement of the hon. member for Calgary has yet been refuted, that the whole postal revenue from the Athabaska district came from the Lesser Slave Lake post office and amounted to $66. The hon. member, in laying down the basis on which he proceeded to distribute these seats, remarked that he thought it would be advisable that each of the cities in the Northwest Territories should have a member, mentioning four or five cities. I would like to ask why it is that one of those he mentioned, the city of Moosejaw, is not given a member, although the vote cast there was greater than that cast in the city of Prince Albert which is given a member. The vote of the residents of Moosejaw, I think, was actually greater than that of the residents of the city of Regina. With reference to the argument that schools are a very good indication of the population of a country, and the fact stated that there are more schools in the northern part of Alberta than in the southern part, I think that argument may be met by this statement. It is certainly true that where you have a settlement of agriculturists living close together, they are likely to form a school district ; but where you have a ranching district, the ranchers are much more distant from each other, and it is more difficult for them to form a school district. In southern Alberta I have met the complaint that the ranchers do not form school districts, but move into the town in the winter and make use of the town schools. The trustees of these schools complain that it is rather hard on them to have to bear the expense incurred by the ranchers coming in and using their schools in this way. So I think that the figures given as regards the school districts cannot be considered reliable in this connection. This afternoon when the Minister of the Interior was dealing with the question of the huge areas in some of the northern constituencies he took exception to a statement of mine that the district of St. Albert, a very large district to which he was calling special attention, ran within 6 miles of the city of Edmonton, I was asking why, if they considered that these vast areas should be taken into consideration, it was necessary to run in a huge area of that sort within 6 miles of Edmonton. The minister stated it was 9 miles from Edmonton. I have the map here issued by his own department in which it is marked within 4 miles. Does the Minister of the Interior intend to repudiate this map along with other documents which apparently have been issued by the Department of the Interior as being incorrect ? I presume we may take that as correct, the way in which the constituencies are laid out in this map which was forwarded to the various members.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. This map places the district of St. Albert within 4 miles of the city of Edmonton instead of 9. It seems to me that just looking at the map should arouse suspicions as to an improper distribution of seats. Here you have four constituencies touching the city of Edmonton, the town of Edmonton and three other constituencies, and you have three other constituencies all poking their noses within 12 miles of Edmonton. That is to say that the city of Edmonton controls practically 7 seats in that legislature. I would like the Prime Minister to look at that point especially on the map ; he will see that 7 different constituencies all come up within 12 miles of Edmonton. Take that into consideration when you say that the areas should be espe-

cially considered in the formation of these constituencies.

Mr. OLIVER. Will you explain how Edmonton is going to control these 7 constituencies ?

Mr. LAKE. I think we may take it for granted that the members who are going to represent these constituencies will be living near Edmonton, in most cases at any rate. The population will be pretty close into Edmonton, and it certainly seems to me that was the idea under which that distribution of seats was made.

Mr. OLIVER. Are the people there ?

Mr. LAKE. I think that the probability is that they are. I simply say that on the face of it it looks like an attempt at gerrymander.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps it would relieve the hon. gentleman's mind to know that the boundary of St. Albert where it comes close to Edmonton, is the boundary fixed in the distribution of 1902 by the Northwest Assembly. There is no alteration of that boundary.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that ; I am coming to that presently. First of all, however, I wish to call attention to statements made both by the Minister of the Interior and the member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) yesterday, when they made the assertion that the Conservative members were invited to conferences a considerable time ago in regard to delimiting these constituencies. Both the member for Calgary and the member for Alberta and myself denied that this was the case. I again take this occasion to positively deny that I was ever asked to a conference for that purpose of delimiting these constituencies.

Mr. SCOTT. Last evening when I mentioned this, I did it upon the spur of the moment. Since then, I have had time to furbish up my memory, so to speak, and my own memory has been assisted by those of other gentlemen who were present. I wish to make the statement again that a conference was held several evenings before the 21st of February, several days before these Bills were introduced. The conference was called by Mr. Haultain and to that conference were invited, I understood, all the members of the House of Commons from the Northwest Territories, including the member for Qu'Appelle, all the senators from the Territories and there were also present at the conference the members then in Ottawa of the Northwest government. I make the statement that Mr. Haultain told that conference that it had been suggested to him by the Prime Minister that he should endeavour to get an agreement from the representatives from the Northwest upon the boundary line between the two provinces, secondly, with regard to the number of local constituencies which should be given to each province, and, thirdly, with regard to the divisions of these local constituencies. I repeat the statement that we were told that by Mr. Haultain. The matter of the boundary between the two provinces was discussed at great length. The matter of the number of constituencies was also discussed and the method of division of the constituencies within each province was debated at considerable length. I make the statement now deliberately that I discussed with the member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) that evening the matter of a bi-party committee for each province to make these divisions, and he gave me to understand he was not willing to go into the work with the other members for Alberta. He put it in this way : It will be two against two, myself and the member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) as against the member for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot) and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) two against two, there will be certainly a deadlock as the interests of Edmonton and Calgary are so diverse and distinct that we could not hope to reach an agreement.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I have already denied in this House that I was ever asked to discuss that question of deciding the boundaries of these constituencies. I do not see why the same insinuation should be repeated, but if anything were needed to show the absurdity of the insinuation, of the member for West Assiniboia——

Mr. SCOTT. I made no insinuation. I make a direct and absolute statement.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I deny it. I deny that I was ever asked and I say that if any thing were needed to show the absurdity of the statement it is the fact that it would be impossible for us to settle the boundaries of the constituencies when the dividing line between the two provinces was not settled.

Mr. LAKE. I made my denial a few moments ago. I will go on to say that no Liberal, to the best of my recollection, ever mentioned the question of local constituencies to me before the schedule containing these constituencies was brought down and then it was mentioned by a member of the government.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that the member for Qu'Appelle was not present at that conference ; I understood him to say that last night.

Mr. LAKE. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. I made a formal motion at that meeting that a bi-party committee representing each province should take up this matter of the division of the provinces. I think my motion was not seconded ; at all events it was not carried. We took it for granted, from the treatment given to the motion by the conference, and I took it for granted from the statement that was made to me personally by my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), that it

was useless to proceed with the proposition, and that our hon. friends on the other side were not willing to act with us in an endeavour to reach an amicable arrangement with regard to the local divisions.

Mr. LAKE. I think the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) has already definitely denied that statement before, it should not be repeated.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the dispute between my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) and my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) arose from something that I said yesterday. Therefore, it would hardly be fair for me to listen to the assertion and denial without saying my say on the subject. I do not know what was said to the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron) or the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), but I have a distinct remembrance of being in room 48 with the hon. member for Calgary and the hon. member for Alberta, and also Premier Haultain and other gentlemen, senators and others. My remembrance is that the purpose we were there for, was as the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has stated. As I remember it and as he had said, we did discuss, at great length, the question of boundary between the provinces, without making any progress in regard to that question. The further questions we were expected to discuss were not gone on with. But there was a conference, and there was a request for a joint discussion, at any rate, in regard to boundaries, and such a discussion, certainly took place as to the boundary between the provinces; and I am of opinion—though I am not so clear on that point as on the point of the discussion with regard to the boundary line—that there was also a discussion on the question of the number of representatives to be given to each province.

Mr. LAKE. I was not present at that meeting, as I have stated.

Mr. LAMONT. I was present, and I distinctly recollect hearing the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) making the motion he states he did make. It was not seconded and the matter dropped.

Mr. HERRON. The motion made by the hon. member for Western Assiniboia was that we should hold out together to get our land and minerals for the Northwest. I was at the meeting and remember the proposition made with reference to the division line between the two provinces. That was all that was discussed at the meeting. And I distinctly remember that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia said we should hold together and fight for our lands and minerals.

Mr. LAKE. I spoke to Mr. Haultain this morning and asked whether he was present when the formal motion which the hon. member for Western Assiniboia has told us of was made. Mr. Haultain told me that no formal motion was made while he was present, if it were made—and no doubt it was; I accept the hon. member's (Mr. Scott's) statement—it was when no Conservatives were present. If I had been invited to a conference of this sort, I should have considered it my duty to accept. I was very anxious with regard to the distribution of seats in the new constituencies. But I felt that I had no right to assume that the government would not do justice to the people, and I did not know to whom it would be my duty to appeal to ask them to do justice; and, after all, that is all we look for.

Mr. SCOTT. Did I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) to say that he asked Mr. Haultain a question this morning with regard to this matter?

Mr. LAKE. I asked Mr. Haultain whether he was present when the formal motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) was made, and he stated distinctly that he was not present when that formal motion was made.

Mr. SCOTT. But he would not dispute the fact of the conference, or the fact that he called it for the purpose for which it was called. The best proof that the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not wish to decide matters, and force them, as the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) had said, nolens volens, upon the people of the Northwest, is that he suggested that Mr. Haultain should try to get amicable arrangements as to the boundary line and the number and division of the constituencies.

Mr. LAKE. Before I came to Ottawa in December, I received a letter from Mr. Haultain similar to a letter which, I understood, had been sent to every member from the Northwest, inviting us to meet in conference in Ottawa during the discussion of the Autonomy Bill. I understood that it was in pursuance of that policy that we were invited on two or three occasions to meet together. I was present at two meetings in room 48. The only questions seriously discussed were the possession of our lands and mines, and the boundary between the two provinces. Certainly nothing whatever was said in my presence in regard to the constituencies.

Mr. LAMONT. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) say that at that conference in room 48, Mr. Haultain did not say, over and over again that the Prime Minister had asked him to give thirty constituencies to each province?

Mr. LAKE. I cannot deny it, because I was not present at the last meeting. But

it is the first I have ever heard of the matter. I had always understood that there was a strong movement to have this question submitted to the judges.

Mr. FINLAY. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) to say that he had a letter from Mr. Haultain on the subject, and now he says he never heard of it.

Mr. LAKE. The letter that I received from Mr. Haultain invited me to meet other members of parliament and senators from the Northwest in conference during the progress of the Autonomy Bill discussion. That is the only letter I have had from Mr. Haultain on the subject. He did not mention the subject of constituencies—in fact, speaking from memory, he did not go into any details, but merely suggested that we should meet and discuss matters in general. I have always understood that, so far as the distribution of constituencies is concerned, it was only the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who held out against this matter being submitted to the judges. That is the effect of rumours that I have heard from Conservatives, not from Liberals. The Northwest members, I understood, were in favour of this course, and there was simply the member for Edmonton who was opposed to it. Another matter discussed at the conference was the matter of one or two provinces. But, after all, these questions are apart from the question we ought to be discussing at the present moment. As the hon. members for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot) and Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) admitted that they were responsible for the schedule for Alberta, I assume that the hon. member for Western Assiniboia and other Northwest Liberal members will take the responsibility for distribution in the new province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. OLIVER. I had occasion to correct one speaker on the other side in a statement similar to the one the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) has just made. I hope it will not be necessary for me to correct it again. Speaking for myself, I do not admit responsibility for the schedule for Alberta. I admit responsibility for having given advice with regard to the schedule for Alberta, but not responsibility for the schedule.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman will have to take the responsibility together with the hon. member for Strathcona. I think their speeches prove it very clearly.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does not the minister repudiate the boundaries ?

Mr. OLIVER. The minister is supporting the Bill.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Then he accepts the whole responsibility ?

Mr. OLIVER. The government takes the whole responsibility.

Mr. LAKE. The Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) have both spoken in very disparaging terms of the redistribution which took place in 1902 in the legislative assembly, and they have given various samples of what they consider to be the gerrymander which was created by that redistribution. In the first instance, I would like to say that that redistribution was decided on by a conference of all the members of the House. I doubt whether Mr. Haultain was present even on that occasion. The lines laid down were laid with regard to population, and a certain consideration of area. The population in the three districts at that time, each of which was entitled to a certain share of representation, was taken into consideration, and the population which was to be allowed to each was figured out. It was figured out that, working on these lines, the constituency of Alberta would get one member to every 4,700 population; the district of Assiniboia one member to 4,492; the district of Saskatchewan, one to 4,279. It will be noticed that the distribution, looked at from that point of view, was a fair one. There was only a margin of less than 5 per cent as between the amounts allowed to these three districts from the average of the whole. It was decided to interfere as little as possible with existing local constituencies, and that may account for a certain discrepancy in the total votes cast, but I do not think it is necessary to go into these figures, and the figures given by the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) are different in many respects from those I have, which were made out by the Northwest government. At the time of the redistribution we had a very lively opposition in the legislative assembly, who were ready to find fault on every pretext. It was just on the eve of an election; and surely if there had been any attempt at a gerrymander that would have been brought up in the House. But what do we find? Looking over the reports, I find for instance two objections were made by Mr. Patrick, of the district of Yorkton. The first was that there should be another representative up there, because he had an additional population of 5,000 Doukhobors, but he did not press that very hard. And it was shown him that his total population was a very fair one under the circumstances. He also thought there should be one more member in the House. It was found necessary to reduce the representation in the district of Saskatchewan by one. Mr. Mackay, of Prince Albert, also objected to losing one member from one of the constituencies of Prince Albert, which was cut off. Mr. Bennett simply objected to the Liberal executive having any finger in this redistribu-

tion. That was all his objection. He went on to say he had no objection to a certain change which was made in his constituency. And I think there was only one division taken on the whole of that question, and that was as to whether there should be 35 or 36 members. I am not sure on this point. If there was a division at all, it was lost. I only find the record of one amendment being proposed, and I do not see whether it was pressed to a division or not. Therefore, it cannot possibly be said that there was any unfair redistribution by the legislative assembly in 1902. Not one of these members who, the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. P. Talbot) says, were so badly treated in the northern part of Alberta, raised any protest against the redistribution. We, therefore, can take it as absolutely the fact that it was a fair one, and I think it will be found to compare very favourably indeed with the redistribution we are now discussing, in which, instead of a margin of only something like 4 per cent between one district and another, we find a margin of from 10 to 100 per cent. I am very glad that the principle has been laid down that the figures of last election are the basis for the distribution of seats. These lists, upon which that election took place, were drawn up last fall, and the election took place in November. There may be considerable difference of opinion as to whether we should take the votes actually cast or those which appear on the lists. For my part, I would take the ones placed on the lists, which lists were drawn up by men employed by the present government, who certainly would not be unfair towards the members of their own party. I think most strongly that the votes on the lists should be the basis upon which this distribution should be made.

However, if the government wishes, let us take the basis of the votes cast just for the purpose of argument. As far as the province of Saskatchewan is concerned, I am perfectly willing to accept that basis. Probably my hon. friends on this side would be willing to accept even that basis also so long as it is strictly adhered to. But I find that in the case of the province of Saskatchewan, the votes cast at last election are not followed to any degree whatever. Let me point to this as an illustration The new province of Saskatchewan can easily be divided up between north and south. There are three Dominion constituencies in the north and three in the south. We have the absolute number of votes polled in all these constituencies so that we can get down to an absolute basis of fact. In the three northern constituencies, there were 7,824 votes polled. Add the number from the districts of Strathcona and Edmonton, and you would possibly have 150 votes more. In the three southern Dominion constituencies there were 17,771 votes polled. Now, we find that the actual distribution we are discussing gives to the north eight members and the south ten members, and that there are seven local constituencies which are divided up, and I think that hon. gentlemen opposite will be perfectly willing to admit that those constituencies can be divided equally between the north and the south. We find that to the 7,824 votes cast in the north they give 11½ seats, whilst to the 17,741 votes cast in the south they only give 13½ seats. It will also be found, taking the votes actually cast, when you come to the province of Saskatchewan, that it takes 100 per cent more votes to elect a member in the southern part of the province than in the northern part.

Mr. LAMONT. When my hon. friend speaks of north and south, I presume he is following the same dividing line as that which was followed in Alberta—township 38.

Mr. LAKE. No ; I have already said that I am not following the same dividing line. I am taking the three northern constituencies, about which there will be no question whatever, and in regard to which the right hon. Prime Minister himself brought down the votes cast in the last election. I will give some figures on another occasion in regard to Saskatchewan, in which I will give one of the degrees of latitude as the division. But in the three northern Dominion constituencies they are only giving half the number of voters to each local constituency that they are in the three southern Dominion constituencies.

Mr. HAGGART. That is in the new province of Saskatchewan ?

Mr. LAKE. That is in the new province of Saskatchewan. It becomes even more apparent if we take the figures which the right hon. Prime Minister laid so much stress upon to-day—the figures of the census of 1901. He used these figures as an argument in support of the distribution in the province of Alberta. If you will take these figures and apply them to the old provisional districts of Assiniboia and Saskatchewan, you will find that the population of Assiniboia amounted to 67,385 in the year 1901. You can deduct, say about 3,000 for the portion of Medicine Hat which would be included in the census. The population of Saskatchewan was only 25,679 in the census and a portion of the territory has been thrown into unorganized territory under the present administration. So that, taking that basis upon which the Prime Minister insisted so much this afternoon, there should be two and a half times the representation given to Assiniboia as to the province of Saskatchewan ; that is to say, there should be eighteen seats in the old provisional district of Assiniboia and seven in the old provisional district of Saskatchewan ; whereas, as a matter of fact, in the

distribution which is proposed by the government, Saskatchewan gets ten and Assiniboia fifteen. That is roughly speaking, but the figures are close enough to make a fair test of the right hon. gentleman's argument. Taking the right hon. Prime Minister's own figures given this afternoon in reference to the votes cast and the voters on the list in Alberta, you will find, if you will calculate them up, that he has made a margin of 10 per cent, roughly speaking, between the representation of the constituencies which lie south of the dividing line at Red Deer and those which lie north; that is to say, that it takes 10 per cent more voters in the constituencies south to elect a representative to the legislative assembly than it does in the north. I noticed that in the instructions which were given for the mapping out of the constituencies of the Transvaal by the British government the other day, it was laid down that there might be a variation of 10 per cent in the populations which were to be allotted to the different constituencies, but it was never suggested that that 10 per cent should apply to a whole group of constituencies. That is what is being done in this particular case. The constituencies grouped north are receiving, taken as a whole, an exceptional amount of consideration. But if you take the number of votes on the list you will find that the right hon. Prime Minister, according to his own figures, has favoured constituencies in the north to the extent of 22 per cent; and I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this, that I am not taking into consideration the two extra constituencies which are to be formed in Athabaska. I am taking purely and simply the constituencies in the old district of Alberta. If you take the voters' list you will see that the northern people have been favoured to the extent of 22 per cent. The figures furnished by the right hon. Prime Minister show that on the basis of the votes cast they have been favoured to the extent of 10 per cent. I would like to know how that compares with the way that the legislative assembly managed their own distribution, in which the variation amounted to about 4½ per cent throughout the whole country. We have heard a good deal about the argument that areas should be taken into consideration in discussing this question. So I consider they should to a certain extent, but a mountain has been made out of a molehill in regard to the difficulties of carrying on an election in the district of Athabaska. The legislative assembly of the Northwest have been holding elections in the district of Kinistino. I have not a map showing the district of Kinistino as at present constituted, but taking the district of Prince Albert East, which was only a portion of the district of Kinistino, I find that that district was 180 miles wide by 270 miles long. Yet no very great difficulty was found in holding an election for a member of the legislative assembly.

The only trouble was that the return of the election had to be delayed for a fortnight, because some of the returns could not be brought in during the same time as in other constituencies. While we are hearing so much talk in regard to the necessity for representation in Athabaska, I would like to say that I fully agree that every man in that country should have the franchise and should be entitled to cast his vote for a member to represent him, but we must not forget the fact that there is a large portion of the country which is being cut off and deprived of representation by the action of the present government. That portion of the district of Saskatchewan which lies north of Manitoba has a fair number of voters in it. I should not wonder if it has just as many voters as those who will cast their votes in either of these proposed districts in Athabaska. They have enjoyed the franchise for many years, they have been entitled to elect a member for the Northwest legislative assembly, and now they are to be thrown into unorganized territory and to be deprived of their franchise. I think that is a point which is worth bearing in mind in connection with this discussion. You have only to look at the map to see how very little consideration has been given to the question, because you will see that they bring in all these huge constituencies from the north and corner them in and around the city of Edmonton. We find also that this principle of area has been departed from in the most astonishing way in the new province of Saskatchewan. There is one constituency in the south that has more than five times the area of two of the constituencies in the north. It has five times the area and nearly double the voting strength of these constituencies in the north. That is one example to show that the area has not been the guiding principle in this redistribution. The smallest district in area is Rosthern, one of these northern constituencies, which is just one-sixteenth the size of Moosejaw in the south, and has only about one-half of the voting population.

Mr. LAMONT. What is the population of Rosthern?

Mr. LAKE. On the 3rd of November last there were 1,348 names on the voters' lists in Rosthern as against 2,584 names in Moosejaw. Take Prince Albert city, Humboldt, Rosthern, area 83 townships, with 2,285 names on the list and 3 members. Take Moosejaw in the south with an area of 420 townships and 2,584 names on the voters' lists with only 1 member. Take Prince Albert city and Prince Albert rural district, add to them Humboldt, Redberry and Greenwood; they have a total on the voters' lists of 2,617 and 5 members. Compare that with the district of Souris on the south which has on the voters' lists 3,346 names—more than that, because one poll was never held as the list was missing:—it has 1 member for 3,346

votes in the south while there are 5 members for 2,617 votes in the north. These are some comparisons which might well be taken into consideration in this distribution.

Mr. TAYLOR. What will the Prime Minister say to that ?

Mr. LAKE. I could compare these five members which are given in the north with the district of South Qu'Appelle——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is not the population in the north much more accustomed to British institutions than the population of the south ?

Mr. LAKE. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in that statement. As a matter of fact the original population came in chiefly along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course there was a small population in the cities of Prince Albert and Battleford, but there has practically been a very small increase of population there until within the last year or two. The increase has taken place along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway and along the southern line. These people living along the two southern lines are the men who have practically made the Northwest what it is to-day. They have stuck to farming and have made a success of farming, and yet we find that the votes of five of them are only equal to the vote of one of these men who have recently come into the north and the majority of whom know very little of our institutions and many of whom are quite illiterate.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that some of our friends opposite have very carefully scrutinized all these lists. Can my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) inform the committee whether the Doukhobor population in that part of the country was placed on the voters' list ?

Mr. LAKE. I cannot be certain on that point. I have spent a good deal of time and labour going through the voters' lists of all these constituencies counting them name by name and in many cases distributing them to each local constituency they may belong to, because of course many of the polling divisions are broken into two or three local constituencies, but I cannot give an answer to the hon. gentleman. In fact I do not know that I should be able to recognize the names of the Doukhobors so as to distinguish them from the names of Russians, Poles, Galicians and others. I do not understand the Doukhobor language.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Your education is sadly neglected .

Mr. HAGGART. Who prepares these voters' lists ?

Mr. LAKE. An enumerator who is appointed by the government.

Mr. HAGGART. By this government ?

Mr. LAKE. By this government I presume. I believe in the great majority of cases these enumerators are strong party men, and I do not think we would find them discriminating against the Liberal party. In fact I know of cases in which they were canvassing for the Liberal party at the same time they were drawing up the lists.

Mr. SCOTT. If my hon. friend wished to be fair to the House, would he not admit that the larger part of the Doukhobor population, which is what my hon. friend from Victoria had in mind, when he put his question——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. How do you know ?

Mr. SCOTT. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) not admit that the larger part of the Doukhobor population are not yet naturalized and are not yet on the lists. It is a very odd one amongst the Doukhobors who have yet taken out naturalization papers, made their homestead entries, and were last fall in a position to be placed on the voters' list.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) tell me how he knows what I had in my mind. I referred to the Galicians, who were hawked all over the country from riding to riding by the hon. gentleman in the last election in November.

Mr. SCOTT. I am perfectly willing to accept the explanation of my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) as to that.

Mr. LAKE. I cannot say how many of these electors have been naturalized, I know that in a return brought down the other day, forty-five of them have been apparently deprived of their homesteads and sent to locate on other lands, and I think it was stated that a great majority of these had naturalized, I know that one man was spoken of as having naturalized, but the only source of information I have as to that is to be found in these papers which were brought down the other day. At any rate it is for us to deal with existing conditions. It has been admitted by the Minister of the Interior and by the Prime Minister that the fairest basis of calculation in regard to this redistribution which is to be for an election which will take place within six months, is the basis of the voters' lists and the votes cast at the recent election. Surely that should be sufficient for the members on the other side of the House as it is sufficient for us. We are quite prepared to accept that as a basis, we consider it a fair basis and if it is adhered to we will have nothing more to say in regard to this matter. For my part at any rate, I would have nothing more to say. I do not care how these are divided up so long as there is a fair distribution of the population ; they may zig-zag them in any way they please so long as they give a fair distribution of the population. Let the man who has lived in the southern part of that country and who has made that country, and who has proved that the country is of some

use, let him have at least equal rights with the new comer in the north. Do not make his vote of only one-fifth the value of the vote of some of these new comers away in the northern part. I was speaking of comparing these five members which are given to five constituencies in the north with a total aggregate voting strength of 2,617, with the district of Souris with a voting strength of 3,346 and the district of South Qu'Appelle with 2,842 names on the voters' lists, each of which has only one member.

That includes the district of Indian Head, about which the Minister of the Interior made some complimentary remarks yesterday. I do not think it is any compliment to the people of Indian Head that their votes are only one-fifth of the value of the votes of the people in that northern country. Compare these five members with the number given to Moosejaw, with 2,584 voters on the list, or with the district of Cannington, another southern district with 2,455 voters on the list. Even compare it with one of the northern constituencies, that of Saskatoon, which gets one member with 2,094 votes, I think the largest vote given to any northern constituency. The two Prince Alberts, Humboldt and Greenwood, four constituencies, have a smaller aggregate vote than Saskatoon. So that there must have been some extraordinary distribution going on. With regard to the question of area, we have the district of Maple Creek, which has ten times the area of the district of Humboldt and seven times the voting population.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does it get seven members ?

Mr. LAKE. Each gets one member.

Mr. SCOTT. That was the district the assembly fixed, was it not?

Mr. LAKE. The district of Maple Creek was formed by the legislative assembly.

Mr. SCOTT. Did my hon. friend compare it with Cardston, also formed by the assembly?

Mr. LAKE. Certainly. I find that where it has suited the present government, they have taken advantage of existing local conditions, but where it has not suited them, they have not done so. For instance it has suited them to take the constituencies in the southern part of the province of Saskatchewan as they stand, adding just one seat the city of Regina. But they have interfered with existing local conditions only in the north, where it has suited them to do so, and where they have been able to run in a considerable number of more members by doing so. Moosejaw has six times the area and fifteen times the voting population of the district of Humboldt, and each place gets one member.

Mr. LAKE.

Mr. INGRAM. Whose Italian hand is that ?

Mr. OLIVER. Sbarretti's, I guess.

Mr. LAKE. It has been suggested that this scheme of representation should provide for the prospective increase of votes in the future, and I think it was stated by the Minister of the Interior that that had been done in the case of the distribution of seats by the legislative assembly in 1902. I differ with him in regard to that. I do not remember ever hearing that point raised. At any rate, the facts stand for themselves—that they took the census of the previous year, which was not a year old, and distributed the seats exactly according to that census, with only 4½ per cent variation. So that I do not think it can be stated that in actual practice at any rate they took into consideration the prospective increase of population.

Mr. LAMONT. Did the assembly not do that in the last distribution?

Mr. LAKE. No, I do not think they did.

Mr. LAMONT. Then, how do you account for 293 votes in Batoche and 1,052 in Moosejaw in the last election?

Mr. LAKE. The special circumstances which made the vote in the southern part of Alberta so small in that election have already been referred to—the carrying away of the bridges over two of the main rivers, which made it practically impossible for a large number of the voters to go to the polls.

Mr. LAMONT. There is no river in Batoche.

Mr. LAKE. I did not understand that the hon. gentleman was referring to Batoche. As far as my memory goes, the question of the prospective increase of population was not taken into consideration at all. As little interference as possible was made with existing conditions. At that time we fully believed that the Dominion government were going to create us into a province almost immediately, and Mr. Haultain was making an appeal to the country on the autonomy question. What would have been the use of complicating that question with questions of gerrymander or anything of that sort ? The fact remains that there was no serious criticism of that Redistribution Bill in the House. I doubt if it took three hours to put it through.

Mr. LAMONT. Then on what principle was one seat in Prince Albert wiped out ?

Mr. LAKE. Because it was found that the district of Saskatchewan had altogether too large a representation.

Mr. LAMONT. It had it for years.

Mr. LAKE. Well, that indicates that it had been at a standstill for a number of

years, while other districts had been increasing in population.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my hon. friend tell me what principle the assembly followed in the previous redistribution?

Mr. LAKE. I was not in the assembly at the time of the previous redistribution. I still point to the fact that the redistribution made in 1902 took into consideration the three great divisions of the country—Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan—and that the seats for these three provisional districts were distributed in such a way as to make only a variation of 4½ per cent in the number of seats given to each of these provisional districts. Further than that while Batoche, Moosejaw and Prince Albert were all represented in that House there was no serious criticism of this measure. The member for Prince Albert was the only one to introduce an amendment which was to the effect that there should be 36 seats. The question was where would the odd seat go. Provision was made for 35 seats already, and with 35 seats Saskatchewan was getting 4½ per cent the advantage of the district of Assiniboia. There was no serious objectiton to that redistribution at all or else we should have heard of it. There is no question about that. At any rate we find that those gentlemen on the other side of the House are most anxious to take it where it suits them and they are leaving it and discarding it where it does not suit them.

Mr. OLIVER. Before the hon. gentleman closes, would he tell the House what this has to do with Alberta ?

Mr. HAGGART. It has everything to do with it.

Mr. LAKE. It is all pointing to a moral. We have been told to-day that the government have proceeded with this distribution upon principle ; that they have adopted the principle of being guided by the voters' lists and the votes cast on the 3rd of November last and by justice and fair-play. I am simply making a comparison of the two districts. As a matter of fact it appears to me that the gerrymander, shall I call it, in Saskatchewan is so glaring that it must in itself call attention to the fact that there has been something wrong in the distribution of seats in Alberta. Of course when the schedules of the province of Saskatchewan come up I will be prepared to go into the figures in regard to that province at far greater length than I have done ; I have not completed my notes in regard to that matter, and I have spent a good many weary hours over it. What I ask is that the principles of fair-play which prevail throughout I think the whole British empire, as well as the English speaking people of the world, should govern in this case, that there should be a fair distribution of these seats in regard to population, that where certain existing local conditions render it absolutely necessary that there should be a variation in the numbers allotted to each seat, it should not exceed 10 per cent, but that discrimination should certainly not be allowed as against a whole district ; that it might take place up to that percentage as an extreme limit in certain individual cases. And yet we find according to the figures of the Prime Minister himself that between the northern and southern portion of the old district of Alberta, leaving out the two new constituencies, the government propose to put in the north, there is a discrimination in favour of the north on the votes actually cast of 10 per cent and on the voters' lists of about 22 per cent. All we ask is a fair distribution according to the best information we have in regard to the voting population of that country and the voting population has been given to us within a year from the time at which these new elections will have to be held.

Progress reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 185) for the relief of Isaac Pitblado.—Mr. Barker.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Could any of the ministers inform us what business will be proceeded with to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. We will continue the same programme.

Mr. HAGGART. Nothing before ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would suggest that perhaps it would be an understanding that the general discussion which has taken place might be brought to a conclusion, and that we might then take up the schedules in their order. However that will develop to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, June 22, 1905.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 184) to amend the Act respecting the Naturalization of Aliens.—Mr. Brodeur.

CONTRACT WITH THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask my hon.

friend the Minister of the Interior if he would lay on the table of the House the ten years' contract of the 28th November, 1904, between the Crown and the North Atlantic Trading Company of Amsterdam, Holland, with reference to immigration, and to which my hon. friend alluded the other day when the estimates of his department were under discussion.

Mr. OLIVER. I would prefer to let my hon. friend examine the papers himself, and then I will be willing to abide by his judgment as to whether they should be laid on the table.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I have read this contract and made some extracts from it, and I do not think there is anything in it which the general public ought not to be made aware of. I think the contract ought to be made public. It is a contract that I think the government ought not have made. I understood the minister the other night to say that if any member of the House desired to have it laid on the table he would bring it down. I desire to have it laid on the table.

AMERICAN FISHERMEN ON NOVA SCOTIA COAST.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a matter which is a subject of complaint among the fishermen of Nova Scotia, particularly those dwelling in the county which I represent. The matter I refer to is well expressed in the issue of the Halifax 'Chronicle' of the 19th instant, by a correspondent resident in Lunenburg.

Mr. SPEAKER. I assume the hon. member (Mr. A. K. Maclean) intends to conclude with a motion.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. This correspondence, after referring to the success of the fishermen in that constituency, concludes as follows :

> The most of these fish have been caught off Cape North, and the fishermen are complaining bitterly that there are no cutters in that section to protect them. In many cases Americans were fishing within two miles of the shore, and also getting bait privileges not allowed them by treaty. They also say that American vessels threw great quantities of small fish away, which are ruinous to the fishing grounds, besides being wanton waste.

This expresses the complaint of many of the fishermen of my county ; and I feel sure, from the correspondence which I have received from many persons able to speak upon this matter, that the statements made by this correspondent are practically correct, namely, that on portions of the Nova Scotia coast, near Cape North, it has been the practice, during the past month or so, for American fishermen to prosecute their business within territorial waters. I merely wish to mention this to the minister so that in future some measures may be taken to protect our interests by the presence there of some of the cutters. I also wish to say that it is the practice of American fishermen to purchase bait supplies on the Magdalen Islands. I know that under the treaty of 1818 the Americans were permitted to take fish, but whether that gave them the liberty of going ashore and purchasing bait supplies from the residents of the islands is, I think, an open question. However, I am not prepared to express an opinion upon it one way or the other ; I would simply ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be good enough to look into this matter and ascertain whether the treaty of 1818 does give the American fishermen a right to land upon the shores of the Magdalen Islands and purchase supplies. It is a matter of great importance to my own constituency at least, and I think to Nova Scotia generally. The protection of bait supplies is as important as the protection of the fisheries. I desire that the American fishermen should have no further privileges allowed them to purchase bait supplies than the treaty absolutely gives them. I move the adjournment of the House.

Hon. H. R. PREFONTAINE (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. K. Maclean) for having brought this matter to the attention of the department. I may say that, with the few cruisers under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it is impossible to cover this large territory and make the protection as effective as we would like. The work is very extensive, and from the reports that I have received in the department it has been done pretty effectively. Up to the 1st of June I think that over 600 nets have been confiscated from Americans fishing and poaching in Canadian waters. The work is done as effectively as it can be done under the circumstances, but if there is some neglect I will certainly look into it and see that a remedy is provided. As regards the Americans getting their supplies from the Magdalen Islands, this is a new question that I am not ready to answer at the present moment, but I will look into it and try to satisfy the hon. gentleman on that point.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. Has the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) anything to present to the House in reference to the Japan treaty?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question raised by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) I have been asked to make a statement in regard to the trade relations between this country and Japan and in regard to certain differences in the tariff of that country towards Canada

and other countries. I must premise with an explanation saying that in the year 1894 Great Britain made a commercial treaty with Japan to which treaty the self-governing colonies were privileged to adhere if they saw fit and these colonies were given two years in which to adhere to the treaty. The expiry of the two years occurred on the 16th July, 1896, three days after the present Prime Minister was sworn into office. When this government came into office we found a recommunication from the imperial authorities asking whether Canada would like to adhere to the Japanese treaty. It was some little time before we could take the matter up for discussion or investigation. The time had really expired, but we did consider the matter and in view of the difficulties which we were then foreseeing in regard to commercial treaties between the mother country and foreign countries which contained favoured nation clauses, clauses which might hamper Canada in her commercial dealings, and also in view of the fact that at that time our people generally classed the Japanese and Chinese together in regard to their entering into Canada and their relationships with us as a labouring class in our country, the government thought it was better for us not to adhere to the treaty. Some little time afterwards, and especially at the time that I was delegated to go to Japan in connection with the exhibition there, I made a careful study of the commercial relations between Canada and Japan, and I found what had not been, I think, thoroughly understood in this country before even by those in office, and yet is not understood by the people of the country at large. The Japanese goverment have treaties with four commercial nations, Great Britain, Germany, Austro-Hungary and France. By these treaties Japan accords to each of these countries special reduced duties on special specified articles, not a general reduction, but special specified duties on special articles. Each of these treaties contains a most favoured nation clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the treaty of 1894?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. Each of these treaties contains most favoured nation clauses. These other treaties were negotiated within a short time of the ratification of the treaty with Great Britain. They were all concluded within a very short time of each other and we may group them so far as time and their characteristics are concerned. The consequence of the most favoured nation clause is that each of these countries obtains the greatest advantage which is given to any one of them by the specific section of each treaty. In addition to that Japan has commercial treaties of a general character with, I think, seventeen other countries, including practically all the commercial nations of the world, and in each of these treaties, while there is no specified reduction of the duty on any specified article, there is a most favoured nation clause with the result that practically Japan is giving to nearly all the commercial nations of the world, either under these special conventions or under their general treaties, the lowest duty which she gives to any country on certain specified articles and only on these certain specified articles. The list of these articles is not a very large one, and it includes chiefly manufactured articles having been made out at the instance of those great manufacturing countries, Great Britain, Germany, Austro-Hungary and France. It does, however, include some articles besides manufactured goods in which we in Canada might enjoy a trade with Japan if we had the same advantages. I may say here in a general way that the difference between the reduced duty and the general duty is as two to three; that is the reduced duties in a general way are about two-thirds of the general duties and in many instances they are 10 per cent or thereabouts ad valorem in comparison with about 15 per cent ad valorem of a general duty.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is there not something in connection with the patent laws of the two countries? For instance, a person from the United States gets more favoured treatment for his patent and the manufacturer of his patent gets more favoured treatment for the articles which he manufactures than if they came from Canada. Is there not something of that kind?

Mr. FISHER. There is also a clause in the treaty to which I will allude later on after having dealt with the customs matter. I am speaking of the customs part of the treaty alone. As Canada has not adhered to this treaty and as the United States especially has one of the commercial treaties with Japan our goods in a general way——

Mr. FOSTER. Not one of the special treaties?

Mr. FISHER. No, but one of the general treaties containing the most favoured nation clause and consequently the United States has all the advantages for her goods going into Japan that any of the special treaties give and the best advantages which any of them give. The result is, that, comparing the treatment of our goods with American goods in the Japanese market on this particular list of articles and only on this particular list of articles, Canadian goods have to pay, roughly speaking, an average of 15 per cent while American goods only pay, roughly speaking, an average of 10 per cent, which is the duty collected on German and other goods.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I properly understand the hon. minister ? The United States is not

one of the nations with which Japan has these four special treaties?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. And yet the United States gets the advantage on the specified articles of these specified reductions?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because she has a general commercial treaty with Japan containing a most favoured nation clause and consequently she gets any advantage which Japan has given to Great Britain, France, Germany or Austro-Hungary and the best advantage which Japan may have given to any one of these countries.

Mr. KEMP. What advantage does the United States give Japan in her markets and which we refuse to Japan ?

Mr. FISHER. None.

Mr. KEMP. Then Japan gets from us just as good terms as she gets from the United States ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. In the treaties between Japan and these four countries and also in the general commercial treaties which Japan has made with some 17 countries, Japan has received practically no tariff advantage ; indeed I may say she has received absolutely no tariff advantage. In her relations with the outside world at that period Japan does not seem to have insisted on reciprocal treatment. She gave advantage to these nations without getting equivalent tariff reductions. At that time Japan was very eager to secure a recognition from the European countries of her own rights in her own country. Before that time Japan had given certain privileges within her own territory to European nations ; there were treaty ports and in these treaty ports the foreign consuls had certain judicial and almost administrative powers. Japan was very anxious to assert her status as a self-governing country without interference from abroad, and the chief thing which she claimed in these treaties was that foreign countries should cease entirely their consular administrative and judicial functions within the boundaries of the Japanese empire.

Mr. KEMP. That did not apply to the United States.

Mr. FISHER. It did. These treaties did away with all these rights of foreign countries and since then Japan has had entire control within her own territory. That was the special point which Japan desired to secure in these treaties. Apparently—I speak under reserve—she did not insist upon reciprocal trade advantages from foreign powers. That is the condition of affairs to-day in connection with Japan's tariff and foreign trade. These four treaties were made, I think, for a period of 16 years, and will not expire for 6 years hence. During the continuance of these treaties the Japanese government seems indisposed to open negotiations for further treaties because Japan would be hampered by the most favoured nation clause in these treaties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was there a time limit within which the dependencies of the British empire must accede to the treaty ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. The time within which Canada can accede to this treaty expired on the 16th of July, 1896, two years after the signing of the treaty. There are some articles contained in that specified list in which Canada is largely interested ; first, of agricultural products, condensed milk and sterilized milk, hops, feather and leather goods, sugar, and in live stock, horses. In these articles the countries included in these treaties have a distinct advantage over Canada. There are the following manufactured goods in which Canada might reasonably expect to enter into trade with Japan : cotton goods, woollen goods, paper, enamelled kitchen goods, rubber goods, wire of all kinds, hats and caps. There is a list of 60 or 70 articles, but these I have mentioned are the chief in which Canada might fairly expect to trade in the Japanese markets if Canada had a favoured nation treaty with Japan. This matter has been before the government especially since my return from Japan, and since I have been able to explain the exact situation to my colleagues we have at various times considered it. In reference to what my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam Hughes) has said in regard to patents, I may say that one clause in these four special treaties entitles the respective countries mentioned to reciprocal advantages in regard to the patent laws. Japanese patentees have the same rights within each of these foreign countries that the natives of these countries have in Japan in regard to the patent law. There are also several clauses in relation to the shipping trade and coast trade ; in relation to the privileges and treatment of the subjects of these different countries in Japan and the treatment of Japanese subjects in these treaty countries. These clauses were at one time considered to be objectionable to us in view of the possibility that Canada might wish to discriminate against the Japanese in Canada. I am happy to be able to say that it is to-day the policy of this government—and I think in that we represent the whole people of Canada—that we should not discriminate against Japanese in Canada, or think or consider of any such discrimination. Therefore in regard to that matter I think I may say we are free from any idea of fear that this clause in the treaty might hamper us in that direction. As a result of discussion and consideration, just lately, the following despatch was sent to the Colonial Office in England, to be transmitted to the Foreign Office, with the object of inquiring whether the Japanese government would overlook the fact that the period

within which we have the right to adhere to this treaty had expired, and allow Canada now, even at this rather late date to adhere to the British commercial treaty with Japan. The following is the despatch :

At the time of the original treaty of commerce and navigation in 1894 between Great Britain and Japan, it appears that Canada was invited to become a party thereto, but in view of certain conditions and possible complications, it was deemed best at the moment to decline participation. These obstacles have been now removed, and it is understood informally that the Japanese government would not be unwilling to allow Canada to become a party to the above treaty.

The committee advise that His Excellency be moved to ascertain whether the Japanese government would be prepared to admit Canada to a participation in the said treaty.

This obstacle in regard to the most favoured nation clause in connection with our preference within the empire is removed, because it is thoroughly understood now all over the empire, and also among foreign countries, that Canada's preference to the mother country or within the empire, does not apply to her dealings with foreign countries. As to the other matter, the treatment of the Japanese in this country, the present awakening of the Japanese to civilization and their great enlightenment, I think, have removed all feeling in favour of discriminating against them from the mind of the people of Canada—certainly from the mind of the government. I do not know that there is any other point to be explained, but if any hon. gentleman has questions to ask I shall be glad to deal further with the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. As I understand it, Canada might have adhered to the treaty and might have given no commercial advantages whatever to Japan ? She could have kept exactly the scale of duties of her present tariff ?

Mr. FISHER. So I understand it.

Mr. FOSTER. The real reason that the arrangement was not made was the fear of complications on account of nationality ?

Mr. FISHER. And also a doubt in regard to the favoured nation cause. At that time, I think the situation in regard to the details of the tariff was not thoroughly understood.

Mr. KEMP. What is the date of the letter addressed to the Colonial Office ?

Mr. FISHER. It was dated June 7th,inst.

Mr. OSLER. I gather from what the minister says that it is likely these negotiations going on now will eventually result in Canada having equal trading privileges with Japan with those now enjoyed by the United States ?

Mr. FISHER. I think so. That is our object in taking this step ; and I have confidence, from what I know of the feeling of the Japanese government, that they will meet us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand, the period within which any colony of the empire might assent to this treaty was extended for a year. I have read that in the sessional papers of 1897.

Mr. FISHER. That had escaped my observation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In order to have a complete record, I will read from the sessional papers of 1897 to which I have referred :

A treaty of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Japan was signed at London, July 16th, 1894, the ratifications whereof were exchanged at Tokio, August 25th, 1894. A supplementary convention between the two countries was signed at Tokio on the 16th July, 1895, and ratifications were exchanged at the same place November 21st, 1895. Article 19 of the treaty provides that the Dominion of Canada might come within the operations thereof, providing that notice to that effect shall have been given to the Japanese government by Her Majesty's representative at Tokio within two years from the date of the exchange of ratifications. Subsequently notes were exchanged between the two governments extending the time for one year from that date.

Upon reports of a committee of the Honourable the Privy Council, approved by His Excellency the Governor General, bearing date the 13th of October, 1896, the 22nd of December, 1896, and the 23rd of January, 1897, the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies was advised that it was not considered expedient that Canada should take advantage of the provisions of article 19, or become a party to the treaty in question.

That, as I understand from the minister, was owing to the fact that the details of the tariff were not well understood at that time. Perhaps it would be of advantage, if these communications are not already before the House, to bring them down at some convenient time. I am not sure whether I gathered correctly from the minister (Mr. Fisher) that so far as Canada is concerned we would be exactly in the same position as the United States—that is we could take advantage of this treaty without offering any special tariff concessions in return. I was absent for a moment or two while the minister was speaking and am not sure that I followed exactly what he said concerning the opportunities which might be given to Canada to take advantage of the treaty now. Will the hon. gentleman state that again ?

Mr. FISHER. First, in regard to the treaty : My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has mentioned the United States. Of course, if we adhere to the British treaty, we shall be bound entirely by the British treaty, and that does not involve any change except in regard to the tariff of Japan herself ; and therefore there will be no change in our tariff as respects Japanese goods. In regard to the opportunity for adhering now

to the treaty, I may say that, when in Japan I discussed these matters with the government there. Of course the discussion was entirely informal, as it is a matter with which the Foreign Office of Britain must deal. But I was assured by the government in Japan that if, at any time, Canada wished to give her adherence to the treaty they would be very willing to overlook the fact that the term expressed in the treaty had expired.

Mr. FOSTER. How long ago was that ?

Mr. FISHER. A little over two years ago. I have no doubt in my own mind, owing to information from various sources, that the same feeling actuates the government there at this time.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood the minister to say there would be no objection to bring down the Order in Council to which reference has been made ?

Mr. FISHER No.

Mr. OSLER. This is one of the most important commercial questions before Canada to-day. The market of Japan, I believe, is the best market we can hope to gain—and a growing market too. We have the shipping facilities unexcelled by any country. I heard incidentally the other day that some gentlemen from Japan visiting Canada —I do not know whether for the purpose or not—purchased some high grade Jersey cattle to take over to Japan ; and are satisfied that they are the best cattle to take, and expressed surprise that they had not earlier known that Canada was raising for sale that class of cattle. This would indicate a want of enterprise on the part of Canada. If this is the case in regard to our cattle, surely the advertising that Canada has been doing in other parts of the world as to our products has not been done in Japan.

Mr. FISHER. I heartily agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has said as to the value of the Japanese market to Canada. But what he said with regard to the Japanese gentlemen to whom he has referred is not quite correct. Two gentlemen came from Japan to this continent to purchase cattle. They first directed their attention to the United States ; but, in consequence of what they had seen of the Canadian exhibit at Osaka two years ago, they thought they would not return to Japan until they had visited Canada and found what could be done here. They came here, and put themselves in communication with my department, with the result that they purchased over twenty head. These gentlemen expressed regret that they had not come first to Canada instead of going first to the United States.

Mr. FOSTER. Were there any particular reasons which led the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) to delay action in the matter from the time, two years ago, when he learned of the significance of the treaty and of the good will of Japan to our adherence thereto until now ?

Mr. FISHER. Simply that the matter was before the government and was not acted upon.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to a promise he made when acting as Minister of Labour. He promised to lay on the table certain correspondence relating to complaints made against the Père Marquette Railway Company. I would like to know when that correspondence will be brought down.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not received the papers from the deputy. I have not seen him within a day or two, but will communicate with him and get them.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. The hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) is not present and I was not here yesterday when he drew the attention of the House to a statement said to have been made by myself. It is not a very important matter, but might just as well be made clear. In the unrevised 'Hansard,' I am reported as having made the statement that the hon. member (Mr. Bole) has brought down with him from Winnipeg certain statements and correspondence and an assignment of Mr. Chaffee's claims. I did not say that, although the unrevised 'Hansard' would be sufficient warrant for the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) to think I had. The full stop was left out and also some words. What I meant to say was that Mr. Bole was in Winnipeg that time. I then preceeded to say that shortly afterwards the papers brought down show an assignment from Mr. Chaffee to McDonald & Co. That makes all the difference in the world in the statement, but the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) was fully justified in calling attention to it from what appeared in the unrevised 'Hansard.'

TRANSCONTINENTAL COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have the government made any appointment to the vacancy on the board of the Transcontinental Commission ? I make the inquiry now because of the statement in the government press that a selection has been or is being made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No appointment, Mr. Speaker, has been made.

PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT IN THE NORTHWEST TERRITORIES.

House in committee on Bill (No. 69) to establish and provide for the government of

the province of Alberta.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

On section 12—distribution of seats.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The wording of this clause would seem to indicate that in its original drafting it was proposed to entrust the delimitation of these ridings or divisions to some other body than parliament—some independent body. I call the attention of the right hon. gentleman to the wording of the section. Those words have no office or meaning in the section as it stands at present, but they would have an office and meaning if they were part of a section which entrusted delimitation of the ridings to some independent body, as seems to have been contemplated in the first instance. I am not concerned at the moment with the question which has been considerably debated in this committee, namely, as to whether or not there is discrimination between the northern part of the province of Alberta and the southern portion. The first question to be considered is the question whether or not this parliament has before it the necessary material for the purpose of making that division. The right hon. gentleman and his colleagues in 1899, as has already been pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side, thought that where certain counties in Ontario had to be divided into a certain number of ridings, the reasonable and proper course would be to entrust the division to an independent commission. The provisions of the Bill, which was brought down to the House at that time, have already been referred to, but it is not out of place perhaps that I should refer to them again. The Bill which was introduced into this House, by the Frst Minister, in 1899, provided that the counties of Brant, Elgin, Kent, Lambton, North Ontario, Oxford, Perth, should each be divided into two electoral districts each of which shall return one member and the counties of Huron, Bruce, Grey, Middlesex, Simcoe, Wellington and York should each be divided into three electoral districts, each of which shall return one member, and the second section was as follows:—

> Where, under the foregoing provisions, any county or city is to be divided into more than one electoral district, such division shall be made by a board of commissioners, consisting of at least three persons, being judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario, who, for that purpose, shall be appointed by letters patent under the great seal, and who shall divide each such county or city into the number of electoral districts which this Act assigned to it.

Very cogent reasons and arguments were adduced by the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues and supporters on that occasion in favour of the principle thus embodied in that Bill; and if that principle was a good one to be acted upon at that time, there is tenfold more reason for adhering to that policy and principle in the present circumstances. I am not quite sure, after having read the debate upon this clause with some considerable care, that I yet fully appreciate the principle upon which the government does profess to act. The eventual basis must, I suppose, be the basis of population, and regard must be had, in the eastern part of Canada at least, to local divisions.

So far as the west is concerned we are not very much troubled by the consideration of local divisions, because there are not in the western part of Canada municipalities, there is no division into counties, no such divisions as those to which the Prime Minister attached importance when he brought down the Bill for redistribution in 1903. With all due regard to local divisions, and to natural boundaries, wherever they exist, the basis must be a basis of population. When you attempt to proceed upon a basis of population in making this distribution what are you to look to? The conditions in this province and in the province of Saskatchewan as well are absolutely different from those which prevailed in the province of Ontario at that time, but the difference is one which forcibly accentuates, in my opinion, the necessity of having these boundaries delimited by some tribunal which can make a proper investigation for that purpose. In Ontario you had not an enormous movement of population, you had not a tremendous immigration coming into the country and disturbing that basis which was afforded by the census of 1901. I have understood from the remarks of the Prime Minister on this question that we are to some extent to proceed upon the basis of population as ascertained by the census of 1901. It must be obvious to the right hon. gentleman, as well as to every member in the House that that basis is an absolutely insufficient basis. It is a basis which is not acted upon in any other part of this Bill, it is a basis which is not acted upon, and cannot be acted upon, when we proceed to make a per capita allowance to the two provinces. The census of 1901 assigned to the province of Alberta a population in the vicinity of 70,000 souls. The basis upon which the government is proceeding to-day, in dealing with that province, assigns to it a population of not less than 250,000 souls. Looking at all available material which is before the committee as to population we must at once conclude that there are no such material as existed in the case of the province of Ontario to which I have alluded. Even in that case it was thought right by the Prime Minister and his colleagues not to interfere by delimiting the ridings in this parliament, but to entrust the duty of dividing the counties to an absolutely independent body which should proceed upon certain principles mentioned in the Bill to which I have referred. It has been said that

we have the material before us; I would like to know where that material exists. It is obvious that it does not exist in the information afforded by the census of 1901. It seems to me that we can dismiss that at once. The census of 1901 is not acted upon in this Bill for any other purpose and it is absolutely clear that it does not afford us an adequate basis upon which to proceed in the delimitation at the present time. It goes without saying, that a census which showed in this province a population of only 70,000 souls is not a sufficient or safe guide when we are proposing to divide the provinces into constituencies upon the basis of a population of 25,000 souls.

It has been said by the right hon. gentleman, or some of his colleagues, that we have before us certain other information. We have before us the lists of voters upon which the general election of 1903 was conducted. We have before us the lists giving the number of persons who voted at the different polling booths on the 3rd of November last. I am still not much concerned with the question of discrimination between the north and the south, but I venture to submit to the right hon. gentleman that if he is proceeding upon either one or other of these bases the schedule which he has submitted to the House does not commend itself to us as having been very carefully prepared. We have no difficulty with these local municipal divisions about which there has been so much discussion in connection with the redistribution of Ontario. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) seems to base his argument largely on the list of those who have voted. If I look at that list I find the arrangement of constituencies quite as unsatisfactory as the list of electors for the different ridings now proposed to be created. Having had some acquaintance with this subject in the session of 1903, when I acted upon a committee to which was entrusted the duty of reporting the distributing of ridings in all parts of Canada, where the distribution was a matter of dispute, I never heard in the committee any suggestion that we should proceed upon the basis of those who have voted in any particular riding. We proceeded always upon the basis of population, and I think it must be apparent to the right hon. gentleman that a list of electors in the riding must be a much better guide to the actual population in the riding than a list of persons who have voted. He has only to consider that for one moment to see the force of that suggestion. The list of voters for each polling division was prepared by officers of the present administration. There cannot be any suggestion of any partisanship against the interests of the administration or against the administration of the Prime Minister's political friends. I do not suggest that there is any partisanship against the interest of those on this side of the House. I must regard these lists for the present as fair and proper lists made up for the purpose of that election. Are you to take the guide thus afforded, or are you to take the guide afforded by the persons who actually voted? The weather, the many avocations which engage the population, the thoroughness of organization, the activity or popularity of the candidates, the interest taken in the issue at any juncture, a hundred other things which one might mention interfere in the different ridings with the percentage of those who come out to vote. The list made for the purpose of the election is supposed to contain, and we must assume it does contain, the names of all persons who have the right to vote at the election, but the list of those who actually voted contains no such guide, for the very good reasons I have mentioned. The suggestion I make is very well borne out by the results, because in some ridings we find that from 75 to 80 or 85 per cent of the electors voted, while in other ridings, for reasons which have been stated, 55, 60 or 65 per cent only of the electors came forward for the purpose of depositing their ballots. But even assuming that either one or the other of these lists would afford a fair guide to the administration in delimiting the ridings which have been placed before the House in this schedule, I must confess that I cannot understand the principles upon which the government has delimited these different constituencies. Beginning with the list, look at the ridings proposed to be constituted according to the number of voters who actually deposited their ballots in November last. I will take them in their numerical order and not according to district or to area. We find the following results :

Constituency.	Votes polled in November last.
Stony Plain	584
Red Deer	608
Cardston	621
Vermilion	632
Leduc	676
Macleod	715
St. Albert	740
Rosebud	749
Banff	750
Sturgeon	772
Gleichen	774
Lacombe	778
Ponoka	794
Wetaskiwin	834
Lethbridge	858
Strathcona	872
Innisfail	896
High River	971
Medicine Hat	1,168
Pincher	1,147
Saskatchewan	1,237
Edmonton	1,340
Calgary	2,042

Well, there does not seem to have been a great deal of care taken to distribute these ridings according to population, because we begin in Stony Plain with 584 electors who

voted in November last, and we end in Calgary with 2,052 electors who voted in the same election, showing a limit of 300 per cent instead of 10 per cent, which I believe has been allowed in the recent instructions from the Colonial Secretary to the commissioners for delimiting the electoral divisions in the Transvaal. If you take the number of electors on the list, you find the same extraordinary discrepancies :

Constituency.	Voters on the list.
Stony Plain	748
Cardston	851
St. Albert	960
Banff	1,017
Vermilion	1,068
Ponoka	1,068
Leduc	1,068
Red Deer	1,095
Sturgeon	1,098
Macleod	1,121
Lacombe	1,182
Rosebud	1,189
Lethbridge	1,236
Gleichen	1,260
Strathcona	1,291
Innisfail	1,325
Wetaskiwin	1,416
High River	1,528
Medicine Hat	1,650
Pincher	1,678
Edmonton	1,689
Saskatchewan	1,757
Calgary	2,682

You see practically the same discrepancy, running from Stony Plain with 748 electors on the list to Calgary with 2,682 electors on the list. There is every variation of population between the lowest and the highest, there does seem to be no principle based on population, to which you can attribute the preparation of these ridings. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman will do me the kindness to state now how it is that we have these extraordinary discrepancies upon the list which I have before me ; and as to the figures, there is not any great dispute between the hon. members on this side of the House and those on that side of the House. Now that is the situation as it strikes me at present. In dealing with these constituencies it seems to me that we ought to have regard, in the first place, as I said before, to this prime question : Can we possibly have in this committee the information which is necessary to make a fair and just distribution of the ridings in these two provinces ? I do not think so. I have read the debates with a great deal of care, and I do not think that this House possesses any such information as should be before us for that purpose. The very circumstance that hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, acting I have no doubt in both cases with the utmost good faith, arrived at such different and irreconcilable conclusions, seems to me a strong reason for suggesting to the Prime Minister that some independent tribunal, with the same means of investigation as those which he proposed to confer upon the commission in 1899 should be appointed for delimiting these constituencies. In the next place, and for the sake of argument only, for what reason is it that you are acting upon either the one or the other of these lists showing the extraordinary discrepancies in the population of the different ridings as disclosed by the lists which I have just read to the committee ?—and I will hand a copy of these to the right hon. gentleman for the purpose of information, if these discrepancies have not already impressed themselves upon his attention. We ought to conclude that this division can be much better done by an independent body having the means of investigation which I have referred to ; and if the government does not adopt that very reasonable principle, that very fair conclusion, then it seems to me that some principle should be stated which would be applicable both to the province of Alberta and to the province of Saskatchewan, and upon which the government can show that they have acted in delimiting the ridings which are contained in the schedules to both Acts. Now I understand that the principle which has been stated from the other side of the House with regard to the province of Alberta produces the most extraordinary results when applied to the province of Saskatchewan, as was set forth in the speech of my hon. friend from Qp'Appelle (Mr. Lake). It does not seem that the principle which was put forward and which was illustrated by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle can really be the principle upon which the government has proceeded. It has been suggested that the ridings have been delimited, and that a principle is now sought for the purpose of supporting that division. I do not suggest this, but if any such course has been pursued, it is obviously not a proper and fair course. Some principle should be adopted, and a very proper principle I think is to adopt a principle and have it carried out, a commission of judges or to a commission of independent and trustworthy persons. If that principle is not adopted, then surely it lies with the government to show the principle upon which they have acted and to apply that principle without fear or favour, not only to the province of Alberta, but to the province of Saskatchewan as well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not propose on this Bill to discuss in any way the schedules which have been submitted to my hon. friend with regard to the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is simply the principle.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The principle is the same in both cases. I will come to that presently, but I do not think it will be consistent with the rules of debate or at all conducive to any good result that we should

mix the two things together. Let us stick to what we have in hand; that is to say, to the principles and the schedules in regard to the province of Alberta. My hon. friend has suggested, that, according to the language of section 12, it was not contemplated that the schedules of this Bill should be settled at this table. I have no hesitation in saying to my hon. friend that in my own mind I thought that these schedules should not be settled at this table. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott), has stated my opinion in regard to that. I have taken that position all along in the debate. The discussions which took place between myself and my colleagues and the representatives of the Northwest legislature were confidential, and I shall not disclose them, but at all events the statement has been made by my hon. friend from West Assiniboia that it was my intention to have these schedules confirmed in the same manner as the schedules were confirmed at the time of the last Dominion redistribution; that is by a conference of members from both sides of the House. This view did not commend itself to the judgment of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House and therefore we had to proceed as we are now proceeding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is entire news to me. I never heard of any such suggestion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think my hon. friend heard of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose I ought to have heard of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia stated that the matter was one which concerned more the members of the Northwest Territories, and he made the offer, I understand, that the schedules should be prepared by hon. members on both sides of the House from the Northwest. There was some misunderstanding with them. But, that was my intention.

Mr. LAKE. As I stated yesterday, that offer was never made to me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not going to discuss what was done. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia has stated at all events what was my intention. If for one reason or the other it did not meet with approval that was my intention, but it has not been done and therefore we had to resort to the course of proceeding as we are now proceeding, or we had to resort to the course suggested by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition just now, or rather proposed in the motion of the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy), that we should refer the whole matter to a commission composed of judges.

Mr. FOSTER. Will my right hon. friend excuse me? He states to the committee that it was his intention that there should be a conference of members from both sides of the House to settle this matter. The committee has been entirely in the dark as to whether that was the intention or not up to this moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. What method did he take to apprise the opposition that in his mind the proper way to proceed was to have a conference of members from both sides of the House? The only thing that has occurred heretofore has been a statement by a member of the opposition side of the House that such a proposition was made by Northwest members supporting the government to Northwest members who were in opposition. Now we have a Northwest member rising in his place in the House and denying that any such proposition was made to him.

Mr. SCOTT. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) permit me to say that we were told at the conference to which reference has been made by the premier of the Northwest Territories that he had been asked by the Prime Minister to get an agreement first about the boundary line between the provinces and next about the number of constituencies which should be apportioned to each province, and also to furnish the Prime Minister with the schedules for each province. The premier of the Territories, Mr. Haultain, came to the conference and suggested that we should help him in furnishing these schedules and help him to come to the conclusions that he might give to the government in regard to these matters.

Mr. FOSTER. That is now a new version. Now we come down to the point that the proposition was not made to the members from the Northwest on this side of the House, but that the proposition was made in some way to Mr. Haultain, but it was not in the mind of the right hon. Prime Minister, as he told us here, that there should be a conference between Mr. Haultain and somebody else to fix this up. There was to be no conference consonant with his idea between the members in this House on both sides. What had Mr. Haultain to do in so far as a conference between members representing the government and opposition in this House was concerned? Nothing at all. The statement made the other day by my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Scott) and the statement he made to-day are not consistent with each other, and both of them flatly deny what the right hon. Prime Minister has said that he had in his mind, and what hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House declare is an absolute fact. The right hon. Prime Minister is the important man on that side of the House. If he had an idea of actually holding it, he placed himself in the position of taking no certain step to apprise the opposition of the fact that he had that idea and that he thought it would be right that it should prevail. Then, having done nothing and having brought the matter to this pass, he now gives as an excuse for the present basis and the present proceeding that

there was no acceptation of what he had in his mind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not intend to convey the idea that I thought that this matter should be settled between the opposition and the government sitting as we are now at this table, but I thought this was a matter which might well be settled by the members who were representing the North-west Territories. I am sorry it was not done in that way. If it were not done in that way we might have done it in one of two other ways. One way was to refer it to a commission of judges as the hon. leader of the opposition and the hon. member for Calgary have proposed. My hon. friend has referred to the precedent, as he calls it, of the Bill of 1899. The Bill of 1899 was introduced for a specific object only and for nothing else ; that is to say, to rectify certain things which the party on this side of the House thought had been done injuriously to them. It was proposed that certain counties should be divided and others united and the Bill proposed that when there was to be a division of a county into two or more ridings the work should be done by a commission, but at no time was it the policy of the party to which I belong that we should entrust the work of preparing the constituencies in this House, because we had only to deal with this House, to a commission of judges. We thought that, on the contrary, we should deal with that matter in accordance with British precedent and that we should have the work done by the House itself and not delegated to any judiciary authority. My hon. friend stated to the House that according to British precedent this work should be referred to judges, but I beg to say that in this matter he is in error. At no time in Great Britain, as far as my information goes, and I think upon this point it is absolutely accurate, and under no circumstances in Great Britain has the work of distribution of seats in the House of Commons been referred to a commission of judges. The work has been done in every instance by the House itself reserving only the mechanical work of tracing upon the ground and putting on the maps the respective divisions to which the House has agreed, not to a commission of judges, but to a special board. That was what was done in 1884 and I understand it is what has been done subsequently. Prior to 1884 this work of redistribution had always been done more or less arbitrarily, but in 1884, when the Act of Representation was introduced by Mr. Gladstone, which was largely to add to the electorate and which was to extend the franchise chiefly in cities, the opposition, led by Lord Salisbury, would not agree to the Act unless they knew beforehand what distribution should be made in consequence of it. Mr. Gladstone agreed to the suggestion. The question was one which was not without some difficulties. As the franchise was to be largely extended, chiefly in the boroughs, and as the representation would be larger in the boroughs than in the counties, the question was to have a fair distribution in consequence. I gather from the debates that the Conservative party were afraid that if the basis of the suffrage were largely extended, and if there was a large acquisition of votes upon the lists, the boroughs might go against the Conservatives to the prejudice of the representation of the counties in which their strength lay. The chief object was to have a fair distribution, before even agreeing to the principle of the extension of the suffrage. Mr. Gladstone agreed to that, and the principles were laid down and discussed at a conference between representatives of both political parties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Were not these principles embodied in a commission issued to judges ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. The commission was entrusted to a board of commissioners, the names of whom I will quote from the record. I read from the speech of Mr. Gladstone, English 'Hansard,' volume 294 :

> The best thing I can say is that a commission has been appointed for the purpose. The division of the boroughs and the fixing of the county districts will be under a commission which has been appointed, and perhaps I might not do ill —since, after all, confidence in the commission is a very important matter—if I ventured to read the names of the commissioners to the House. For England the names are Sir John Lambert, Mr. Pelham, barrister-at-law, Sir Francis Sanford, Mr. Joseph John Henley, the son of a former well-known member of this House, Colonel Owen Jones, and Major Hector Tulloch.

I have here the instructions that were given to the commissioners, and it will be found that the work of the commission was largely to be the mechanical laying out of the boundaries upon the ground. They had to divide counties and boroughs ; and in England, where the population is thick, where the divisions are ill-defined and where the boundaries are sometimes the result, not of law, but of custom, the difficulty was to distribute the population so as to give a fair proportion as between boroughs and counties and between boroughs and boroughs and at the same time not to interfere too radically with existing conditions. I have here the instructions which were given to the commissioners, and I have the report made by these commissioners. The report is signed by the gentlemen whose names I have given, and it is prefaced with the instruction from which I quote:

> The duties of the commissioners will be the following :
>
> 1. With respect to counties.
>
> In the first place to examine the survey maps of the Ordnance Department, and determine from them and other documents in the possession of that department and of the local government board and from other available information, the boundaries to be assigned to the several divisions of each county to be divided. In

forming the divisions care must be taken in all those cases where there are populous localities of an urban character to include them in one and the same division, unless this cannot be done without producing grave inconvenience, and involving boundaries of a very irregular and objectionable character.

Subject to this important rule, each division should be as compact as possible with respect to geographical position, and should be based upon well-known existing areas, such as petty sessional divisions, or other areas consisting of an aggregate of parishes. In some instances, however, it may be found necessary to include separate parishes, but a divisional boundary should not intersect a parish.

Each division will be named from some important town or place within it, preference being given to any merged borough or boroughs, when it consists wholly or mainly of some well-known area, from that area.

When the divisions have thus been provisionally determined, public notice must be given of their contents by advertisement in one or more local newspapers, and day and place appointed for the attendance of one of the members of the commission or an assistant commissioner at some principal town in the county to hear any objections to the proposed constitution of the divisions and receive proposals for their alteration. It will be convenient that the substance of such objection and proposals should be handed in to the commissioner or assistant commissioner in writing.

2. With respect to boroughs.

The duties of the commission will be, in cases where the question of an alteration of boundary arises, to ascertain whether the present boundaries or those indicated by the Bill embrace the whole of the population which ought to be included within the borough. The commissioner will, therefore, previous to making any recommendations, take the necessary steps for satisfying themselves whether or not there are any considerable number of houses beyond the boundaries but contiguous thereto, the occupiers of which, either from community of interests with the borough or from other circumstances, form part of the town population proper. Where, however, the adjoining areas consist of large and populous urban districts it will often be found desirable, especially in those cases where otherwise it would be necessary to intersect the districts, that they should be left to form county divisions instead of being absorbed into the borough.

In every case where the boundaries of a borough are proposed to be altered, whether by extension or otherwise, the alteration should, if possible, be consistent with well established limits, such as parochial or other similar boundaries.

Where the divisions of the boroughs which are to be divided have been provisionally determined, the proceedings will be similar to those in the case of counties.

3. In dealing both with county and borough divisions, the boundaries of the divisions must be adjusted so that the population, excluding in the case of the county divisions that of the parliamentary boroughs, may be proximately equalized and in the arrangement of the divisions special regard should be had to the pursuits of the population. If the county voters having qualifications in a parliamentary borough within a county division are numerous, some regard may properly be had to their number in determining the population to be embraced in that division.

As between counties and boroughs, the boundaries must, when the divisions are formed, be in conformity with existing boundaries except so far as these are altered by schedule 5 of the Bill, and where it appears to the commission, from information obtained in the course of their inquiry, that an alteration of existing borough boundaries is desirable, a description of the alteration should be embodied in their report.

I wish to cite, not the whole of the proceedings, but the first step which was taken by the commissioners to carry out their instructions; and I read from the report of the commissioners:

Immediately upon our appointment, which was dated the 29th of November last, we entered upon our duties, and shortly afterwards, finding that without additional assistance we should be unable to complete the work entrusted to us before the re-assembling of parliament, we applied for the appointment of three assistant commissioners, and accordingly Major General Phipps Cary, R. E., Captain M. W. Skinner, R.E., and G. Pemberton Leach, Esquire, barrister-at-law, were, with the consent of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, attached to the commission in that capacity.

You see, therefore, that the work entrusted to the commissioners was simply to carry out the intentions of parliament. They were asked to look at old charts and old maps, to find out the grouping of the population and so on, in order to get the best division that could be made. They were to have so many constituencies within a certain area, and to divide so many boroughs and so many counties in order to produce so many electoral divisions. It was found that could not be done by parliament in England, because information was needed which parliament could not possibly ascertain of itself. There are no such difficulties confronting us in the present case as were experienced in England. We have a very sparse population in the Northwest Territories; there are no ranges of mountains to divide population on one side or the other; there are no large rivers, except those which are well known to us; there are not many streams, and therefore we are cognizant of all the conditions which enable us to do the mechanical work which, in England, was entrusted to commissioners. The leader of the opposition asks what principles we have followed in order to arrive at this conclusion. Well, we have endeavoured to be guided by two principles—geographical conditions and population. These are the only two principles which we think should guide us under existing circumstances, and whether we have this matter settled here and now or whether we appoint a commission of judges or of any other body, they will always have to come back in the last resort, to those two guiding principles—geographical position and distribution of population. It is true that the result will never

work out mathematically either in this or in any other distribution. You will always have to depend upon that substratum of justice and fair-play, which, after all, is the best guide in matters of this kind. If you attempt to carry out your purpose by any precise mathematical rule, you must fail; you have to trust to good sense and fair-play in the end.

I wish to refer to two matters to which my hon. friend has called my attention, namely, the population of Stony Plain and the population of Calgary. The hon. gentleman asks: Why do you give a member to Stony Plain when you give only one member to Calgary? Well, Calgary is a city, while Stony Plain is a rural district. I appeal to hon. gentlemen on the other side, I appeal to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), who has sat on the treasury benches when the redistribution was undertaken, that you cannot have the same unit of population for the representation of a city as for the representation of a rural community. Two years ago, when we last had a redistribution measure before this House, a strong appeal was made to us by representatives of urban populations, that they were not treated fairly because the unit of population was not the same for the city as for the rural places. Our unit of population for counties was 25,000, but for Toronto and Montreal we had a very much larger unit. If this principle were not adopted some portions of the rural populations would be left unrepresented. Calgary, for instance, had a population, according to the last census of 4,865. This is a compact population included within, perhaps, two square miles. Stony Plain had a population of 2,938; here is a population of about 3,000 scattered over a territory hundreds of miles in extent. On what principle are you to deal with these two populations if not on the principle we have adopted of considering geographical conditions as well as population?

Mr. AMES. Will the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) allow me to ask him why he argues that Stony Plain with 589 votes cast in the last election should have one member to itself, while Saskatchewan, with about equal area and with 1,168 votes cast in the last election, should have only one member? Or will he tell us why Stony Plain, with 768 votes on the list should have one member, when High River, with 1,786 votes on the list, both rural sections, has only one member?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because of geographical considerations as shown in the map I have before me. It is impossible to make division so as to establish mathematical equality among the voters. No matter what arrangement you make you must do apparent injustice to somebody. How, then, would my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) do it?

Mr. AMES. I would follow the principle adopted in the Transvaal, in New Zealand and in New South Wales—establish a certain quota of representation by voting population, and then leave it to the judges to define the boundaries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But how could the judges proceed in any other way than that in which we have proceeded? I have looked at the laws of the Transvaal on this subject. They provide that every electoral district must have the same population within 10 per cent. I do not know the population of the Transvaal or the conditions of that country, but I feel sure it would not be possible to work out any such system in this country.

Mr. AMES. Does not the Prime Minister think that the conditions of the Transvaal and of New South Wales are very much the same as our own—population very much scattered in some places, and, in others, concentrated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In this country, from the time of confederation, no such rule has been followed; and I do not think it is possible to follow out this fanciful new theory, but we must, to some extent, stick to the old idea, so far as it can be applied with justice. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) contrasts the registered vote of Stony Plain 766 with the registered vote of Saskatchewan, 1,382.

Mr. AMES. Stony Plain and High River.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that High River is a rather thickly peopled portion of the country. But Stony Plain is a remote section, at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and I understand, very sparsely settled. If representation is to be given with even a semblance of justice, these people must be considered in the light of their geographical position.

Mr. AMES. Practically all the population of Stony Plain, I understand, lies in the northeastern portion of it. So far as High River is concerned, why cannot that territory be given two representatives, inasmuch as it has more than double the population and more than double the number of voters that Stony Plain has?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) suggest why High River should have two representatives and none should be given to Stony Plain? Would that be justice?

Mr. AMES. That is not necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then, what will take place if that is not necessary?

Mr. FOSTER. What will take place is that the right hon. gentleman will not have the balance in the north, as he has taken care to have it now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What will take place is that Stony Plain will have to be added to some other large territory, whose representative already would have

too much to do, and, although this section should have a representative it would be denied that advantage.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman a question. I am trying to follow what he says. You have no municipal divisions in Alberta, so far as I know, except the cities. You estimate a certain population based upon the number of voters on the list or on the number who voted, assuming the correctness of that estimate, why is it necessary in applying the unit of population, to have the very great discrepancy shown by the contrast of Stony Plain with 584 votes polled, and Calgary with 2,052 ? Or leave Edmonton and Calgary out for the moment—I will give reasons why I think they should not be left out—and you have Stony Plain with 584, and Saskatchewan with 1,237. Or Stony Plain with 748 on the voters' list and Pincher with 1,678 on the voters' list. In applying the unit of population,—and that was the basis we adopted in 1903—why do you have such extraordinary discrepancies ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Because in Ontario you were dealing with a compact population, whereas in these new Territories you are dealing with a moving and everchanging population, and you have an uneven population distributed over a large amount of territory. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has spoken of the feeling against the proposed distribution and asked why we want to have so many members in the north. For my part I have no sympathy with this miserable—no, Mr. Chairman, I shall not use that expression because I do not want to use any offensive word—but I will say these unfortunate appeals to excite division between the north and south. Have we not already divisions enough in this country—division of race and religion?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But it will not be my fault, if they do exist.

Mr. FOSTER. The right hon. gentleman always deplores what he himself brings about.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall be glad to discuss this subject before the session is over, but do not propose to do so to-day.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say that High River was thickly-peopled because of its proximity to Calgary. But it is not as near Calgary as Stony Plain is to Edmonton at present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why, it is evidently a question, upon the other side, of rivalry between Calgary and Edmonton. But why not discard Calgary and Edmonton in this matter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. That is not the case at all, as I have attempted to show by citations from newspapers published in Macleod, which is eighty miles from Calgary, in Medicine Hat which is 200 miles distant, and in Lethbridge which is 120 miles from Calgary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will not depart from his local prejudices. It is always with him Calgary and Edmonton, in one form or another. It is always a question with him of north or south. If we have spent the last two days or so, and if we are going to spend Heaven knows how many more on this point, it is simply because there is rivalry between Edmonton and Calgary. My hon. friend would not object to having Stony Plain represented if there were not rivalry between Edmonton and Calgary. Surely no one will object to every section of the community being represented here. Wherever there are settlements, no matter how young or how recently settled, wherever there are men who have a right to the suffrage, why should they not be represented in the legislature of the new province?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is objecting ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The gentleman whom my hon. friend represents and my hon. friend himself.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I challenge the right hon. gentleman to point to any word I have spoken which raised any such objection. His statement is most unwarrantable.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend had not that intention, I apologize for attributing it to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not uttered a word which gives the right hon. gentleman the slightest warrant for making that imputation, and he knows it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought my hon. friend spoke of Stony Plain and Calgary a moment ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no use making suggestions which have not the slightest foundation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be the last to impute anything of the kind to my hon. friend and at once accept his statement without any qualification, and absolutely withdraw the imputation. I do not want to impute motives to him. I do not want to charge him with anything of that kind ; but when he takes exception to what I have said, I simply refer him to the fact that the whole discussion we have had has been due simply to the rivalry between Calgary and Edmonton. And I repeat the only objection to Stony Plain having one member and to Athabaska having two is that being nearer Edmonton than Calgary, they will be more likely to vote for Edmon-

ton as the capital rather than Calgary. That is what is at the bottom of the discussion.

Mr. LAKE. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If it be not, then I shall be glad to hear I am in error. But what has been the purport of all this discussion? Why all this discussion between north and south? Why not look at the whole question from the boundary up to the limit of Athabaska rather than to Red Deer north and Red Deer south? If we look at the question on this broad basis, no fault will be found with the divisions. That they are, or can be, mathematical nobody can pretend ; but that they are fair I assert in face of all the contradictions we have had in the last two days. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, said a moment ago that we could not take the census as a sufficient basis. I agree with him. We have not taken the census as the only basis, but we have taken also the recorded vote, the registered vote, the post offices, the school districts, and my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) has given us in addition the business done by the railways, banks and so on, and I think also the customs duties. I do not object to all these things. They are all fair elements for comparison and to be considered in our endeavour to give representation according to population. My hon. friend said a moment ago that in the committee on which he sat two years ago, they were guided by the census of the population. That is true, but what figures did they follow? They followed the census of 1901. in the old provinces of Canada; we can take the census as the basis of population until we have another census, because we know the population will not vary much from one census to another. There will be a small accession from immigration and the natural increase, but nothing to prevent the census being taken as a basis. In these Territories, however, the conditions are quite different. There we cannot take the census alone but have to supplement it by all the information to which I have just alluded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman himself introduced the question of the two capitals and then charges my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) with having done so.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman has not been here the last two days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I want to point out that he was not quite fair. The question was put him with regard to High River, and he referred to its proximity to Calgary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did so because I concluded there must be a large population in High River on account of its being in the vicinity of Calgary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes, he referred to its proximity to Calgary, but when my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) referred to the proximity of Stony Plain to Edmonton, he charged him with raising the question of rivalry. He is not applying the same principle to each case.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is wrong. I said there is a large population at High River because it is in the vicinity of Calgary. My hon. friend from Calgary replied : But Stony Plain is in the vicinity of Edmonton. But, Sir, there is no population in Stony Plain though it is in the vicinity of Edmonton. That has nothing to do with it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think it has, but the right hon. gentleman introduced the illustration and thus gave warrant to my hon. friend from Calgary to refer to Stony Plain. Because if you argue that High River should have a population away above the mark because of its proximity to Calgary, it is equally good reason to say that Stony Plain should have a similar increase of population because it is in the vicinity of Edmonton. If the principle be good in the one case, it should in the other. but my hon. friend dismissed that argument with a smile and an entire disregard of logic very refreshing on a warm day like this.

The right hon. gentleman made a great deal of the point that in England judges were not selected. I was under the impression that judges were selected in Great Britain, but if judges were not selected there, men were selected who had the confidence of both parties. The important part of it is that the delimitation was entrusted to an independent commission, and that was done after an agreement as to the principle had been arrived at by both parties. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says it was his own intention to have pursued that course in this case. I very much regret that although I have been pretty steadily in the House since the 1st of February I have heard nothing until to-day of any such suggestion. I have not heard any such suggestion from the right hon. gentleman himself, as he will admit. I have not heard any such suggestion from my friends on this side of the House from the Northwest Territories, and I am inclined to think if they had been cognizant of any suggestion of the kind they would have imparted it to me. The right hon. gentleman says he regrets that that course has not been carried out. Whose fault is that ? It is his own fault. These matters are arranged by private interview between the right hon. gentleman and myself or some one on this side of the House, usually between the right hon. gentleman and myself, but I have not heard one word from him or from any other person that this was to be arranged by a conference between the

two sides. It seems to me that my right hon. friend cannot be very earnest in his expression of regret that a course has not been adopted which he himself could have carried out, but which he did not take the proper steps to carry out. It is idle to endeavour to throw any onus upon this side of the House when we have not even had the opportunity of considering the acceptance or rejection of any such suggestion. In Great Britain in 1884, a deadlock arose between the two Houses over the Franchise and Representation Bills. To remove this difficulty Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury came to an arrangement whereby the question of redistribution should be submitted to commissioners, the principle upon which the commissioners should act, the instructions to the commissioners having first been arranged by a conference between the two sides. Five commissioners were appointed on the 29th of November 1884, and on the 5th of December they began their preliminary work. Shortly afterwards the judges called in officers of the Royal Artillery, and Royal Engineers, professional men familiar with the work of delimitation, with boundaries, and also called in a leading lawyer as assistant commissioners. After the preliminary divisions had been mapped out, notice was given of an inquiry in each division with a view to obtaining a better division if possible. As a result of that inquiry much additional valuable information was obtained, and the commissioners were able to make many improvements in the preliminary boundaries. This took place even in a country so thickly populated and so well known as Great Britain, in England, Scotland and Ireland, and the right hon. gentleman stood by that principle in 1899. Whether or not the measure which he introduced then was a measure for a complete redistribution, or whether, as he says, it was a measure to correct wrongs in the redistribution previously made, is immaterial; the right hon. gentleman then stood upon the principle and I quote his language:

> The principle which we want to lay down and which we act upon is this, that whenever a county has to be divided into ridings, whenever a county which up to that time is entitled to only one member, becomes entitled to two or three members, the division should take place by judicial decision and authority.

That is the principle upon which the right hon. gentleman stood then, and I repeat once more, it is not only a principle which is absolutely applicable to the delimitation of ridings in these new provinces, but it is one which is tenfold more necessary in those new provinces than it was in Ontario when the right hon. gentleman laid down that principle. That is obvious, I think, to any hon. gentleman who gives the matter the slightest consideration or attention, and the only excuse for not adopting that course to-day as in 1899 is that we on this side of the House did not accept an offer which was never made. That is the only excuse up to the present. Further, he has not given the slightest answer to the question I asked him a few moments ago. I asked him how it was that the voting strength in these different ridings varied so remarkably, and the only answer he has made to me is that Stony Plain is a rural constituency and Calgary a city constituency. In the first place the principle of giving less representation to a city constituency has never been applied to cities of the size of Edmonton and Calgary; certainly no such principle as that was acted upon in the redistribution of Ontario in 1903, and I challenge my right hon. friend to point to one instance in Ontario where any such principle was acted upon. It was applied to Toronto and Montreal, I do not remember that it was applied to any other cities although it may possibly have been taken into consideration with regard to Hamilton or Ottawa, but certainly in no cities of less size and importance than those to which I have just referred. Therefore it seems to me we can put aside at once any suggestion of that kind We then acted upon the basis of population; we are acting upon the basis of population to-day according to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and we have 584 who voted in Stony Plain, and 2,052 in Calgary. But we shall leave that aside. We have 608 in Red Deer and 1,168 in Medicine Hat. Are there any natural divisions? Are there any local conditions? Are there any municipal divisions which make it necessary that there should be such a discrepancy? Taking the electoral lists we find for Stony Plains, 748 and for Calgary, 2,682. Omit Calgary if you please, and we have Stony Plains with 748 and Pincher Creek with 1,678. The right hon. gentleman, when we draw this discrepancy to his attention, suggests that we desire to deprive Stony Plains of representation. We desire nothing of the kind. We desire to have some principle whereby the electors of Stony Plain will have just the same voice and representation in parliament as those in Pincher Creek and I do not know that there is any reason why they should have more. There is a reasonable allowance to be made. That allowance has been fixed at 10 per cent in the case of the Transvaal. I do not know any reason why you should depart from that principle. I do not know why you should have Stony Plain with 748 and Pincher Creek with 1,678, an allowance of more than 100 per cent instead of 10 per cent as in the Transvaal. The right hon. gentleman has no answer to this except the suggestion that a rural voter should have more voice than a city voter. The constituency of Pincher Creek is not a city constituency, yet 1,678 electors in that proposed riding have no more voice than 748 in the constituency of Stony Plain. Does not the right hon. gentleman think there is some further answer

required than that which he has given ? If there are any reasons on account of natural boundaries, on account of local conditions, or on account of anything else which have led the government to make up this extraordinary schedule, let us hear what they are, but surely the hon. gentleman is not going to content himself with simply placing Stony Plain on one side and Calgary on the other and omitting the other 23 constituencies designated by the schedule. I venture to think the right hon. gentleman is altogether departing from the principle he laid down in 1899 and doing so without any good reason.

My right hon. friend must have well known that I never had the slightest knowledge or intimation of any intention on the part of the government that there should be any such conference between the two sides as that which he has referred to to-day. He has admitted frankly that it was not the intention of the government, in the first instance, to proceed along the present lines ; he has admitted that it was the intention of the government to proceed along the lines of a conference between the two sides of the House, adopting the British principle, and if he had followed out that principle to its legitimate conclusion he would have left its application to some independent tribunal. The right hon. gentleman has abandoned both; he has abandoned, in the first place, the suggestion of a conference, which was his own idea, as he admits. For what reason has that been abandoned ? My hon. friend has given no explanation of that. For what reason was the intention of a conference, admitted by the right hon. gentleman, abandoned ? Whose fault is it ? It is certainly not the fault of any one on this side of the House, because we never heard anything of it before. It was a very fair intention, it was one in which we acquiesced in 1903; although we at that time thought it should go further, and that there should be a commission of independent men to delimit the constituencies. But there was a conference of the two sides of the House by means of a committee, and our deliberations, the right hon. gentleman well remembers, were carried on informally in order that we might ascertain whether we could not, in that informal and private way, come to a conclusion as to some matters respecting which we were likely to differ in opinion. We were not altogether satisfied with the conclusion of the conference on that occasion ; some alterations were made by the right hon. gentleman after the committee had reported. But still that was an infinitely fairer method than the one which is presented to the House by the right hon. gentleman on this occasion ; and I trust he will see his way clear to revert to his first good intention and to deal with this matter somewhat differently from the method which he now seeks to impose upon this side of the House. He spoke of this question the other day as one of higher politics. A principle of higher politics should not be varied as this is being varied, simply because the right hon. gentleman concludes that there has been some misunderstanding between members on both sides of the House from the west. I was entitled, I think, if the right hon. gentleman had any intention of that kind, to know something about it. If he had brought it to my attention, probably he would have saved a good deal of debate, a good deal of delay and discussion with regard to this matter. But inasmuch as he is quite clear now that his intention has not been brought to the minds of those on this side of the House who have dealt with the matter, I ask him whether he does not think it would be fair to deal with it in that way at the present time, and to see whether we cannot come to some conclusion as to the schedules which will be a little more in consonance with what we on this side of the House believe to be justice and fair-play to all concerned?

Mr. OLIVER. The leader of the opposition is certainly doing his humble best to create dissatisfaction in the minds of the people of Alberta. I do not know that he will be successful, because, after two or three days engaged in threshing this case out in parliament, he and his friends have certainly failed to establish a case.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What part of my remarks were intended to excite dissatisfaction ?

Mr. OLIVER. The whole of them, as I understood them, by trying to create a grievance where no grievance exists, and where none has yet been shown. My hon. friend has laid some stress on the assertion he makes that there was no attempt at a conference with regard to this question. Had he been here last night, or had he read the proceedings of last night in the 'Hansard,' he would have seen that there was a direct statement made by three members on this side of the House that there was a conference held in which the question of the division between the two districts was discussed, and during which, according to the statement of the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), other questions in that connection were discussed ; and that the conference was not continued because it was evident from the results of the meeting that there was no use in continuing it. There was no refusal on the part of members of this side to go on, but there was an absence of willingness on the part of members on the other side of the House when it was desired to go on.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the hon. gentleman referring to ?

Mr. OLIVER. I say there was a meeting held at which the hon. member for Alberta

was present and at which I was present. Does he deny it ? Is the hon. gentleman contradicting what I say ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I merely wish to say, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OLIVER. I have the floor. If the hon. gentleman wishes to make a contradiction let him make it, and I will sit down ; but I will not sit down to let him make a speech.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I simply desire to ask a question.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of the Interior take the ground that when a gentleman rises on the other side of the House and asks leave to ask him a question which has to do with an emphatic statement made by the minister, and which is denied on the other side, that he is going to stand on his rights and not allow it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I mean to say that when I make an emphatic statement, if the hon. gentleman has any denial to make, I will sit down and let him make it.

Mr. INGRAM. My hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) asked the hon. gentleman for an explanation.

Mr. OLIVER. I asked him to deny my statement if he could. I stated that there was a meeting at which were present the hon. member for Saskatchewan (Mr. Lamont), the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) and the hon. member for Alberta (Mr. Herron), at which the question of the division between the two districts was discussed, along with other questions in that connection, as stated by the hon. member for Alberta last night. Now, does he deny that ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Does he mean the division between the two provinces ?

Mr. OLIVER. Between the two provinces.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Well, so far as that goes, the minister is correct.

Mr. OLIVER. Thank you. I have only to say that when the hon. leader of the opposition rung the changes on the alleged fact that there was no conference——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not referring to a conference about the boundaries between the two provinces, I was talking of a conference respecting the delimitation of the ridings.

Mr. OLIVER. He was denying that there was a conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman surely knew what I was referring to, and what I expressly stated. There was no conference, so far as I am aware, certainly not with myself, respecting the delimitation of the ridings in either of the two provinces. That is what I said.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman is certainly depending upon his legal ability.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not, I am depending upon the truth.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a question as to whether there was a conference in regard to the delimitation of the constituencies. We say that there was a conference called for that purpose, and when that conference met, the first duty was necessarily to decide as to the boundaries between the two provinces ; and we found, during the conference, that we could not come to an agreement even on that point, nor on other points that were brought up at the conference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the delimitation of the boundary brought up ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe it was brought up. The evidence on that point is the statement of my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). I did not bring it up. I was not a party to the discussion in regard to it.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did the hon. gentleman hear it brought up ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say I did, but I do say most emphatically that the conference was held with the view of discussing the delimitation of the constituencies once we had decided upon the delimitation of the boundaries of the province.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether the gentlemen who were invited to attend the conference were told of that. I certainly was invited to attend but I was not told that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the hon. member was told ; I only know what I was told.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When the hon. minister uses the expression 'with the view to' he is rather ambiguous. It may have been 'with the view to' in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, but that is of no importance unless they communicated to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that that was their design.

Mr. OLIVER. The main point is that we, on both sides of the House, did come together amicably in regard to the preliminary feature of this question, and if the discussion was not carried further the fault was not with those of us who believed the conference was for the purpose of securing an amicable delimitation of the boundaries of the constituencies, and who were present on future occasions expecting to meet our friends on the other side, but who, as I said, were not there. I cannot answer for the reason why they were not there, but I say that the insinuation that there was any desire on our part to avoid a conference is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. LALOR. You say you cannot understand why they were not there. Were they invited to be there ? I would like you to answer that.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether they were invited to be there or not ; I know they were not there.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. We did not meet although they certainly had the privilege of being there if they wanted to be.

Mr. LALOR. In what way did the hon. minister give them that privilege ?

Mr. OLIVER. They were invited to the meeting we had and the business of that meeting was not concluded.

Mr. TURRIFF. This meeting was called by Mr. Haultain. I was present at it. The bulk of the discussion was over the boundary line between the two provinces and we could not agree upon that. I remember distinctly that matter of the boundaries of the divisions was discussed, but why it was not continued further or why there were not any further meetings about it I do not know. But, we met there at the call of Mr. Haultain who said that the Prime Minister had asked him to give his views and to give information in reference to the dividing line and also in reference to the number of the constituencies for the two provinces.

Mr. LAKE. Is the hon. gentleman sure it was not as to the number of the constituencies of the two provinces ? I think an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House stated last night that that was the question at issue.

Mr. TURRIFF. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Then, if that is the recollection of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) I think we came pretty close to the question of delimiting the boundaries, if there was a question discussed as to the number of constituencies.

Mr. LAKE. I did not say that of my own knowledge ; I merely said that the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) stated that last night.

Mr. OLIVER. The conference was certainly held for the purpose of discussing this question of the delimitation of the constituencies. The first preliminary which it was necessary to decide was what should be the boundary between the two provinces. The next point was to decide how many constituencies there should be, and certainly the question of the boundary between the provinces was discussed. There is no denial of that. There is no denial that the other question as to the future of the new provinces was discussed, as stated by my hon. friend from Alberta (Mr. Herron) last night. The discussion was not confined to the delimitation of the provinces. As stated by my hon. friend here there was also a question discussed as to the number of the constituencies. In the name of common sense how can we discuss the boundaries of the constituencies until we had decided the boundaries between the provinces and considered how many constituencies there should be ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely that must be evident. But, the point is that the conference was held for that purpose or else there was no purpose in holding it. If it is decided that there was a conference between the two sides of the House, there was no attempt to sidetrack hon. gentlemen opposite or to shirk giving them any information, but on the contrary every effort was made to have a unanimous presentation of the case to the House, and as far as we are concerned if it was not so put before the House the fault is not ours but the fault is that of hon. gentlemen opposite who did not see fit to take part in the discussion. If that matter is disposed of——

Mr. FOSTER. The matter is not satisfactorily disposed of.

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my hon. friend, certainly.

Mr. FOSTER. I would put it to my hon. friend again so that he will see the difficulty. What was the principle that the right hon. leader of the government said he had in the back of his head ? The idea was that representatives of the two sides of this House would come together. That is the only way in which a conference takes place between the government and opposition.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. This was a sort of social meeting.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman deny that such a meeting took place ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. What right has he to trespass, anyway ?

Mr. FOSTER. If such a meeting took place it was a social meeting between gentlemen from the Northwest.

Mr. OLIVER. Does he assert that it was a social meeting ?

Mr. FOSTER. I hope it was not a dissocial meeting ? I do not say that there was anything round the table or anything on the board. Or, shall I say that it was an amicable meeting ? In his present temper probably the word 'amicable' grates upon the hon. minister just like drawing the breath of the southern pine across a Northwest blizzard. But an amicable meeting, we will say, took place between gentlemen from the Northwest Territories, a sort of family

meeting, to discuss certain things one of which it is well known because it is agreed to by all, was the boundary line between the two provinces. The rest of it is in an interminable and unfathomable haze, denied by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House and haltingly affirmed by hon. gentlemen opposite. But the hon. gentleman has not cleared up the question as a minister and member of the government until he shows that something was done in the only way in which it could be done to bring together representatives of the government and the opposition in a conference in reference to this delimitation of the boundaries. There is no other way. If members from one section of the country meet with members from another section of the country, even though they are of different politics and belong to both sides of the House, that does not make it such a conference as the right hon. Prime Minister had in view. His idea was that the two sides of the House should confer together and that they should agree together as to what should be the basis of delimitation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, what I said was that the idea in my mind was that this question and other questions of a similar character should be settled by the gentlemen who represent the Northwest Territories in this House on both sides of the House. Unfortunately this idea did not prevail.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not what the right hon. gentleman said a little while ago. The right hon. gentleman pointed to what had been done in Great Britain. There was a deadlock, representatives from each side of the House had a conference, and defined the principles, and I certainly gathered most distinctly from the words of my right hon. friend that it was his intention, as far as this Bill was concerned, that the same procedure should be followed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That was not it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, my ears have played me false if that is not what the right hon. gentleman said in the earlier part of his remarks this afternoon. His reference to what took place in Great Britain was entirely irrelevant if he did not mean that, because what has been stated just now has not any relevancy at all to what took place in Great Britain. My right hon. friend, if his statement represents what was in his mind, should certainly have conferred with me or some other member on this side of the House privately and arranged for this interview. We know that no such interview took place, but he excuses himself now by saying that is not what he intended at all. The illustration he drew from British practice was in that case so absolutely irrelevant that I cannot imagine why the right hon. gentleman referred to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I never conferred with my hon. friend in regard to having a conference on this question, but I stated that my view was that the division of boundaries might well be settled by members on both sides of politics, and that did not carry.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would not that involve a communication from the right hon. gentleman to myself?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; because when it was not adopted I did not go any further.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was not adopted?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My suggestion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How can I be accused of not adopting something which I never heard.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not accuse my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, there was no intention of a conference.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not consult my hon. friend with regard to the boundaries; I consulted the members from the Northwest Territories. I asked them to give advice, and I wanted to have their advice as to the number of constituencies and as to the capital and other things which were purely local. My argument in regard to the precedent in England was in answer to the statement of my hon. friend that these matters were always referred to judges in England, whereas in the case mentioned they were referred to special commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not care whether they were referred to judges or not; that is not the point we are dealing with. The right hon. gentleman in answer to me certainly did say that he regretted that this had not been dealt with by a conference between the two sides of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have explained over and over again that I regretted, and I regret now, that this matter was not settled by the members from the Northwest Territories who are directly concerned in the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Did the right hon. gentleman as leader of the government, or did the Minister of the Interior as representing that district, call that conference? Was it the right hon. gentleman or was it the Minister of the Interior who called this conference and authorized it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was not I who called it. I simply understood that it had been done and that nothing effectual could result from it.

Mr. SCOTT. It may not be out of place for me to repeat exactly what I said last evening upon this question. I stated:

I wish to make the statement again that a conference was held several evenings before the 21st of February, several days before these Bills were introduced. The conference was called by Mr. Haultain and to that conference were invited, I understood, all the members of the House of Commons from the Northwest Territories, including the member for Qu'Appelle, all the senators from the Territories, and there were also present at the conference the members then in Ottawa of the Northwest government. I make the statement that Mr. Haultain told that conference that it had been suggested to him by the Prime Minister that he should endeavour to get an agreement from the representatives from the Northwest upon the boundary line between the two provinces, secondly, with regard to the number of local constituencies which should be given to each province, and, thirdly, with regard to the divisions of these local constituencies.

The hon. gentlemen from the Northwest Territories who sit on the opposite side of the House have taken the position that I was making an untrue statement when I stated what I have quoted. It was so interpreted by the reporter of the Ottawa 'Citizen,' which paper this morning had the heading 'Walter Scott's statement in regard to conference flatly contradicted.' Let us begin at the beginning. We had the statement at that conference from Mr. Haultain that he had been asked by the Prime Minister to get an agreement from all the members from the Northwest Territories with regard to these three points. Is there any hon. gentleman opposite who is prepared now to deny that statement? If so let him speak now. I make that statement now in the hearing of the Prime Minister.

Mr. LAKE. So far as I am concerned I was not present and so I am not able to contradict it.

Mr. SCOTT. We have the fact admitted then that the Prime Minister as head of this government did desire, not to perpetrate something in a hole and corner with regard to redistribution and force it upon the country, but that he did desire that the Northwest members, representing both political parties, should arrive at an amicable arrangement with regard to these points. My hon. friends opposite are not so fast in making denials now as they were last evening and the evening before. Let me tell them that when we get out into the Northwest Territories they will have some trouble in denying many of the statements they have made in this House and in certain districts in this country. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) will have some explanations to make when we get out into the Territories on these different matters.

Mr. LAKE. I have neither admitted nor denied the statements made by the hon. member for West Assiniboia. I could not possibly do so because I was not present at the conference and therefore cannot speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. SCOTT. Then we have the fact admitted that the head of the government did ask Mr. Haultain, who is not a member of the Liberal party, to get a conference. After these schedules were brought down we had the Conservative press throughout Canada crying out that an outrage was perpetrated; we have had three days' discussion in this House now, and the cry of outrage has pretty well petered out. Gentlemen opposite are not able to bring any just argument against these schedules; they are not able to get down to figures and make comparisons to show that there is any outrage; they are practically brought down to this contention: that because the government and the members supporting the government are entirely responsible for these plans of redistribution, that therefore an outrage has been perpetrated.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did not some of the newspapers supporting the Liberal party or the so-called Liberal party say so too?

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that one or two Liberal papers in southern Alberta have made such statements, and against these we place the statements made with equal force by Conservative newspapers; the Edmonton 'Journal,' for instance, one of the rankest of the Tory organs in the Territories made a statement to the very opposite effect. We come down to this point now, that our friends opposite are unable to support their contention that an outrage has been perpetrated by any other argument than that members on this side of the House are practically wholly responsible for these plans of distribution. I made the statement that the leader of the government suggested to Mr. Haultain—who is certainly not a Liberal and who is certainly not prejudiced against the gentlemen opposite—I made the statement that Mr. Haultain was asked by the leader of the government to take the responsibility of getting an agreement, and Mr. Haultain called that meeting to get such agreement. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle says he never heard anything about any suggestion for an agreement with regard to the constituencies. Who is responsible for that? The leader of the government is not responsible; we are not responsible; I fancy that responsibility will have to fall upon his friend Mr. Haultain, who certainly received the suggestion from the leader of the government and called a meeting for that purpose. If my hon. friends from Alberta and Calgary never heard of the suggestion, as I understand they contend, it must be their friend Mr. Haultain who neglected to follow the suggestion that was made him by the leader of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend (Mr. Scott) has a good memory and will he say what questions were brought forward for discussion at what he calls 'that conference?'

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly. I will read a little more from the statement I made here

last night, and it deals with that very point :

The matter of the boundary between the two provinces was discussed at great length. The matter of the number of constituencies was also discussed, and the method of division of the constituencies within each province was debated at considerable length.

I do not understand that the conference was of a confidential or private nature, and I may say that Mr. Haultain contended at great length and with some force that the number of constituencies should be thirty. He was unable to carry that point; the majority in the conference were in favour of a lesser number.

Mr. HERRON. Were the number of constituencies settled at that meeting?

Mr. SCOTT. Not absolutely. As a matter of fact we did not arrive at a perfect agreement either with regard to the boundaries or with regard to the number of constituencies. I have already told the House that my choice for a boundary line between the provinces was the present boundary of Alberta. I pressed that strongly. But I stood alone, and so I was driven to agree to the 4th meridian. A very substantial majority of those in the conference favoured the 4th meridian as against the 3rd meridian. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) reminds me that he favoured the 3rd meridian ; but, the majority was in favour of the 4th, and that was finally adopted by the government. And I say that the number of constituencies was discussed at considerable length. Mr. Haultain contended, and with a good deal of force that the number of constituencies allotted to each province should be thirty, but he was unable to carry a majority of the conference with him. There was a discussion with regard to the method to be followed in the preparation of the schedules, and I repeat, though it has been emphatically denied by some hon. members opposite,—but my own memory with regard to this is supported by the memory of other hon. gentlemen present—that we did discuss the method of meeting Mr. Haultain's suggestion with regard to schedules, and I put forward a motion in favour of a bi-party committee representing each province to arrive at an agreement with regard to schedules. This was not carried. There are hon. gentlemen here who recollect distinctly that I made the motion. My hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) said that the absurdity of what I stated was proved by the fact that the boundary had not then been selected.

Mr. LALOR. Was the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Scott's) motion seconded ?

Mr. SCOTT. Although there were Conservatives there, the motion was not even seconded. They did not seem to regard it as a proper suggestion to be followed.

Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to mention again, as I did yesterday, that Mr. Haultain stated to me yesterday that he was not present when the motion referred to was made—that he heard no formal motion.

Mr. SCOTT. That may be true, and it is undoubtedly true that the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) was not present. I could not swear to the personnel of the Conservatives who were there at the moment when I made my motion, but I am perfectly satisfied that all the Conservatives who had been in the conference had not left. At all events, I certainly made the motion.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I have said that I was not there when the motion was made. Perhaps I could jog the hon. gentleman's memory by asking him whether he remembers a telegram from W. R. Abbott, of Maple Creek ?

Mr. SCOTT. The telegram that I handed to my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You gave me a copy.

Mr. SCOTT. That was before the conference opened.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No, I went down and sent the telegram to Calgary.

Mr. SCOTT. And returned to the room ?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. SCOTT. My recollection is that this telegram incident occurred while the members were gathering. I showed the telegram that I received in regard to the boundary line from the secretary of the Maple Creek Board of Trade. But my hon. friend (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) said last night that it would have been absurdity to talk about delimiting the boundaries within the province before the line between the provinces was settled. There was no attempt made at this meeting to settle the delimitation of the boundaries, but we all talked over the question of the method by which Mr. Haltain's suggestion was to be met, of furnishing the government with schedules for both these provinces.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 12 be adopted ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has forgotten something. Allusion was made by the leader of the opposition to the speech of the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) last night in which he took up the proposed province of Saskatchewan and showed that the principle of subdivision laid down by the Prime Minister would work out in the greatest absurdities. When allusion was made to that today, my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) deprecated mixing the provinces together in one discussion. But it was

pointed out that the same principle applied to both, and that in case of one it resulted in absurdity. The right hon. gentleman said he would take that up later. Apparently he has forgotten it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not intend to discuss Saskatchewan to-day.

Mr. FOSTER. But it certainly is pertinent to the present question. The right hon. gentleman has stated a basis upon which, as he contends, a fair distribution can be made. That basis, presumably, applies to both provinces ;—certainly a basis of general principle cannot be wrong for Saskatchewan and right for Alberta. But, when the principle is worked out in the case of Saskatchewan, it produces the most enormous disparity, as shown by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake). To that hon. gentleman's statements there has been no answer. I think there ought to be an answer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not see that that answer should be given to-day. If there are discrepancies so great as to be absurd, in the case of Saskatchewan, when we come to the case of Saskatchewan, we will discuss them. And, if there are things to be rectified they must be rectified.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, are we not entitled to know from the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) why the unit of representation is so greatly departed from ? Whether we deal with the number of votes cast or the number of names on the list there are remarkable discrepancies. For instance, at Rosebud, there are 749 votes cast and 1,189 on the list. At High River, there were 971 votes cast and 1,528 on the list. Why does the right hon. gentleman make some constituencies so much below the unit of population and others so much above it ? We go upon the basis of population. As there are no municipal divisions, you are at liberty to make the ridings approximately the same, one would think. I have not heard or read anything in this debate which would indicate a reason for these disparities.

Mr. TURRIFF. The list of voters does not in every case represent the population now in the district.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, it is not a safe guide ?

Mr. TURRIFF. Not absolutely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then, is not that a reason to refer the matter to investigation ?

Mr. TURRIFF. This affects the north more than it does the south.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not care about north and south.

Mr. TURRIFF. It was pointed out that at Stony Plain there were some 700 on the list, while at High River there were 1,700 That might very easily be and yet there might be no great disparity in population, for the reason that in the northern part of the district a far larger proportion of foreign-born immigration is going in than in the southern portion. In the southern portion of Alberta the population is practically all English speaking, and in the northern portion there are a great many foreign born, who cannot become naturalized until they have been in the country three years. So that there are many districts where there may be thousands of people, who were not there when the census was taken in 1901 and who have not yet the right to vote. So that many districts, which have a small number of votes on the lists, may have a very large population and are entitled to the representation they are getting.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I might say, in answer to my hon. friend, who asked why do you make certain divisions of a lesser population than others. This is altogether dependent upon geographical conditions. It is impossible, in a matter of this kind, to come even within 10 per cent of giving the same number of voters in each riding.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would imagine that the geographical conditions in this province would offer less difficulty than in Ontario or any other of the eastern provinces, as it is nearly all prairie. Let us take the districts where there are no geographical difficulties or will my right hon. friend say that geographical difficulties have prevailed in every case?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I assume that in dealing with the conditions, you deal with them as you did with the provinces in 1903. You think that you have some evidence as to what the population is, although my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) seems to think that these figures are not a sufficient guide, and in that I agree with him. But assuming, for the purpose of argument, that they are, you must, I suppose adopt a unit of population. When we redistributed for the Dominion we adopted a unit, I think, of about 25,000. When you are fixing the divisions of the province of Alberta, you likewise adopt a unit of population, if you are proceeding on the basis of population, as I understand you are. What is the unit of population which the right hon. gentleman has adopted and why is it you depart so largely from it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The unit of population we have tried to get from some five or six different sources, but unfortunately we can only get an approximate figure. If we were dealing with any of the eastern provinces, we could take the census of 1901, and no one would seriously object to that. But we know that in the Northwest the conditions are not at all to-day what they were then, and we have had to take recourse to other sources of information, such as the

vote recorded, the vote polled, the post offices, the school districts and so on ; and the population on each division must vary between 1,000 and 1,400, so far as I can see. My hon. friend must remember what took place in 1903 regarding the delimitation of Ontario, 25,000 was the unit we adopted, but in some instances the population went beyond 25,000 and in others under that figure.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But my right hon. friend is putting it as if in that case we said our unit of population shall be from 25,000 to 40,000. We had a unit of 25,000 and came as near to it as possible.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But you cannot say there is equality of population in one section and another. Here is one section which is less than 1,000 and another which is more than 1,500. When we come to discuss each case separately, we can see whether or not it is possible to make changes. Take the case of Stony Plain as an example. It is at the foot of the Rocky Mountains. The division extends to the west from the summit of the Rockies, the height of land, up to the Saskatchewan river, and it follows the Saskatchewan river. Does my hon. friend say that in order to have a larger body of population in Stony Plain, it would be advisable to cross the Saskatchewan river? Is it not preferable this river should be made the boundary ? It forms a natural boundary, and my hon. friend will agree that it is better, in a large constituency of that kind, to follow the river. We must take every case by itself. Suppose this were referred to a commission of judges, could they have proceeded any differently? They would have to observe the conditions and ascertain the best way to accommodate the population to the natural divisions. Sometimes that is easy because there are no rivers or mountains ; but when we come to section by section and division by division, we can take each by itself and see if it is possible to improve one or the other.

Mr. AMES. I understood the right hon. gentleman to say some time ago that there were no rivers in the province of Alberta sufficiently important to be considered as natural boundaries, and that it was a very simple proposition to take the map and arrange the various constituencies. For the local legislature we find four constituencies : Lacombe, Ponoka, Wetaskiwin and Leduc—which extend completely across from east to west and which take up the territory now occupied by Stony Plain. And if we look at the number of votes cast, we find that all these four constituencies are considerably below the mean average. But if we should add Stony Plain to these four and allow their boundaries to go entirely across, thus absorbing Stony Plain into these four constituencies, we should then have about the average. How is it that although these four constituencies are now perfectly satisfactory it is found necessary to create five and give Stony Plain less than its quota and also reduce the other four below the necessary number?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think they are still above the necessary number. If my hon. friend will look at the map of the province of Quebec, he will find that there are counties in that province to-day—for instance, the counties of Ottawa, Montcalm, Joliette and Berthier—which extend almost to the North Pole. At one time the county of Ottawa was only one, but we divided it into two. Why ? Because the population extended northward, and at a certain time the county of Ottawa, which extends to-day almost to the limits, the population was sufficient for the purposes, but in 1882 it was divided into two counties—the counties of Wright and Labelle. The time will come when the county of Montcalm will have to be divided and also the county of Berthier, and we shall have another division made north of these counties. You will have the same experience here. There were no people in Stony Plain some years ago but there are now, and they have to be represented and that is the reason why we give them representation.

Mr. AMES. The Prime Minister misunderstands ; we have no intention of depriving any portion of the new province of representation. But we do not wish to see parts over-represented. We do not understand why a man in one section of the country should be considered worth double the voting power of a man in another section, that is all. We have no objection to having every man in the country represented if it is possible to bring him to the poll. As far as the county of Wright is concerned, this county was divided north and south so the distance between the extremities is the same to-day as it formerly was. If the the minister will look at the map he will see that it has been found necessary for some reason to have Red Deer extend from the Rocky Mountains in the west to Medicine Hat on the east, and yet it is a constituency of proper size so far as population is concerned, and the next four districts in order to make room for Stony Plain, have to be bounded by the river so that five constituencies may be formed where there is only population for four.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Take again the county of Ottawa. It matters not whether it was divided north and south or east and west ; it was divided because population had flowed into that county which was not there when the county was organized. That is why in a new country like ours you have to vary the constituencies from time to time, because population comes in and representation must be adjusted accordingly. In the case of Stony Plain if my hon. friend

will succeed in persuading the House that it is right that the 3,000 people scattered over that plain should not have representation, well then I am ready to give in to him, but that is not his contention. His proposition is simply to absorb them elsewhere, into the adjacent constituencies. That is not my idea and I do not think it is an idea of fair-play either. I think these people who have populated that vast territory west of the Saskatchewan should have a representative by themselves, and I think when we come to discuss that we will impress the fairness of that even on the hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. How far does the settlement extend west ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are people on the summit of the Pass, on the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. How many are there between the summit and the Saskatchewan River ?

Mr. OLIVER. I tell the hon. member there are white people on the summit, 250 miles west.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Two families, and the summit is in British Columbia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not one side of it.

Mr. AMES. I think the minister will find if he consults the record that almost the entire population of Stony Plain is found within 40 miles of Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER. That is quite true but it does not account for the balance of the population.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BARKER. I understand the First Minister may be here presently, and I will proceed therefore with my remarks, as perhaps some other ministers present may be able to give the explanation I wished to obtain. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the remarks of the various speakers on the opposite side of the House with regard to this distribution of the seats in the proposed province of Alberta, and there is one point about which I have failed to see that any real explanation has been given. The proposed province contained, in last November, and no doubt contains today, and for a few years to come will contain, about 30,000 votes upon the list, in round numbers. There may be a few hundred more or a few hundred less, but about 30,000, according to all statements, is the number of voters upon the list. There are twenty-five seats, which will give an average or unit of about 1,200. Now, I observe that in the distribution the government have arbitrarily, so far as I can see, certainly without any explanation so far being given, allotted two of the twenty-five seats to a portion of the province which contains no more than 500 votes, according to every calculation that one can make from the statements that have been given as to the probable population there. So that in that portion, the most northerly portion of the proposed province, 500 voters get two seats, or 250 to the seat, the average being 1,200. Now, I would like to have some distinct and clear explanation of how that comes about. It cannot have been accidental, there must have been discussions between some of those gentlemen, who are so active in representing the Northwest, and the government. We ought to know who suggested that, and why it was suggested. If you attempt to make such a distribution on the ground of an early increase of population, I would point out that it would be necessary, within the next two, or three, or four years, for the northerly portion, that portion which is in Athabaska, to increase 500 per cent to get up to the present position of the remainder of the province ; it would have to increase 500 per cent while the remainder of the province was stationary. I think we ought to have some explanation of that anomaly. If, on the other hand, we ask, assuming it to be reasonable that 500 voters have two representatives in Athabaska, what should be the total number of seats for the province, the result would be that you would have to have 120 members in that province instead of 25. It is impossible that such a thing could have been proposed as appears upon this schedule without some discussion, and without some particular object of a selfish nature being at the bottom of it, and I say deliberately that there must have been a motive, an intention to accomplish some purpose.

I think that is a matter that deserves very serious consideration, and it is incumbent upon the government to explain that circumstance most fully. We have not heard any satisfactory explanation from the present Minister of the Interior. We all know the section he represents, and his personal interest—his political interest, rather —in creating such an anomaly, because it throws the balance of power of the whole province into the end of the province he represents. I think, therefore, for the very reason that this hon. gentleman has so recently been taken into the government, we should have a very explicit explanation upon that point. I did understand the hon. the Minister of the Interior to say : Oh, there is such an immense territory up there, and that territory requires representation apart from the very few people there. Well, it strikes me that is a very odd way of putting it. I could understand it if there were fractions to be provided for, if you were going to create one and a-half into

two, or two and a-quarter into three, or something of that kind. But to go so far as to say that 250 people shall be entitled to a seat when every other part of the province, on an average, must have 1,200—it seems to me an outrage, unless the hon. gentleman can give some explanation which we have not hitherto heard.

But, let us see what there is in his statement of the area to be represented. Do individuals own this area? The 250 people who are to be represented in this area will have their own land. They do not own this immense area but who does own it? The Dominion of Canada. The government of this Dominion are deliberately retaining under their ownership the whole of this immense territory and saying, that the fact that the territory is unoccupied is a reason for having additional representatives for that part. Surely the people who have built up the lower portions of the province, built up towns of 10,000, created manufactories and developed ranching and industries and all that sort of thing are more entitled to representation than the government of Canada who own wild lands up there and hold them for settlement. I defy the hon. Minister of the Interior to show that there are on the voters' list at the present time more than 500, yet, without the slighest excuse that anybody has suggested, he is giving these 500 voters two seats, I ask an explanation and I think I am entitled to it. That is one point that I thought the right hon. Prime Minister would have been able to explain, but in his absence I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Justice will do it; if not we must accept an explanation from the recently appointed Minister of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret the Prime Minister is not in his place to answer my hon. friend (Mr. Barker). I am sure he would give him his best attention and if I might make a suggestion it seems to me that this question has been answered by the Prime Minister as well as by other members who have spoken on this side of the House. The question that the hon. gentleman asks is: Why should a small population living in a large territory be given the same representation as a larger population living in a smaller territory. I think that is his question.

Mr. BARKER. I asked an answer to the specific case I put. There is an immense territory undeveloped remaining the property of the Dominion and occupied by a few people who represent 500 votes. I ask why the people occupying a small portion of that large territory and having only 500 votes should get two seats when it will require five times that many to get one elsewhere.

Mr. OLIVER. In regard to the specific case it has already been stated and stated again and restated that a small population is occupying a very large territory.

Mr. BARKER. It is not.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, that is the misfortune of this discussion. We are not able to come to the same conclusion. The hon. member says that a small population is occupying a small part of a large territory.

Mr. BARKER. Yes. that is it because the government own the big territory.

Mr. OLIVER. We say that a small population is occupying a large part of a large territory and the circumstances being as they are, if this territory is to be adequately represented it must have two members. The conditions of travel, the situation of the people, the divergence of interests in different parts of this great territory are such that if it is to be represented adequately and intelligently, or in other words if it is to be represented at all in the legislature of that new province, it must be represented by two members and therefore it should be divided into two constituencies. We do not expect our hon. friends to see the matter as we see it. We have had the experience of the last three days of discussion to inform us on that point. We can only state and restate the position we have taken and hope that it will commend itself to the majority of the House. Though perhaps we are not able to bring our friends to view this matter as we view it from our statement of the case, perhaps we can induce them to view it in something the same light by comparison with other instances as for instance when the Redistribution Bill relating to the seats of this parliament was passed in 1903. In the Northwest Territories at that time, according to the census there was a matter of a little over 150,000 people, and according to the unit of population these 150,000 people were entitled to six members, but this House saw fit in its wisdom—I think properly taking into consideration all the different interests to be represented and the probable increase in population—to grant ten members to the Northwest Territories instead of only six which they would have been entitled to on the unit of population. The principle is exactly the same in regard to the district of Athabaska. The hon. member may suggest that the conditions are more strained in regard to the district of Athabaska, but on that point he has not any better information than we have, and our information is that the conditions are not strained in the district of Athabaska. We regret very much that we have not later census information than is available, but we have other information in regard to the increase of population, in regard to the increase of trade and in regard to development generally which leads us to believe that there is a comparatively large population in the western part of Athabaska to-day. The fact

that the Hudson Bay Company has built a steam mill in one part, that other people have built other steam mills in other parts, that the Hudson Bay Company and other companies have built and equipped and are running on these waters five steamers since the census was taken, that saw mills and other industrial establishments mentioned by my hon. friend from Strathcona (Mr. Talbot) are in operation in that country and that schools are unquestionably in operation lead us to believe that the census of 1901 in regard to the district of Athabaska is no more correct as representing the population of to-day than it is in regard to the district of Rosebud, which, according to the census, has a population of only a very few over 1,000 people in 1901, but which, in the election of 1904, cast very nearly 1,000 votes. I think it is very unfair that our hon. friends should absolutely ignore the census as being unreliable throughout the southern part of the district of Alberta and as soon as we touch the district of Athabaska rest their case absolutely on the census. If we are to have the census for one part let us have it all over, and if we are to drop the census and take the best estimate we can of present population let us take that estimate all through.

Mr. BARKER. What estimate did the minister give the other day of the present probable population in Athabaska ?

Mr. OLIVER. My information is that there are at present about 5,000 people in the western part of the district of Athabaska exclusive of Indians. It is the best information I can get from men who are acquainted with that country, whose homes are there and in whose word I have confidence, but of course I do not say it is as reliable as the census report. However, when these gentlemen opposite ask us to accept estimates of the increase of population in certain parts of the country, they have as good a right to accept our estimates as to another part. If they come down to actual figures and take the census over all the whole province of Alberta, then they have no cause for complaint in regard to the district of Athabaska or any other district.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How much of the population given in the census of 1901 for Athabaska, is in the portion proposed to be taken into Alberta ?

Mr. OLIVER. At the suggestion of the hon. gentleman from Toronto (Mr. Foster) I laid on the table of the House to-day the definite figures signed by the census commissioner with regard to localities and distribution of people. It may not be correct but it is authoritative. If the sole question with my hon. friends opposite is as between what lies north of township 38 and what lies south of that township, and there is no question as to the delimitation of the boundaries between the constituencies, then it is only a question as to whether there are as many people north of township 38 as there are south of township 38. We are all agreed that the dividing line should be township 38, we do not want a commission of judges to decide that, and if we take the census we find there are more people north of 38 than there are south ; we find there are enough people to entitle the district north of 38 to 13 members and the district south of 38 to 12 members. If hon. gentlemen opposite will not accept the census as the basis throughout the entire district of Alberta, they have no title to stand here hour after hour ringing the changes and asking questions based upon the census figures for the district of Athabaska. If they want us to take an estimate in one part of the country let there be an estimate all over, and if it is to be the census in one part let it be the census all through. As to the horror that has been expressed by gentlemen opposite about the disparity of population in the different constituencies of Alberta, I might point out that my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) and my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames) rang the changes on this question. Did these gentlemen ever hear before of a disparity between the number of votes in one constituency as compared with another ? They wanted to know why it took two men in Calgary to be equal in value to one man in Stony Plain, and they seemed to think that was a poser. Well my friend from Argenteuil represents a constituency with a census population of 16,497 and my friend from St. Antoine represents a constituency with a census population of 47,650. It would appear that it takes three men in St. Antoine to equal one man in Argenteuil. In the county of Huntingdon represented by a Conservative in this House there is a census population of 13,979, and in the almost adjoining district of Maisonneuve represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, there is a population of 65,158, so that it takes five men in the constituency of Maisonneuve to equal one man in the constituency of Huntingdon. And yet these gentlemen opposite are amazed that there is a discrepancy between the constituencies in the district of Alberta. The constituencies of St. Antoine and Argenteuil and Huntingdon and Maisonneuve are, so to speak, within a stone throw of Ottawa ; they are old constituencies, constituencies in which the conditions have been understood from generation to generation ; the redistribution of these constituencies has been under the control of the Conservative party for years and years, and yet they never thought of regulating these discrepancies although when the constituencies in Alberta come up for consideration they are overwhelmed with amazement that there should be a discrepancy at all. Parliament after parliament, redistribution after redistribution, census after census,

these discrepancies in old constituencies have been tolerated by Conservatives, but now they threaten that they will keep the House in session until the snow flies before they will submit to a discrepancy in the far off province of Alberta. They will go through these constituencies with a jack plane and a plumb line and a square and a level, and they will see that they are pared right down to a hairs' breadth of equality, or they will keep this House in session until next Christmas. Well, if these gentlemen want any credit for a sense of justice they have a noble work to do right at their doors in regard to matters they are better acquainted with than they are with those of far off Alberta. My hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) might show a sense of justice by resigning his seat and bunching his constituency up with one of the other small constituencies so as to remove the injustice done to his friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). This would be a practical display of his sense of justice, but I have heard no mention that he has any intention of sacrificing himself on that altar.

But he is prepared to sacrifice the well-being of this country, of this very district of Alberta which he purports to protect; to sacrifice the time and energy of members of this House; but he will not sacrifice his own seat to his sense of justice. This condition which I have referred to is not confined to the province of Quebec; it prevails in Ontario as well. I see my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) sitting right alongside the hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames). My hon. friend from Peel has been a member of this House for two parliaments. He sat in the previous parliament for a constituency which according to the census, had a population of 13,687, as against 47,000 in the constituency of the hon. member for St. Antoine. But we do not need to go to the province of Quebec to show a discrepancy. While the hon. member for Peel sat here with 13,687 people at his back the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who then represented East York sat here as the representative of 40,405 people. Three of the people represented by the then member for East York had just as much right in this parliament as one of those represented by the hon. member for Peel. But my hon. friend from Peel did not offer objection to that condition of affiairs. I know that the wrong has been, to some extent, righted since that time; but I have not heard that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) manifested any great enthusiasm in supporting that change. Let me instance the province of Nova Scotia, from which the hon. leader of the oppopsition comes (Mr. R. L. Borden) and which he represented in the last parliament. Of course, the discrepancies are not quite so marked in that province as in some others, for reasons which are apparent. The county of Richmond, Nova Scotia, was represented in the last parliament, as it is in this parliament, by one member. According to the last census, its population was 13,515. The county of Cumberland, also represented by one member, had a population at the time of the last census of 36,168. This cannot be justified on the ground of difference between rural and urban constituencies, for both of these are rural constituencies. Both these cases were known about when the Redistribution Bill was going through this House in 1903, but I did not hear the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) make the walls of this chamber ring with denunciations of that condition. If he believes in the principle of equality in representation, that would have been a good time for him to assert his love of fair-play. But he was not heard on that occasion, as I understand. He waits until the case of the province of Alberta comes up for discussion and then he joins in the denunciations of unfair treatment on the ground that there is a difference, according to the calculations of his own supporters, of 10 per cent between north and south. And, according to their own statement, the fairest proposition for redistribution within their knowledge was that of the Transvaal, and in that case the very law itself allows a difference of 10 per cent.

Mr. AMES. But it does not say that all constituencies in one part shall be over 10 per cent and all the constituencies in another part shall be under 10 per cent.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume that my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) can point out the clause in the law of the Transvaal which says that the constituencies in our district shall not——

Mr. AMES. No, but the spirit of British fair-play, which is likely to prevail where that distribution is to be made, would be a sufficient guarantee against that.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the district of Alberta and this House of Commons are quite as British as is the Transvaal. When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) goes to the Transvaal for his example of British fair-play he is travelling a little off the line, especially is he unfortunate in bringing in that comparison in the Canadian House of Commons. If the Transvaal is British today, the answer to the question why it is British came in considerable degree from this Dominion of Canada.

Mr. ALCORN. With the hon. minister's (Mr. Oliver's) permission, I would like to ask him a question. Are we to understand that he is arguing for inequality of representation?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. ALCORN. Then, why did he not say that these discrepancies were wrong in 1903?

Mr. OLIVER. Because I take it for granted that they are not improper discrep-

ancies. I assume that had they been improper or unreasonable, the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and hon. gentlemen behind him would have tried to do away with them. But, as these hon. gentlemen and all of us know, there are circumstances and conditions which govern in the distribution of seats besides the mere consideration of population. It is necessary that the people with common interests shall be grouped together. And this principle which prevented the absolute recognition of the equality of representation prevails in the province of Alberta as it does elsewhere. And why should it not? And, if in all other parts of the Dominion, we regard local conditions and circumstances and do not regard only the equality of population, why should we not do the same for Alberta? Although these schedules and maps have been before the people of Alberta for a month or more there has not been a complaint from any section against this distribution on the ground that one constituency was larger than another. The only complaint that has been voiced in this House or anywhere else is the complaint as between the south and the north, and not as between constituency and constituency. And when these hon. gentlemen presume to argue that injustice is proved because one constituency has 600 votes and the other has 1,000 votes they know they are not dealing fairly by the House and the country. The evidence is in the census; the evidence is within the knowledge of every man of them.

With regard to the fairness of treatment accorded members of the opposition in this matter, may I be allowed to show where the suggestion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and his colleague from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) leads them. Their suggestion gives ample proof of the purpose and reason which is the foundation of all their complaints. Their first charge was that there was no attempt to have a conference; and when that had to go by the board, then they say: Oh, we do not mean that kind of a conference. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition complained because the leader of the government had not approached him with a definite proposal for a discussion by a joint committee from both sides of the House—in regard to what? The distribution of constituencies for this House? No; the distribution of constituencies in a province about to be created. It seems to me that that is a question of a territorial or provincial nature rather than of a Dominion nature, and that while, in the nature of things, this parliament has to give its final decision in that matter, it was a subject chiefly for consideration with the present existing government of the Territories, with whom this government was carrying on its negotiations. And in pursuance of that idea and of the suggestion of the premier of the Dominion to the premier of the Territories, a conference was proposed to be held between the government of the Territories, as it was represented here in Ottawa at that time, and the members of this parliament representing the Territories. Such a conference would be in the nature of dealing with a provincial or local question, which was not a question of party politics or should not have been. And when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and his colleague from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) complain that the First Minister did not approach them with a request for a joint committee between the two political parties in this House, they thereby demand that this question of the distribution of seats in the new province of Alberta shall be dealt with as a question of party politics and not of provincial interests.

Mr. AMES. If this be purely a local question, I understand that there are fifteen representatives in the local House who come from the present province of Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. AMES. Have they been consulted in any way in this connection?

Mr. OLIVER. I regret to say they have not.

Mr. AMES. Then it is a purely local question in which the fifteen representatives who will have—probably the most of them—to come up for re-election, should have been consulted.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say it was purely a local question. I said it was chiefly a local question. It is not purely a local question, because this House has to give a final word with regard to it. But it is purely a local question to that extent, and on that point the hon. member and myself differ. But when he says that the members of the Territorial legislature might very well have been asked, in their official capacity, regarding this redistribution, I quite agree with him. But it was not for the First Minister of the Dominion to call together the Territorial legislature for the purpose of discussion. That was the duty of the premier of the Territories. He did not choose to do it, and therefore he must be held responsible if the people of the Territories have not been consulted in the matter.

Mr. AMES. Would the hon. minister tell us what encouragement the premier of the Territories had to make any overtures of this character?

Mr. OLIVER. The premier of the Territories was not required to make overtures. It was not in the nature of an overture, but a matter of duty on his part. If he thought an injustice was being done, if he thought inequality was being meted out to the different parts of the country under his control, it was his duty as premier to have the opinion of the Territories heard in that matter. And when he did not take that stand,

when he did not take that plain course which it was his duty to do, I say that, so far as he is concerned, the case is against the contention of my hon. friend that any injustice has been done. Hon. gentlemen opposite can take either horn of the dilemma they please. Either Mr. Haultain did not do his duty, or there has been a fair division. They must accept either one position or the other. There is a responsibility in this matter outside of this House. We admit our share of that responsibility, but we do not admit a responsibility which properly rests upon the shoulders of the premier of the Territories. And it is not the privilege of hon. members to cry out injustice, to claim to be fighting the battle of the people of the Territories, when they are simply agitating in the interests of their own political party, as is evidenced by the demands of the leader of the opposition and his lieutenant to-day—until they clear themselves and their party from the imputation of their having been guilty of dereliction of duty as regards the action of the Territorial legislature.

Mr. AMES. Do I understand the hon. gentleman's argument to be this, that in case there is guilt on the part of the government in bringing in an unfair schedule, that guilt does not rest upon their shoulders, but upon the shoulders of Mr. Haultain, because he did not insist upon the schedule being different ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether my hon. friend is a member of the legal profession or not. I am not ; but I think I have some little knowledge of the rules of law ; and I think my hon. friend will admit that, under the existing circumstances, if a crime has been committed, our mutual friend, the premier of the Territories, has been certainly an accessory after the fact, if not before.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. He had it in his power to bring into this discussion the very people of the Territories, the very constituencies affected. He has not seen fit to do so ; and I submit that if he has not done so, it is not because he had no desire to embarrass this government, it is not because he would not go out of his way to embarrass it, if he thought he had a case. We have had ample evidence of that this last few weeks. And so my hon. friends, when they assume to create a grievance amongst the people of the district of Alberta, would do well to find the ground on which they are standing before they depend upon it too much. They have insinuated and suggested that this distribution is for the purpose of giving a preponderance of representation to that end of the province which is more in accord with the Liberal party than with them. They probably do not know that in the southern end of the province there is a fair proportion of local constituencies represented by Liberals and that as far as that part of it is concerned, a Liberal vote in the south end is as good as one in the north end, and when they argue that we are trying to take votes from the south because they are Conservative votes and give them to the north because they are Liberal votes they simply are arguing against what is the plain fact.

Mr. BARKER. You are the only one who has argued on that.

Mr. OLIVER. Then if the hon. members are not arguing on that point in the name of common sense, what have they kept us here the last three days for ? There is no ground of complaint as between constituency and constituency, the only complaint that has ever been suggested is as between north and south on the part of the south as against the north as these gentlemen are championing it. If they have any reason for the championship which they have been putting forward I should say it is up to them to give their consent to a proposal which after three days discussion, they have failed to show in any particular is unfair and permit the business of the House and country to proceed.

Mr. AMES. With reference to the premier of the Northwest Territories, does the minister intimate that if the premier had protested against this schedule or should now protest against it, or should go on record in any way as considering this schedule unfair, the government would take that into consideration and would change the schedule in any way?

Mr. OLIVER. I should say certainly not.

Mr. AMES. Then how could he be particeps criminis.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend seeks to get away from the point. It is not a question of the premier of the Territories but of the legislature of the Territories. We are not questioning the action or the proposed action of the hon. the premier ; we have had evidence within the past two or three weeks of his partisanship, of his readiness to prostitute his premiership to the interests of hon. gentlemen on the other side. We do not suggest that his personal view is any better than that of any other individual in the Northwest Territories, but we do suggest that as premier of the Territories it is his right, it is within his power, it is his bounden duty, if an injustice is being done to the people of those Territories by this Bill, to call the legislature and let the voice of the legislature be heard. Talk from the premier of the Territories is of no account; it is votes that count in the Territories, as it is votes that count here. Let him speak through his legislature and I will guarantee he will be heard and the voice of the legislature will be heard as well, but so far our friend the premier of the Northwest Territories has been content

to be one of the party heelers of our friends on the other side, in the by-elections which did not concern him or the Territories and therefore we take the liberty of suggesting that his word in this matter is not to be considered as that of the premier of the Territories but as that of a partisan of our friends on the other side.

Mr. AMES. Let us understand this clearly. The legislature are not to blame because Mr. Haultain did not call them together. Premier Haultain is particeps criminis in this because he did not protest. The Minister of the Interior announces that if he had protested it would have made no difference. It seems to me that this is very hard on Premier Haultain, to hold him criminally responsible for something he could not possibly help. Would the minister explain how that can be?

Mr. OLIVER. It takes five of the hon. member's constituents to equal one of the members for Argenteuil; he is excused. The premier of the Territories is responsible to the people of the Territories, to the legislature of the Territories as premier. He acts by and through and with his legislature and until he does call his legislature together and give that legislature an opportunity to voice its opinions on that question he is speaking as an individual and not as premier. Does my hon. friend understand that?

Mr. AMES. I understand what you mean, yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The somewhat remarkable speech to which we have just listened, from the Minister of the Interior, has concluded with a rather undignified attack on a gentleman who is not here to protect himself. That is quite in keeping with some of the characteristics of the hon. Minister of the Interior. As far as Mr. Haultain is concerned, he deserves no such language as has been applied to him by the Minister of the Interior. He was summoned here as Prime Minister of the Territories without any special session of the legislature being held, and as Prime Minister of the Territories he placed himself, as far as I know, at the service of this government and gave them every possible assistance by the furnishing of information for the purpose of preparing this Bill. He did that in good faith and I know that, so far as I am concerned, I never had any conversation with him while the proceedings were going on; he regarded them as absolutely confidential and placed himself absolutely at the disposal of this government. Further than that he brought the best man he could from the Territories, a gentleman who has been at the service of this government during the last four or five months, and in every possible way he has done what he could to facilitate the enactment of this Bill along what he regarded as right and proper lines; and because forsooth he finds himself at liberty to address two or three audiences of his fellow countrymen—and I suppose he has as good a right to be heard in those elections as the minister himself—he is to be characterized by this gentlemanly Minister of the Interior as a party heeler. Well, I do not know that the language is worth noticing, but I venture to think that the Minister of the Interior does not add anything to the respect in which he is held by this House to or the dignity of the administration when he indulges in such a tirade.

If his information as to the northern portions of the province of Alberta is not more accurate than his knowledge of the Redistribution Bill of 1903, we had better hand this Bill at once to a commission of judges and get some information that is really of value. He told us about the county of Argenteuil and the constituency of Maisonneuve. Does he not know the two principles that were laid down by his leader when he introduced that Bill into this House? One was that municipal and country boundaries must be observed; and does he not know that on account of that principle, imposed upon the committee of which I was a member, these very discrepancies to which he has referred are entirely due except so far as they are due to another principle enunciated by his leader and mentioned again to-day, namely, that rural constituencies should receive a larger voting power to the elector than city constituencies. These two principles stated by his leader on the floor of this House many times during the debate of 1903, acquiesced in by his own vote, are responsible for these very differences to which he has called attention. Now he knows well enough that no such principles apply to the province of Alberta, because there are no municipal and county boundaries there, so far as I am aware. He says that the leader of the opposition, when the county of Richmond was in question in 1903, did not raise his voice. Is he quite sure of that? Is he stating that as a fact? Does he persevere in that statement?

Mr. OLIVER. I would say that the leader of the opposition did not raise his voice loud enough for me to hear it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is probable, because the hon. gentleman was not in attendance in the House; in accordance with his usual practice he was probably waiting outside for the bell to ring before he came in to vote on something of which he knew nothing. I tell the hon. gentleman that I did make a motion before the committee, and referred to it again in the House and pressed it upon the attention of the House, with regard to the county of Richmond, the only instance to which he has called attention. I merely point that out to show how extremely inaccurate the

hon. gentleman is in regard to all these matters. There was no principle acted upon in 1903 which affects the distribution of the ridings of this province, as the hon. gentleman claims. How does the principle of municipal and county boundaries apply? Does the hon. gentleman claim that it applies at all? I always understood there were no municipal and county boundaries in the province of Alberta, yet that is the grand principle upon which the Prime Minister and his colleagues and the hon. gentleman himself upheld the discrepancies to which he has called attention.

Now, so far as the whole question is concerned, the hon. gentleman tells us that he is acting upon an estimate of the population of the northern portion of the proposed province of Alberta. The hon. gentleman in making that statement, on the hearsay evidence of some person whom we have not before us, whom we have no chance of interrogating, a mere casual statement, I suppose, made in conversation, puts it forward as a reason for giving two members in the legislative assembly to that portion of territory which, according to the census of 1901, is entitled to about half a representative, and which does not certainly include more than three or four, or at the outside, 500 voters; in making that statement and bringing it forward as a reason, he is giving the best argument in the world for a reference of the question to some tribunal. Nothing could be more cogent.

When we ask him how it is that he gives to this part of the province two representatives, having regard to the census of 1901, having regard to the fact that we have no evidence as to what the increase of population is, how are we met by the hon. gentleman? Met by the statement that some person, on some unknown occasion, told him that he believed there are 5,000 people in there over and above Indians. And that is the way in which we are to proceed and make a division of the new province of Alberta. Let us look at the report of the census commissioner with regard to districts 24 and 25, the document to which the hon. gentleman has already called attention. 'Population of the Peace River district, No. 24.' I need not read the whole of it, but the totals are: Whites and half-breeds, 769; Indians, 955; total population, 1,724. Well, if you apply to that the proportion of electors which we obtained from the other portions of the province, we would have about 150, or at most 160 electors in the proposed district, 24, according to the census of 1901, while the unit of population entitling it to a member is at least 1,200. The hon. gentleman, upon some such hearsay, casual information as that, asks us to believe that 150 electors in 1901 have increased to 1,000 or 1,200 in 1905. Let us take the other district, No. 25. According to the same report made by the census commissioner, the total number of whites and half-breeds was 941; total number of Indians, 735; total population, 1,676. If you apply to this also the proportion of electors which we reach by referring to other portions of the province, we would have the number of electors in 1901 at 180 or 185. Now, Sir the position seems very plain. Let us look at the first seven constituencies as proposed by the government, and we will take their own figures in this regard. The constituencies numbered 1 to 7 of the Bill have, according to the statement of the government, a voting population of 10,784, or an average of 1,540. The 11 constituencies numbered from 8 to 18 have a voting population of 13,264, or an average to each constituency of 1,206 electors; and the 7 constituencies 19 to 25 inclusive have a voting population of 5,902, giving an average to each of 843. If you group the whole 25 you have an average of about 1,200. Now let us look for a moment at a comparison of the constituencies 1 to 7, having a voting population of 10,784, and constituencies 19 to 25. If you add 400 for the electors in Athabaska, you have 6,302, representing a difference in the voting population between the first 7 constituencies in the south and the 7 northern constituencies, of no less than 4,482, or equal to a population entitled to 4 members. Well, there may be some justification for that, but for my part, notwithstanding the declamation of the Minister of the Interior, I fail to find any justification for it in anything that has been said by him or by the right hon. gentleman. That is the position as outlined by the government here to-day. The Minister of the Interior himself admits, in effect, that there is nothing beyond these vague statements to which he has called attention to lead us to believe that the population in the north is as great as he claims it to be. That, I repeat once more, is the best possible argument in favour of the motion of my hon. friend from Calgary, that the government should act upon that principle which they laid down in 1899, and should leave the delimitation of these divisions to a tribunal which will have an opportunity and means of making the necessary investigation, in order that justice may be done to all parties in that province.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We stated upon introducing this Bill, and we have repeated it over and over again, that we have endeavoured to obtain some idea of what the population is at the present time in the Northwest Territories for the purposes of this distribution. We have stated that we have taken several sources of information, the vote registered, the vote polled, the census, the post offices, the school districts and the local improvement districts. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) bases the whole of his argument upon two of these sources of information, upon the vote recorded and the vote registered. But, there is another

side to that. He takes the first 11 constituencies——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Seven.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take 11 because that figure is according to my statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am merely referring to what I said.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. In so far as the comparison goes he compared 7 with 7, but I will compare 11 with 11. The first 11 constituencies south of Red Deer recorded a vote in the last election, according to my figures which have not been controverted, of 10,566. I think the figures quoted by my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) are a little different, but the difference is so minute as not to count. On the other hand, the 11 constituencies north of Red Deer only cast 9,555 votes. That is one source of information, and if we were to be guided alone by that the argument of my hon. friend would be unanswerable, he would have the best of it, and we would have to bow. But, as another source of information we take the census. The 11 constituencies to the south which recorded a larger vote than the north in the last election have a population of 31,000, whereas the 11 constituencies in the north have a population of 36,000. Therefore, if there is on one side a preponderance in favour of the south in the vote recorded, there is a preponderance in favour of the north in the number of the population in 1901.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Yesterday I asked the right hon. gentleman if he knew the number of Indians north and south.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I answered that yesterday. I take the census population. I cannot say if it includes Indians or not. Suppose it does include Indians there will be Indians north and south. Suppose it does not include Indians then my hon. friend is answered.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. There are a great many more north than south.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Are there 5,000 more?

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I would not care to say because I am not sure.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. These figures show that after all the difference is not very great, and as far as that goes I do not think there is much of an argument to be based upon it. Let me say to my hon. friend again that in my estimation it is absolutely impossible to do anything with these constituencies in regard to proportion of numbers. I do not think it is possible to apply the principle which it is sought to apply in the Transvaal of having the same number in every constituency, allowing a margin of only ten per cent. In order to bring about that result you will have to cut up the territory like a checker board, irrespective of villages, population, groups and all those things which we have to respect. One of the instructions, if I remember aright, which I quoted to the committee this afternoon, was that the commissioners were to group the population in reference to its character if possible. Let me call the attention of my hon. friends opposite to conditions which have existed at all times in this country. I have here the Parliamentary Companion for 1874 containing a record of the first parliament elected after British Columbia came into the confederation. There were five or six members representing four or five constituencies. The record shows a great variety of conditions prevailing in British Columbia at that time. For instance, the city of Victoria, with a population of 4,540 and 2,925 voters, was given two members. There was the constituency of Yale with a population of 1,316 and 148 votes. That is all it had. The constituency of Cariboo had a population of 1,955 and 359 voters. New Westminster had a population of 1,356 and it had 460 voters. Well, some one may tell me that Yale which had only 148 voters should have been united with some other constituency, just as it is suggested that Athabaska and Peace River should have been united with some other constituencies. But, it would not have been fair to have united it to another constituency and we say that you must give representation to these constituencies in the north and that the only way you can do it is in the way we have suggested.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to call the right hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in discussing the 11 constituencies above Red Deer, I do not think he is taking a fair view of the case. There are 13 constituencies above Red Deer and the 13 constituencies ought to be taken and not the 11 which are above Red Deer. To my mind the whole crux of this matter is these two constituencies of Peace River and Athabaska. The right hon. gentleman compares the north 11 with the south 11 and absolutely ignores these two sections which have so few voters. He has left out Nos. 24 and 25 which really make 13 constituencies above Red Deer with practically no more voters, or only 300 more, than there are, from his statement, in the 11 constituencies.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but the two constituencies of Athabaska and Peace River have never been organized and they have to be left out of the comparison because there never has been an election there. We have been anxious to take everything we could get in order to come to a conclusion. For these 11 constituencies north and south of Red Deer we had recourse to the recorded votes, the registered votes and the population. In Athabaska and Peace River we could not have the recorded votes or the registered votes because there were none. It is impossible to treat Athabaska and

Peace River on the same basis as the other constituencies. The population is not there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is only a small amount of population and because there is a small amount of population shall it go unrepresented? I do not think it is fair at all, any more than it would have been fair to have left the people of Yale in British Columbia unrepresented although they had only 148 voters and less than 1,000 of a population. That is the reason why, if you are going to give representation to these people, there can be no fault found with what we have done. Moreover, may I be permitted to say that if it were not for the fact of this imaginary division which has been introduced in this discussion there would not have been a single man on one side or the other of the House who would have begrudged giving these people representation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As far as I am personally concerned I am very much in favour of Edmonton being the capital of the province, and I have no hesitation in telling the right hon. gentleman that the House and the country will view it as an outrage to give Peace River and Athabaska this representation. Why is he giving representation to Stony Plain with a little bit of a village a few miles out west and an area that will never be settled within the life of any member of this House? We are not giving representation to swamps and plains and mountains; we are giving representation to men. Take Sturgeon, Stony Plain, St. Albert, Peace River and Athabaska and the five of them together have a less population than High River in the south.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Which five do you say ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Stony Plain immediately west of Edmonton ; St. Albert immediately northwest ; Sturgeon immediately northeast; Peace River and Athabaska; the five of them together have less population than has High River, or about the same population as Lethbridge, Rosebud and Calgary. I tell the First Minister that in these two northern ridings, the population such as it is is almost entirely nomadic. The right hon. gentleman may shake his head but that statement is true. More than half these people put down as residents in that country travel up there for trading purposes, but they are registered in Edmonton and vicinity and have their families there, as the Minister of the Interior knows. Many as the outrages are that are perpetrated in this Bill, I am satisfied the people of Canada will consider this one of the blackest of the lot. Take Stony Plain where there is a little settlement, very nice people no doubt, but it is a strange coincidence that the people in High River, Calgary, Lethbridge and Rosebud, who have been brought up under British institutions, with the English constitution drilled into them, the English language their language ; should be hived together and that ridings should be cut and carved up to give over representation to these northern districts where a word of English is scarcely spoken, where men cannot spell the word constitution or understand what it means, and where many of them never knew what a vote was till they came here a couple of years ago. I ask the Prime Minister to look into it and if he has that spirit of fair-play he professes to, he will make a change. I would not object to three of them having representatives, and if one extra member were given to Calgary and one to High River, making three ridings out of the five, there would not be much fault to find, although I am satisfied that if the five were made into two ridings there would be more fair-play in it. So far as there being an imaginary line north and south from Red Deer I care nothing about that. What have we to do with where the capital should be, let them fix that as they like. So far as I am personally concerned I think Edmonton is central and is the proper place for the capital, but what has this House to do tinkering about these matters. Give these people in the south fair-play, let the people of Alberta fix their own capital, and that is all that is required of us in this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me show the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) how far he can be led astray by his own imagination. He proposes that we should give a second member for Calgary and a second member to High River. Now, according to the census High River has a population of 2,472, Calgary has a population of 4,862, Saskatchewan has a population of 6,544 and Strathcona a population of 4,248. If we gave a second member to any of these Saskatchewan or Strathcona would better deserve it than the others. My hon. friend had better consider before he makes such a proposal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The First Minister is giving figures five years old ; I am giving the figures of to-day.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Where did you get them ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. From the returns of your own land inspectors throughout that country and from my own personal observation as well. I can tell the First Minister further that these northern constituencies are not divided properly. Why is Strathcona cut short of Beaver Hills Lake ; why are the settlers to the west side of Beaver Hills Lake not thrown in with Strathcona where they naturally belong ? However, that is a detail. I have given the latest figures obtainable and they tally fairly well with the First Minister's own figures in that respect. As to the census figures I can get them from the Minister of Agriculture, and even they are not correct. Why, down here in the county

of Northumberland the census gives figures as to the shipping of apples when the actual shipments from the railway station are three times as great. The figures which I have here and which the First Minister cannot contradict show the population as I have stated it. At any rate he can make no argument in favour of having these barren northern regions represented. What representation have the people round James Bay in the Ontario legislature ? Look at his own beautiful beloved province of Quebec, and what representation have the people round the shores of James Bay above Lake St. John in the legislature of Quebec ?

Mr. BRODEUR. They are represented.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Not at all. There is not one polling subdivision upon the shores of James Bay, and yet there are more white people living there than are living in Peace River and Athabaska.

Mr. PERLEY. The Minister of the Interior thought fit to make a little merry over the county I represent, and he is welcome to all the comfort he can get from that. He appears to be unable to answer the argument of the figures I gave last night, except by introducing these extraneous matters. It is quite true that there is a discrepancy between city constituencies and rural constituencies, but that has always been the case. The province of Alberta has practically the same conditions all over its extent ; it has a few small towns but no large cities and no great urban populations as we understand it in this part of Canada. The city of Edmonton in the north and Calgary in the south are both small cities compared with the large cities of eastern Canada. But even in the eastern constituencies we have no such discrepancies as the minister would lead us to think. What constituency in this part of Canada has fifteen times as great a voting population as another constituency ? The hon. gentleman proposes to give two members to Athabaska which according to the Prime Minister's own figures has only 342 voters while the town of Calgary with 2,653 voters only gets one member. A voter in Athabaska will have fifteen and a half times as much power as a voter in Calgary. The hon. gentleman further goes on to say there is only 10 per cent difference between the south and the north. That is true according to the figures of the eleven constituencies north and south of Red Deer, but in making the estimate the Minister of the Interior has—I do not know why he did it ; I do not like to say he did it deliberately——

Mr. OLIVER. I did not make it ; I took it from one of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. I did not think it worth my while to make such a foolish argument.

Mr. PERLEY. The Prime Minister has made exactly the same difference of 10 per cent between the eleven constituencies north and south of Red Deer. This comparison cannot be made unless No. 24 and No. 25 are added. Otherwise it is impossible to calculate the average of population as between the south and the north. Now, I wish to say once more that the contention between the two sides of the House is practically with regard to Athabaska and Peace River. If these two constituencies were omitted, the difference between the two sides as to the other twenty-three constituencies would not be very great. Two seats are to be given to this district, where there are only 1,710 half-breeds and white people, which would mean only 342 votes. Why should these 342 voters, 90 per cent of whom are half-breeds, have the right to elect two members of this provincial legislature ? That is practically the whole question.

Mr. SCOTT. What difference whether they are half-breeds or white men ?

Mr. PERLEY. I am not suggesting that the half-breeds should not have equal rights with the whites, but what I want to know is why a half-breed should be given a vote fifteen and a-half times as potent as that of a white man ?

Mr. SCOTT. If there is any man in the Northwest who should be considered as having a special right it is the native. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman so often repeating that so many of these people are half-breeds.

Mr. PERLEY. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Scott) claim that the half-breed has a right to fifteen and a-half times as many votes as a white man ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are as much entitled to it as the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Perley's) constituents are entitled to three and a-half times as much representation in this House as the constituents of the hon. member for St. Antoine, Montreal (Mr. Ames).

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. minister's answer does not apply to the point under consideration. The contention on this side is that the half-breed is entitled to equal rights with the white man, but no more. Once more I wish to point out, as the leader of the opposition has done, that seven northern constituencies have one member for each 892 voters, whereas seven southern constituencies have one member for 1,540 voters. In other words, two constituencies have, in effect, been taken from the people of the south and given to 342 voters in the north.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I know that in a matter of this kind there is great difficulty in arriving at a basis that will be satisfactory all round. I listened with pleasure to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) outlining the policy of the government in marking out these constituencies. I understood him to say two main considerations were population and geographical position

or extent. That is very well; but, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes), it is people that should count and men that should vote. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has asked why there has been no protest against inequalities in other provinces. If he were conversant with provincial affairs in Ontario, he would know that this has been a crying evil for many years, against which there have been numberless protests. At this moment the position is far from satisfactory, especially in the case of the city of Toronto. Toronto is represented in this House and in the local legislature by one member to about 45,000 or 50,000 of population, whereas rural constituencies each represented by a member some times have a population of 15,000. The Prime Minister rises to defend that by stating that the cities cannot be allowed the same representation as a country district. I do not think he made out a very good case; certainly not a case to justify the discrepancy of 400 or 500 per cent. The principle I contend for is that, if there is to be one man one vote, then it should be one vote one value. The Minister of the Interior has spoken of Toronto and Montreal as places whose representation as it is to-day should be protested against. So far as Toronto is concerned, a protest has been made; and Mr. Whitney, I believe, is pledged to remedy the evil in the near future, and that, I think, will be one of the first acts of his administration. Montreal is not quite in the same position as Toronto is. In Montreal a man may vote in every constituency in which he has property. It is possible for a man there to put in five votes. In Ontario a man may be a multi-millionaire, and own property in a dozen constituencies, but he votes only in one. There is inequality, and that inequality is being protested against, and will be protested against until justice is done. These are inequalities that exist. But here, under this Bill, you are establishing these inequalities in a new province. We ought at least to start equal—inequalities will come with time. Some districts will increase in population, while others will not increase, or may even decrease, so that, if changes are not made in the representation, we may find that one voter in a certain district has equal power with five voters in another. This is neither justice nor common sense. If the Minister of the Interior intends to uphold this distribution on grounds of reason, he should start with some principle—population, county boundaries, geographical position or geographical extent. But none of these is laid down, but each is followed as it may suit the views of hon. gentlemen opposite. The First Minister mentioned many considerations that should govern in these matters, but he did not mention the consideration of political complexion. It would be a comfort if we could feel that this was left unconsidered as completely as it has been left unmentioned by the Prime Minister. But we cannot see on what other consideration these constituencies of very small population should appear on this map. We have heard of the fairness of hon. gentlemen opposite. We are glad to learn that they are fair. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) pointed out that there was a conference to which Mr. Haultain was summoned. Mr. Haultain is not here to say what happened. But the Minister of the Interior has told us that the question of the boundary between the provinces occupied nearly the whole time. But what we have to do with here is the boundaries between the ridings. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) tell us that the conference was held, and say that that was the time to protest. The members on this side say that they did not have this before them, and had no chance to protest.

Mr. SCOTT. When the conference was held the delimitation of the boundaries had not even then commenced. One of the purposes of calling the conference by Mr. Haultain, at the suggestion of the First Minister, was to discuss a method for the delimitation of the boundaries.

Mr. HERRON. At what date was that?

Mr. SCOTT. Some time during the week previous to the day the Bills were introduced.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman says there was a conference before these schedules were drawn out. Then that conference never reached the principal business it had in hand. Who finished the business? Who made out these schedules?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Haultain had his conference. I was agreeable to what was suggested and proposed a motion that we should have committees appointed from each of the proposed provinces to take up the matter of preparing the schedules. That motion was not agreed to. Not a single Conservative member in that conference seconded it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Was there a solitary Conservative member at that meeting at that time?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Haultain was there and so was Senator Lougheed. Mr. Haultain called the conference together. He was premier of the Territories. His constituency was the whole Northwest Territories, according to hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BARKER. He was not a member of this House.

Mr. HERRON. Cannot the hon. gentleman give us the date of that meeting?

Mr. SCOTT. As nearly as I can recollect, it was about a week prior to the 21st February.

Mr. HERRON. Were not these schedules made out by the government and submitted to that meeting?

Mr. SCOTT. No; if my hon. friend had been listening to this discussion, he would have known that the boundary lines between the provinces had not been drawn nor had the number of constituencies been settled which each province should have. The First Minister asked Mr. Haultain if he had any suggestion to make with regard to these three points and if he would furnish them to the government: First, with regard to the dividing lines; second, with regard to the number of seats in each legislature; and thirdly, the schedules in each province. Mr. Haultain called his conference, and it was held, but he failed to propose any plan to the First Minister. What then was the government to do? Mr. Haultain had failed, and the First Minister had to take some other method to procure a decision with respect to these several matters.

Mr. LAKE. After listening to all the details of this meeting which we have heard so much about to-day, it appears that this is what took place. A conference was certainly called by Mr. Haultain, but apparently, after a great deal of talk, no decision was come to. Then after all the Conservatives had withdrawn—at any rate Mr. Haultain was not present and the other Conservatives who had been at that meeting were not present—the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) moved this formal motion? By whom was that rejected? Evidently by the Liberal members from the Territories in that meeting. That conference was held in room 48, the room of the Liberal members from the Territories, and quite naturally, after a long conference, the men who did not belong to that room went out one by one. After that, the hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) moved a resolution in accordance with the wishes of his chief, that there should be a conference held by the members of the Territories. That formal motion was rejected and rejected by his own friends. He did not even get a seconder.

Mr. SCOTT. It is perfectly evident from the confessions, not only the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) but of Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) and Alberta (Mr. Herron) that Mr. Haultain took no pains to get them into a conference and obtain their opinion, and consequently he is responsible if the duty fell on the representatives from this side of giving advice to the government with regard to the preparation of these plans.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The hon. gentleman has taken a good deal of time to answer the question I put to him, but he has not touched the main part of it, and that is: Who did this carving up? Who chalked out these ridings? We have heard that a conference was held, but, to quote a great biblical authority, 'the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hand is the hand of Esau.' This map has been carved out in a most wonderful way to suit the views of these hon. gentlemen who support the hon. minister from Edmonton. That hon. gentleman has failed to do justice to the population, because the list he has furnished shows that there are as many as three in one constituency to one in another. Surely if cities are to be considered great centres, such cities as Calgary and Edmonton, with 5,000 of a population each, cannot be called great urban centres. It is nonsense to talk of a hive being created in a district which does not contain 5,000 people. To say that those people are not as well educated or intelligent and should not have as much to say in the conduct of public affairs as those in the surrounding county is absurd. Even admitting that Montreal and Toronto should not be represented according to their population—and I am not saying that they are not entitled to more liberal representation—such small cities as Edmonton and Calgary cannot be considered great centres of population. The hon. member for Western Assiniboia (Mr. Scott) has said that these half-breeds are the best entitled to vote of any people in the district. They are, he says, natives. Let me tell him that they are only half-breeds and that the natives of the country are the Indians; and who deprived the Indians of the franchise so far as they had it? It was not this side of the House. We gave the Indians the franchise the hon. gentleman says the natives should have. The native then is the Indian and the half-breed is only a half native, according to that reasoning, and therefore you are giving to the half what you refuse to the whole. And in that respect the hon. gentleman is certainly putting himself in the hole. I see by this division that the district of Calgary had upwards of 2,000 voters at the last election who voted. There are 2,682 on the list and 2,052 voted, whereas in some of the districts named there are much less. In Stony Plain there are only 584, or a difference of nearly 375 per cent. You have four in Calgary to one in Stony Plain. Surely the hon. minister will not pretend that an inhabitant of Stony Plain is worth four times one in Calgary. I am not as conversant with the country as the hon. gentleman; but so far as I have been able to learn from various inquiries and from having done business in that country for many years, I believe that the residents about Calgary are just as intelligent as any in the western provinces, and I cannot see by what system of reasoning the hon. gentleman can claim that justice is done by this schedule when he gives one

person in one district the same power he gives to four in another. If he wants to be fair, he should either proceed on the basis of territorial division or of representation by population. I contend that representation by population is the only safe course we can possibly take, and that was established as one of the fundamental principles of Liberalism in days gone by. Representation by population is the fairest way for the voice of the country to be heard. If that be the case and if hon. gentleman opposite are prepared to legislate fairly, this House should not be held in session day after day debating this matter. Schedules could be easily prepared which would do justice to these various constituencies and give the honest, intelligent voter the same right and political power in one division that he has in another. That is what this side of the House is contending for.

That is all we on this side are contending for, but I think in all fairness we should protest against this distribution as made here. I understand that the voting white population of the Athabaska district is only about 200. I am not sure that this is the correct figure but it is about that. They have only one post office with a revenue of less than $100 per annum, and still they are going to outweigh some of those districts with a large population, many of them from the older provinces, taking an intelligent view and knowing all about our political institutions, having the same aspirations as the people of the older provinces. I understand that the settlers from the older provinces are largely in the southern districts, whereas the Europeon elements are largely in the north. Without drawing any 'Red Deer' line I wish to point out that in all fairness this should be decided upon the principle of representation by population, and that if there is to be one man one vote that vote should have one value, and having decided on that I think we could very easily draw a plan that would be suitable and agreeable to both sides of the House. I trust that hon. gentlemen will not persist in pushing this matter through in its present form. Let them get both sides together and draw up a schedule that would be fairly satisfactory to all the people concerned. The Minister of the Interior finally stated that he was ready to listen to the views of the west if Mr. Haultain would do his duty, but he was not ready to listen to Mr. Haultain. He would listen to the legislature if Mr. Haultain would call it together. That seems to me a very vain boast. We have these Bills before the House disbanding these legislatures on the 1st of July, not two weeks hence. There are seven vacant seats there now, but the minister claims that Mr. Haultain could get this legislature together, have the seven members elected and obtain their view before the Bill goes into effect on the 1st of July. He knows it is impossible to call that legislature.

Mr. OLIVER. Why ?

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I question much whether, if the views of the legislature are against that division he would take this course, but he makes an impossible suggestion knowing it is impossible for the legislature to meet before this comes into force. He is prepared to ignore Mr. Haultain's views as expressed, and to ignore the views of those concerned and push this matter through, without I think due consideration and without fairness to the political party and to those who are entitled to vote on this question in the great Northwest Territories.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would ask the Prime Minister what real sources of information he has with regard to townships 24 and 25. Peace River contains 769 whites and half-breeds, and Athabaska 941, a total of 1,710, according to the census of 1901. That would probably give about 342 or 350 votes at the present time. The Prime Minister speaks as if this district were in some way distinct from the rest of the province. It has been distinct from the rest of the Territory in the past but it will not be in the future, the imaginary boundary line is obliterated and it is part of the province. The position is that you are giving two members to a portion of the province which in 1901 had only 350 votes. What are the sources of information on which you rely in giving that particular territory two representatives ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The only official information I have with regard to the census is the number of schools there are at present ; I speak of the official information alone. The number of schools was 14. That is the last official information I have, but I understand there are more.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What schools are these, are they around the missions ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Probably they are around the missions. Since the commencement of the session the hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot) has exercised special diligence in order to collect information and he has given information as to the character of the development of that country since 1901. The member for Strathcona stated yesterday evening that in Athabaska there were found to be 24 stores, 13 churches, 7 steamboats, 4 sawmills, 2 or 3 planing mills, 1 flour mill. On the Peace River he stated there was 18 stores, I think, 20 churches, 2 flour mills, 3 or 4 saw-mills, and I think 2 planing mills ; I forget the number of steamboats plying on the river. This goes to show that there is now a nucleus of population. You have there all the primary elements of civilization, churches, schools, stores, mills, and when

you have these things and steamboats plying on the rivers you have the elements of population. What the present population is I have no means of knowing.

Mr. SPROULE. I think we could find from the report of the Department of Indians Affairs how many scholars there are in attendance at each of these schools. I think that would be interesting and valuable information to have.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That information can be obtained, and I should be glad to have it at the next sitting of the House when we take up this matter clause by clause. I have a statement of the school attendance which has been prepared with some pains and is signed by Mr. Caldwell who had a right to sign it. The number of school children attending school north of township 38 in the district of Athabaska is 8,834 and south of that including Red Deer the number of school children in attendance is 8,553, or a difference of nearly 300, in favour of the north.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. That includes the mission schools and all ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That includes the mission schools that receive the allowance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That does not give us much information about the schools in this district. If you can give us the attendance for the whole province, what is the objection to giving us the attendance for this particular unorganized district ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None, except that we have not got it ; we may have it tomorrow.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask the First Minister if the defeated Liberal candidates for Alberta and Calgary were asked their opinion of the division of this province ? Were they summoned in connection with it ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They were not asked for their opinion, they gave it voluntarily.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the minister state whether they approved of the schedule as we have it before us ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I remember right, they thought Calgary has not sufficient representation.

Mr. INGRAM. How about Alberta ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot tell.

Mr. TURRIFF. As regards the defeated candidate for Alberta, he was in town last week, and he told me that he considered the whole redistribution for the province as eminently fair, and he had no objection to make in any shape or form.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to say what Dr. Stewart told him ?

Mr. TURRIFF. As for Dr. Stewart, the defeated candidate for Alberta, all I can say is that I understood he objected.

Mr. INGRAM. The First Minister, in closing his remarks a short time ago, stated that if there was no seat of government to be chosen in the province, we would hear no complaint about the distribution of seats. Now let us apply a little of what I call common sense to the consideration of this question in relation to the distribution for the province of Alberta. Any hon. gentleman who has visited the Northwest Territories, especially the province of Alberta, knows perfectly well that there are strong local jealousies in the several towns of that district. When you are at Calgary the people are to be credited for that spirit, and will tell you they have the finest city and country under the sun and they advocate Calgary as the seat of government. When you pass along to Red Deer they say they have got the finest country, and that Calgary or Edmonton are not in it with Red Deer. So it is when you reach Edmonton. Now they are to be credited for that spirit, and I have no fault to find with it. But knowing that to be true, and knowing that a government seat is to be chosen for the new province of Alberta, it is evident that great efforts will be put forth by the people of these three towns to obtain the government seat. That is common sense, that is perfectly true, and no man can deny it. Now at the time these schedules were to be prepared, in whose hands were they placed ? They were placed in the hands of two gentlemen, one representing Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and the other Strathcona (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. SCOTT. Not at first, but in the hands of Mr. Haultain.

Mr. INGRAM. No. Never mind Mr. Haultain ; he has very little influence with this government. Now these two gentlemen had the preparation of these schedules. We have their own statement as evidence, and do not require any other. Now the hon. gentleman representing Edmonton and the hon. gentleman representing Strathcona knowing the great pull each of these towns would exert in order to get the seat of government, naturally were representing their constituencies and acting in their interest, and in their interest only. Why ? Because the Minister of the Interior at that time was a private member representing Edmonton, and the hon. gentleman representing Strathcona was not representing Alberta or Calgary. As a result, what did the member for Strathcona admit in this House ? Why, he said, I looked over Athabaska, I figured out all these stores, all these mills, the immense amount of capital invested in Athabaska, and I concluded that that portion of Atha-

baska lying north of Alberta should be cut in two and two representatives be given it. By reason of the population? Not at all, but by reason of the immense amount of wealth, as he put it, that was invested in these enterprises in that portion of Athabaska. As a result he concluded, and no doubt Edmonton approved of his conclusion, to cut Athabaska in two and give it two representatives. That is what they did, that was the starting point. Then they said: We will divide the other portions of Alberta into twenty-three districts. That is what they did. Then the next move was this: Calgary polling the largest vote of any place in Alberta, they cut that vote out. Why? Because it was the largest vote polled in Alberta. Then they come up to Edmonton where there was not so large a vote, and they cut that out. In order to do what? To divide that portion of the territory north of Red Deer, township 38 into a certain number of constituencies, according to the number of votes polled less those in Edmonton. And the same rule applied to the south. And it was by these means that the hon. gentlemen put thirteen representatives in the north and twelve in the south. Now if there was no government seat to be chosen these arrangements would have no importance. But they knew there was to be a government seat chosen, and they wished to procure a representation that would decide where the government seat should be situated. And that is what these gentlemen had in view at the time they made this schedule, there is no question about it. Now if the First Minister wanted to be fair, what would he have said? He would have said that previously to the introduction of this Bill on the 21st of February these schedules must be prepared, as the schedules are prepared in connection with every other Bill when it is introduced. But in the preparation of these schedules what course must he pursue in order to do justice to all classes in Alberta? And what would my right hon. friend have said then to the member for Edmonton and the member for Strathcona? You consult with the defeated candidates for Calgary and Alberta, and you four gentlemen between you map out what the different constituencies ought to be in Alberta, and when you do that I will embody it in this Bill and submit it to parliament, and we will have a fair representation, at least one that will be satisfactory to our friends.

But, not so. The Dixie line which my right hon. friend mentioned has been created by his own conduct or that of his friends in the preparation of these schedules and the Dixie line or the Red Deer line will be heard of for many years to come by reason of the way in which these schedules were prepared. What follows from this legislation? We are preparing schedules here for the purposes of an election which will take place within six months of the passage of this Bill. It is our duty and it ought to be the duty of our hon. friends on the other side of the House to provide for a fair representation of the different parts of the province of Alberta as created by this Bill, so that when the representatives of the people meet in the legislature of the new province they can select any place they desire to be the seat of government for all time to come or so long as they feel disposed to continue it at the place decided upon. That would have been the proper course, but that course has not been followed on this occasion and that is what the people of Alberta are complaining of. Apart from my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. McCarthy) what interest has any member of the opposition in the question as to where the seat of government shall be? What interest is it to me whether Edmonton, Medicine Hat, Red Deer or any other place is selected as the government seat? It is of no interest to me but it is of some interest to me to know that the new province shall have no friction created by any legislation passed by this House. A good deal has been said about those newspapers from which quotations have been read. My hon. friend from Calgary quoted some statements made by the Liberal press of Calgary. I can understand that and I shall not be influenced by what the Liberal or the Conservative press says in the city of Calgary because I look upon them as prejudiced and biased witnesses as I do upon the Tory newspaper which is edited in Edmonton, and which has expressed its approval of the distribution which favours the establishment of the government's seat in Edmonton. These newspapers have no influence on me because they are prejudiced witnesses, but it is interesting to note what the press of Medicine Hat, Lethbridge and other places that have no idea of getting the government seat have to say. South of Red Deer the press complain of this division but north of Red Deer the press are satisfied. On the south side there are Liberals and Conservatives opposed to this division because they have not been treated with that spirit of fairness which the right hon. premier ought to have displayed towards them. Does the right hon. gentleman believe that we have no reason for complaint? I believe we have every reason to complain because this is not merely a question of the selection of the government seat. If we are giving these people representation it should be so carefully given to them that no man north or south of Red Deer should have any cause to find fault with the division. If instead of shutting out our Conservative friends entirely they had been given an opportunity of sitting down with the hon. gentlemen opposite we would have come to some conclusion which would have removed all this friction that is liable to continue for years to come. The hon. Minister of the Interior has found fault with Mr. Haultain. He says that Mr. Haultain should have called the assembly together for the

purpose of approving or disapproving of the schedules. I would like to know from any man who would exercise the smallest common sense what he thinks of such a suggestion. The legislative assembly was short some six or seven members. It was expected that on the 1st of July this Bill would become law and that the assembly would cease to exist at that time. I ask any man of common sense if the taxpayers of the Northwest Territories would desire Mr. Haultain to have a general election which costs a large sum of money, to put the people to that inconvenience, for the purpose of determining whether in their opinion the schedules prepared by the Dominion government describing the limits of the constituencies in Alberta are fair or unfair. I know that if I were a large taxpayer in the Northwest Territories and if any man came to me and asked me to cast my vote for the purpose of determining a question of this kind, putting the Territories to a large expense, I would not vote either for that man or any party that sustained him in any such proposition as that. It is an absurd idea. If the government had exercised sufficient care and caution to get their own friends to declare that this division was a proper one and one that meets the views of their own party, if they did not want to give fair-play to this party, the government could have treated the Conservative party with perfect indifference so long as they satisfied their own friends. I am bound to say after all I have heard of this question in this House that it will be many a long year before Alberta will have this friction removed that has been created by this measure. If, after the first six months they had an election and if in Alberta the legislative assembly saw fit to divide up Athabaska and give that small population two seats we could find no fault with them, but I think they are the proper parties to determine a question of that kind and that fair representation should be given to all classes there now in order that this very friction we are complaining of will not occur in that particular section of the country.

I have heard a great deal about the Athabaska and Peace River districts. That is a subject which has been before this House on many occasions. There is a committee of the House of Commons known as the Agriculture Committee, and at no time in the experience of the Committee on Agriculture, at all events, for the last 17 years to my knowledge, has the committee been so disturbed as it was over the question which was raised in regard to the character of the Peace River district. This disturbance was brought about by this very report that has been referred to since this discussion began. A government officer, Mr. Macoun, reported to the Geological Survey in a report dated 1904 the results of the work done by him in the Peace River country in 1903, and there is nothing in the report to justify the extravagant statements made by the hon. member for Strathcona and approved evidently by the right hon. leader of the government itself. There is nothing in that official document to show the statements made by the hon. member for Strathcona to be anything like true statements. The hon. Minister of the Interior admitted himself that there are portions of this country that he had never passed through, that he had no personal knowledge of, but yet he took the opportunity on that occasion to dispute the statements made in this document. So, I say that instead of taking coloured statements, because I believe they are coloured statements that have been made by the hon. member for Strathcona and by the Calgary and Edmonton newspapers, let us take the authority of some person who is not interested, as the hon. member for Strathcona is and as these newspapers are, and if we do that I think we will be able to prepare a fairer schedule than we have before us to-day.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the hon. member for East Assiniboia to say that the pople there were perfectly satisfied with the redistribution.

Mr. TURRIFF. What I said was that the defeated Liberal candidate for the district of Alberta was in the city last week and in conversation he mentioned to me that he considered the whole redistribution of the province of Alberta was eminently fair and satisfactory.

Mr. SPROULE. It would be interesting to read what is said by a genteman who has been travelling through that country on business since last summer, and who has no interest in this question one way or the other. He writes

> I have been talking to hundreds of Liberals regarding the Autonomy Bills and I have not found half a dozen who are satisfied with them. The people in Alberta are dissatisfied with the dividing line of the two provinces, they also want control of their own public lands. Then last but not least there is a big kick about the way the constituencies have been carved up by Frank Oliver so as it will be a sure thing that Edmonton will be made the capital.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Who wrote that?

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. W. J. Whitley, who is now in the Territories and from whom I received this letter the day before yesterday. He has no interest but speaks in a casual way of what he sees from day to day. It is the third letter I have received from him unsolicited. He speaks of the feeling of the people in regard to the educational clauses, the fact that the provinces want their own lands, and other features of the measure. There is apparently widespread discontent in that country because scarcely a letter you get from a resident there does not speak of it. What my correspondent's politics are I do not know;

he does not write from a party point of view, but he speaks of the general discontent among the people and he says that the Reformers are just as much dissatisfied as the Conservatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL. They did not show it in the Edmonton election.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member had better keep quite on that; that is too much comedy.

Mr. HERRON. Before the debate closes I wish to say a few words in connection with the proposed schedules. Although I had something to do in assisting the hon. member for Calgary in preparing the figures, I shall not follow him in his argument, because he, and the hon. members for Montreal and Argenteuil, have placed the results before the House in so convincing a way that it is not necessary for me to speak of them in detail. The figures presented by these gentlemen ought to be sufficient to show this parliament that an injustice is being done to the southern portion of Alberta. I do not believe that the Prime Minister and the Minister of the Interior have any solid foundation for their contention, that the geographical conditions of the north should be taken into consideration as against the greater population of the south. As the Minister of the Interior knows, from 1887 up to last November, almost the whole of the new province of Alberta was represented by one member in this parliament, and the hon. gentleman himself has represented it for the last eight years. If there is a good reason why we should have two members for that northern country to-day, there must be very good reason to say that we have been very badly represented for the last eighteen years. Alberta, which has been represented by one member was certainly far greater in area than the Peace River and Athabaska districts to which it is proposed to give two members in the local assembly. The district of Alberta was something like 450 miles in length and over 300 in width, while the new district is in or about 300 miles square. The industries were just as varied in the old district of Alberta as they can possibly be in the two northern constituencies. One hundred miles north of Edmonton in a district which the Minister of the Interior represents, is chiefly a fur-producing district, Edmonton is an agricultural district and the south was a stock-raising district for a great number of years. If the varied industries afford a good reason why this district should now have two members, it affords the same reason why we were badly represented for the last eighteen years all over Alberta. I was interested last evening to hear the member for Strathcona refer to the industries of Athabaska and Peace River districts. I shall not dispute his figures because I have no statistics to enable me to do so, but at the same time I do think they were very much exaggerated. I am quite satisfied, from the conditions in that country in the early days and judging by the conditions which prevail in mountain and foot-hill countries generally, that the stores to which he referred are in a great many cases not what people down here would consider ordinary places of business. A store in the general acceptance of the word in such a country simply means a settler living by the wayside who may be tweny-five miles from a neighbour and who only keeps articles for trading purposes with travellers who frequent that northern country. It would perhaps be more correct to call these stores trading post. I know also the Hudson bay have posts in that country. I think the hon. gentleman stated last evening that one of these stores represented something like $300,000 of commerce. I suppose it does at certain times of the year, when the furs are coming in. But it is a trading post just the same, and I do not think it indicates much permanent settlement in that country. I do not think the stock interests are very great—in fact, I know they are not. I have not been there for a number of years, but I have information from men who travelled that country and that information is quite as reliable as that of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver.) It is a moving population. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has said that, according to the present regulations of the department, squatters' rights are not protected in unsurveyed territory. The surveyed territory, I believe, extends only about 50 miles from Edmonton. Therefore, the population outside of that limit is not of a permanent characer.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member (Mr. Herron) will pardon me, but, while there is no regulation of the department protecting squatters' rights in this country, squatters' rights are and always have been held to be the best rights a man could have.

Mr. HERRON. That is not borne out by experience in my country. Previous to about 1889, squatters' rights were recognized, but about that time notices were scattered broadcast that they would not be longer protected. I know many cases of people having been removed, and denied redress because of the notice having been given that they were no longer protected.

Mr. OLIVER. Squatters before survey? I think not.

Mr. HERRON. Yes; they are not protected now as they were before 1889. Therefore, I say population in that country is not of a very permanent character. A fair estimate of the number of voters in that northern country would be 250 for each constituency. Compare that with some of the districts in the south. Take, for instance, Cardston, with its great irrigation scheme, in which probably more than $1,000,000

has been invested. We know that that irrigation system is attracting immigrants from the south. It will be seen that neither the voters' list nor the number of votes cast is a fair criterion by which to estimate the population of that section to-day. A large portion of the voters there are on 40-acre plots along the line of the ditch. Then take the district of Lethbridge, in the south, and compare it with Stony Plain, near Edmonton. Lethbridge is a very prosperous town—city, you may say—with a population, probably, of 5,000, and the centre of very large business interests of all kinds. From the coal mines there they have been sending out 2,000 tons of coal daily for years past. The town of Raymond is also in the Lethbridge district. Four years ago there was not a soul where that town now stands with a population of nearly 3,000. It has a sugar refinery that cost over $400,000, and has about it a very large rural and agricultural population. To show that the number of votes cast is not a criterion of poulation in that country, I may say that in the town of Raymond, with a population 2,800, only 113 votes were cast in the last election. It surely is unreasonable to give to Lethbridge and Raymond, with their great agricultural population, only the same representation as is given to Stony Plain, near Edmonton, or to give this district in the south only one member when two members are given to Athabaska. Or take the district of Pincher Creek, in which I live. We have the Crow's Nest pass there, with the town of Frank and its coal mine that sold for over $3,000,000 the other day. That mine is in operation, and has probably $500,000 invested in plant and sends out a large quantity of coal daily. The French camp of Lille is in the pass also. It is another mine, in which probably half a million dollars is invested. The town of Coleman is also in the pass with another great mine, with a plant in which is invested $300,000 or $400,000. Belleview is the name, I believe of another new town with a mine and plant in operation. Besides these there are several smaller mining villages. In addition to all this, there is the agricultural portion of Pincher Creek that will ship this year 500,000 bushels of wheat from the station where I live. There is a population of 10,000 people in the district in which I live, including the Crow's Nest Pass and Pincher Creek. I do not think it fair to say that one member should be sent from that district to the assembly to vote on equal terms with a member from the sparsely settled northern district. I do not think we could give a much better representation to that country than that given by the legislative assembly in 1902. That was immediately after the census. As has been stated here, nine members were given south of Red Deer and six north of Red Deer. And there never were any complaints from the north, so far as I know. That would indicate that that representation was a fairly good one. Then take the redistribution of Dominion seats in 1903, south of the Red Deer there were given two seats and two north. The hon. member for Strathcona (Mr. Peter Talbot) said last night that one-fifth of his district was also south of Red Deer, so that in Dominion representation for one and four-fifths to a district in the north they have two and one-fifth in the south. I think that would be another fair way to estimate the seats in that country. Why, in this distribution, do they give thirteen seats north of Red Deer and only twelve south. I cannot see any good reason why that is done. I cannot see any good reason why Athabaska with only 250 votes should have the same representation as Calgary which has over 10,000 souls. I do not think that any hon. gentleman would say that that is a fair way to represent that large district in the new parliament. Then take the Banff district and look at the interests there, for instance, the Anthracite coal mines. In Canmore, $250,000 are invested in coal mines and in Bank head $800,000. These districts are growing just as rapidly as the northern country. We have been told by some members that we are providing for an increase of population and by others that we are not; but no matter which way you take it, these places are developing as rapidly as that northern country and will develop more rapidly in the future. Therefore, I have yet to see any fair reason why north of Red Deer should have thirteen seats and south of Red Deer only twelve. As regards the grain producing capabilities of the two countries, I see that in the Edmonton district spring wheat averages 16·53 bushels per acre, fall wheat 11·60, oats, 29·70 and barley 24·73. Take Calgary and I find that spring wheat averages 19·04 per acre compared with 16·03 in the Edmonton district; fall wheat 23·40 compared with 11·60; oats 37·41 compared with 29·71 per acre in Edmonton district. In the Macleod district there is still a greater difference. Fall wheat there compares 25·97 bushel with 11·60 in the north, and oats, 34·57 against 29·71 in the north. I take these figures from the geography published recently by the Department of Agriculture. They show that even from an agricultural standpoint, the southern country will rank above the north; and for that reason I do not see why it should not continue to progress in the same proportion. For many years the southern country was supposed to be nothing but a stock country, but in almost every part of it where agriculture has been tried to any extent, it has proved a success. In the district where I live, at one time we thought it would be impossible for a farmer to make a living from his farm, yet to-day we find it the most prosperous farming country pro-

bably in the Dominion. For the last five or six years, we have raised the best crops grown anywhere in the country, either wheat, oats, barley or potatoes or in fact vegetables of almost any kind. So that I do not see any reason why our southern country should not be considered a first-class country, likely to go ahead in the future even more rapidly than any part of the northern country referred to. As regards schools, it is well known that in a stock country, the stock men evade the school tax in every way possible. That is easily understood by any one who understands the conditions under which these men live. There would be a large area covered by one of the stockmen, and the odd settlers who would go in there would naturally try to establish a school district. Eight children are sufficient to form a school district, but the stockmen would have to pay the bulk of the taxes and naturally would oppose the establishment of schools, and therefore they did their best to keep out small farmers who would settle on 160 acres each. They discouraged the schools and drove the small settlers into the town where their children could get schooling. That is one reason why there are not so many schools in the southern country as in the north. The local improvement districts are practically in the same position. A lot of farmers living together would rather turn out and do their own work with their own teams in their spare time in the month of June, than contribute $2.50 to the general treasury. Whereas on the other hand the stockmen, who do not use teams very much, would naturally prefer to contribute to the general assembly at Regina, and every one in the Northwest has the option of either paying to the local improvement district at Regina or forming a local district. I think eight men, or about that number, can form a local district and do their own work if they see fit to do so. You can see from what I have said that the local improvement districts are not a very good ground for saying that there is more population in the north than in the south; neither do the post offices form a good index of population. The Minister of the Interior represented our district for the last eight years and I think he was more kind to the people of the north than to the south and for that reason there are more post offices in the north than in the south, although there is not so large a population. Many of our people have to go from ten to twenty miles for their mail. I have been asking this session for post offices in districts where there are a dozen families in a settlement who have to travel seven or eight miles for their mail, but my applications have been refused with the statement that it was impossible to establish post offices for that number of people. That I say is a good reason why post offices are not a good guide in which to estimate a basis of representation. The minister said it was

men who voted and not money or cattle. I claim that we have both men and the money in the south; we have a larger population and more invested, proportionately, than they have in the north country. That is not a reason why the northern people should not have an equitable proportion of representation, but under these conditions they should not have more representation in the north; it should be equal. The Minister of the Interior and the member for Assiniboia have said that the Northwest Territories assembly should have been called together and have the feeling of the people of the Northwest put on record with reference to these new constituencies. The reasons for not calling that legislature have been made clear to this House. There were seven vacant seats in the assembly, and the assembly held its annual session a year ago. The Northwest assembly received money from here as a sort of gift annually in the form of estimates, each item assigned to a special service. I suppose the estimate of last year was taken in the usual form and was used by the ordinary session last year. As soon as the session was over these men resigned. In the first place there was no money to hold the by-elections and I do not suppose there was anything provided wherewith to hold a session of parliament. That I think is a good reason why the assembly was not called. Then it was well known or anticipated from the time parliament met and the Bill was introduced that the powers of the legislative assembly would cease on July 1st. We in the Territories, including Mr. Haultain, were expecting that we would eventually get justice in that country, and I have no doubt he was fighting and living in hope that we would get the same justice in the south. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) say that my opponent was in favour of this distribution of the seats. The Board of Trade of Lethbridge has condemned it in the strongest terms possible, and I believe they have sent a protest to the First Minister. More than that the gentleman in the Lethbridge district who was looking for the nomination there and who I believe was nominated, received the nomination strictly on condition that he would oppose these Bills. He had to give that promise before he could get the nomination, and he is a Liberal supporting this government.

Mr. OLIVER. Has the hon. gentleman heard any objection from Macleod or Pincher Creek?

Mr. HERRON. I have had protests made to me personally and I think I can produce resolutions of the Board of Trade of Macleod.

Mr. OLIVER. And this Bill gives Macleod two members when it only had one by the redistribution of two years ago!

Mr. HERRON. I acknowledge we have two, but I think you will admit we were entitled to them.

Mr. OLIVER. So you were before but you did not get them.

Mr. HERRON. We were trusting and we were entitled to it five years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. You had to wait for this Bill to get justice.

Mr. HERRON. We are getting partial justice now.

Mr. AMES. Has the minister read the Macleod 'Gazette' of May 18 and the Pincher Creek 'Rocky Mountain Echo' on this question ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not.

Mr. AMES. He will there find all the protest he wants.

Mr. OLIVER. What I have already said to the House will show how reasonable those protests are, when they are getting twice the representation under this that they had before.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The population is increasing.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether he has acted on exactly the same basis in the distribution of seats in Saskatchewan as in the distribution of seats in Alberta ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend that the object is to have regard to geographical distribution of population.

Mr. LAKE. I understood the Prime Minister yesterday to say that the policy was to employ as the greatest test the census of 1901 and to use the population of 1901. Would that be the main principle guiding that distribution in Saskatchewan ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, I think not ; all the sources of information that were used in Alberta would be used also for Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAKE. The strongest reason given for the distribution in Saskatchewan was the number of votes cast in the election of November, 1903, that number having preference over the number of voters on the list. That was the main principle applied in Alberta, and I presume exactly the same principle has been applied in Saskatchewan. I suppose there can be no question about that. Two seats are given to that portion of Athabaska which has been added to the province of Alberta. I understood the Prime Minister to say that the principal reason in his mind for giving two seats to that district was the great distances between the settlements which made it physically impossible for one man to cover the whole district and to properly represent it. Could I have an answer to that question ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My information was that the information in each district was confined to the river shores, and the population was on the river. The chief centres of population in both districts are on the river.

Mr. LAKE. How far were the rivers apart ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say.

Mr. OLIVER. Between the settlement at Lesser Slave lake and the settlement at Peace River, which is the nearest point at which they approach until they finally join, the distance is between 90 and 100 miles, and from that they diverge to a distance of about 200 miles apart, and finally they come together after a considerable distance.

Mr. LAKE. I ask this question to call attention to the fact among the electoral districts of the legislative assembly we have had one district electing a single member which I think would comprise a greater area than the settlements in the district of Athabaska, to which it is proposed now to give two members. I speak of the district of Kinistino, which, roughly speaking, is over 300 miles from east to west and about 210 miles from north to south. But there has been no difficulty in holding an election for that district. It had 682 votes cast at the last election, a larger number than I think will be cast in these two constituencies in Athabaska at the first election for the new legislature, probably twice as many. I do not know what map the Prime Minister has before him, but I notice that in most of the maps which have been supplied by this government the old distribution of seats was given, which does not contain the district of Kinistino as it exists at present. The old maps give the old distribution which was in force before 1902, when a redistribution was made by the legislative assembly. I have one of the new maps, and I can assure him that the figures I have given as to the distance are practically correct. There has been no practical difficulty in that large district. The polls were held at very extreme distances, and the proclamation, I think, had to be delayed for a fortnight before all the returns could be obtained.

Mr. LAMONT. Would the hon. gentleman wish us to understand that in Kinistino the election was held at the same time in all the polling divisions ?

Mr. LAKE. I have no doubt the election was held on the same day in all of them.

Mr. LAMONT. They were not. The distances are so great in the Kinistino district that in some of the polling divisions

the elections were held two weeks after the elections in some of the others.

Mr. LAKE. Still that does not alter the fact that we had a very large district, as large no doubt as the new district which it is now proposed to divide into two. The Prime Minister has stated that the whole dispute over the distribution of seats in the province of Alberta was due to the rivalry btween the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAKE. Hon. members who endorse that statement, I presume, mean to convey their opinion that Edmonton is the proper place for the capital of the new province. More than that I take their endorsation to mean an endorsation of the attempt that is being made to force that opinion upon the people of the new province, who should be free to make the choice for themselves. But I may say that is not the reason which causes me to offer strong opposition to this distribution. The figures given by the Prime Minister himself are sufficient to convince me, and I think will be sufficient to convince any man who looks at this question from an independent point of view, that there is an unfair distribution of seats, even taking the votes cast as a basis, which I do not consider is a fair basis at all. But even taking that basis, which the Prime Minister considers the fairest, we find he is giving to the northern seats 10 per cent more representation than to the southern seats. And taking the basis of the names on the voters' list, he is giving to the northern portion of Alberta an advantage of 22 per cent over the seats in the southern portion, dividing the line near Red Deer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What if you take the population according to the census of 1901 ?

Mr. LAKE. If the hon. gentleman will pin his faith to the census of 1901 all through, well and good ; let him apply it to Saskatchewan as well, and he will find where it will lead him.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will see about that at the proper time.

Mr. LAKE. Will the Prime Minister say now that he will make the distribution in Saskatchewan on the basis of the census of 1901 ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will take that along with the registered vote of 1901 and the school districts, all will be taken into consideration, as in the case of Alberta.

Mr. LAKE. That would mean giving the strongest weight to the points which are in his favour.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like to make a test of the matter. Would he offer to distribute Alberta on the basis of the census ?

Mr. LAKE. I do not accept the position for one moment that the census of 1901 is a fair basis for the distribution of seats at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. Then don't ask that it shall be applied to Saskatchewan.

Mr. LAKE. I did not ask for it. I said that if the Prime Minister wished to take that as a basis in Alberta, he should be consistent and apply it to Saskatchewan. But I say it is an absolutely unfair basis, and you might as well distribute the seats for the Yukon elections on the basis of the population of 1894.

Mr. OLIVER. Because the hon. gentleman thinks this is unfair he refuses to take it in the old part of Alberta and accepts it unreservedly in the new part of Athabaska.

Mr. LAKE. I did not accept it unreservedly in any case. I have not stated that I have accepted it unreservedly in Athabaska. In the speeches that I have made on this subject I have never made an estimate of the population of Athabaska except to state my belief that the votes cast in these two districts will be less than the votes which were cast in the district of Kinistino in the last territorial election. The right hon. Prime Minister has stated that it is almost impossible to distribute the populaton between these different seats within a 10 per cent margin. I cannot see that impossibility at all. I think there is no difficulty in the matter. At any rate I say it is unfair to have the balance always on one side. If there is any difficulty in distributing the population within 10 or 20 per cent we ought to see that general average is evened up. There may be constituencies in the south that are higher than the average and constituencies in the south that are lower than the average. Then, there may be constituencies in the north which will work out in the same way, some higher and some lower. Let there be give and take on both sides so as to make a distribution as between north and south that is fairer than this distribution. Do not give the advantage all to one side. I consider that the only fair basis at which we can arrive. Do not give the advantage to the north of a representation 22 per cent over the representation which you are giving to the south, and in addition to giving to the north an advantage of 22 per cent add two seats in the district of Athabaska which, in my opinion, can be very well added to existing districts in the northern part of Alberta.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. gentleman complain that the rural districts in the northern part of Alberta are smaller in population than those in the south?

Mr. LAKE. I am quite willing to take the right hon. Prime Minister's own figures which show that there is a smaller voting population in the northern part of Alberta than there is in the southern part.

Mr. OLIVER. The vote cast in the whole province of Alberta outside of the cities south of the new district of Saskatchewan, partly south and partly north of the Saskatchewan river, was 1,168.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. gentleman is taking an isolated case again. If you average it up you will see the unfairness of this distribution. It is well known there are variations and I have stated that if you will take these variations and average them fairly between the north and the south it is a different question altogether. On the very face of this question and in view of the figures which have been presented to the committee I say this it an unfair distribution and that is why I am opposed to it. It is not because I think Calgary would make a better capital than Edmonton. I have not expressed my views upon that point because I do not think I have any right as a member of this House, nor do I think that any member of this House has the right to dictate to the people of Alberta where their capital shall be.

Mr. INGRAM. Will the hon. Minister of the Interior tell me how the area of Edmonton that he now represents compares with the area of the two constituencies in Athabaska and Peace River ?

Mr. OLIVER. I should say that the area of the Edmonton district would be approximately one-fourth of the area of the district of Athabaska, or the area of the Dominion electoral district would be about one-half of the area of the district of Athabaska.

Mr. INGRAM. Do the polling subdivisions that are located in Edmonton cover a greater area than the polling subdivisions there would be in Athabaska and Peace River ?

Mr. OLIVER. In one way they do not, and in another way they do. In Athabaska the polling divisions in each proposed district would be in a continuous line along the river. The distance between the extreme east and the extreme west polling division in the Edmonton district is about 250 miles, roughly speaking, whereas the distance between the polling subdivisions at Lesser Slave Lake and at Smith Portage, which would be the most northerly part of the proposed Athabaska division, in a direct line would be about 350 or 400 miles but by river, which is the only means of communication, it would be 150 miles more.

Mr. INGRAM. So that the polling divisions in Athabaska and Peace River would be more convenient than in Edmonton, because in Edmonton they are more scattered?

Mr. OLIVER. If the distance were not greater they would be more convenient, but the distance is greater.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the hon. gentleman give us the shortest period of time within which an election could be held by the Northwest government in this area ?

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend will remember that the hon. member for Saskatchewan has already stated that there are polling divisions in the local district of Kinistino where the polls cannot be held at the same time as the general polls throughout the territory. These polls have to be postponed from ten days to two weeks beyond the ordinary time, but the time between nomination and election is ten days. Three weeks would be the shortest possible time, leaving out the extreme polls in Kinistino.

House divided on amendment (Mr. M. S. McCarthy).

Amendment negatived—Nays 70. Yeas 32.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the section carry ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I presume it will be discussed item by item. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may say to the right hon. gentleman that I have another amendment to move, and it is very desirable we should adjourn now after working nine hours. I shall hand my right hon. friend a copy of the amendment this evening or to-morrow morning in order that he may have notice.

Progress reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose we will continue with this same matter to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

INDEX

FIRST SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1905.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques. Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5114 ; (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii); (distribution of seats) 8740 (v).

Western Life Insurance Co.'s Incorp. B. 108, 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4684 (iii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4375; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7960 (iv).

Bay of Quinte, Lighthouse *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).

Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).

Immigration Association in Prince Edward County (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7706 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection for Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1205 (i).

SUPPLY :

Immigration (interpreters) 7706 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (life-saving awards) 2624 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c., (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual Saving, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Inspection *re* (remaks) in Com. of Sup., 1723 (i).

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

Alberta Steam Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ques.) 6904 (iv).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Claims of Damages, Amounts paid (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) 7021 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4504 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8006 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7789, 7829, 7880, 7930, 7951 (iv).

Bissonnette, vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).

British American Fish Corporation, Contract *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2897 (ii).

Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).

Butter in Cold Storage, Shipped by Allan SS. Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).

'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Collision, Resignation of Capt. Salmon, (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

———'Statement of Case', (M. for ret.*) 2067.

———(remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).

Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
——— Quantity and Price (Ques.) 914 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Amt. Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Dental Institute: *See* 'Franking Privilege'.
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c. (Ques.) 7422 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Distribution, Rep. *re* Frauds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Fort William Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars from Dental Institute (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1807 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2620 (ii).
——— circular *re* supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
See 'Marine.'
Grain Survey Board, Recommendation from Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1763 (i).
——— Toronto and Montreal, Appnmts. *re*, Names, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).
Hamilton Cove, Que., P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ques.) 7421 (iv).
Harbour Buoys, Contracts with Companies *re* Placing, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission (Ques.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund (remarks) in Com of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Immigration Arrangements for a Refund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leased by Govt. (Ques.) 913 (i).
'Lady Laurier' Govt. Str., Repairs *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2752 (ii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Montreal, Purchase of Site, &c (Ques.) 915 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure, &c, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1849 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* private Tenders, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4753 (iii).
See 'Govt.,' &c.
Molson's Bank Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 317; in Com., 1755 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members (Ques.) 150 (i).
Montreal, Free Port, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Removal of Shoals, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept., *re* (M.) for copies, 689 (i).
——— Steel Sheds, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
——— Steel Freight Sheds, Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green *re* Plan, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).
——— Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
——— (Ques.) 687 (i)
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Pneumatic System, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1135, 1136 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i)
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Naval Militia, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
Ocean and River Service, Removing Obstruction, &c. (Ques.) 151 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2540 (ii).
Protection to Women, Children, Pet. *re* Wife Beaters and Criminal Code (Ques.) 591 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt by Govt., (Ques.) 152 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies, Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange (read) 7178 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2482 (ii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

——— Aids to Navigation, 2858; Res. of Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2859 (ii).

——— Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2461 (ii).

St. Louis, Capt., Reinstatement, Certificate *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c. (M. for cor.) 384 (i).

See 'Canada,' &c.

Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Leases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).

Seamen's Act Amt. B: 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Purchase of Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2486 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (Act violations, &c.) 1723 (i).

Canals—Trent (dredge engine) 9381 (v).

Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2905; (inspectors' salaries) 2890 (ii).

Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6401 (iv), 9323 (v).

Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7230 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705; (aids to navigation) 2758, 2858; (buoy contracts) 2742; (engineers' salaries) 2761; lightships, maintenance) 2706 ; (Marconi stations) 2869; (pilotage) 2760; (salaries) 2703 ; (submarine signals) 2877 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Canada) 881; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7088, 7178 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2687 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv).

Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6472; (examination of masters and mates) 2623; (govt. steamers) 2596; (icebreakers) 6464; (steamers, maintenance) 6464; (wrecks investigations) 6466 (iv).

Penitentiaries—(contract supplies) 479 ; (general expenditure) 476 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.W.T. (Strathcona Horse barraks) 1637; Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1136 (i); (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Meteghan) 7413; (Port Hood) 7414; (West Arichat) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chicoutimi) 7377; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Doucet's Landing) 6850, 7299; (East Templeton wharf) 7303 ; (Grand Machins) 7304 ; (Grande Piles dam) 7329 ; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Little Pabos) 7307; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmorency wharf) 7312; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312 ; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (harbour works) 6727; (Repentigny wharf) 7314; (Rimouski pier) 7320 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2461 (ii); (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6447 (iv); (St. Mary's current) 814 (i); (St. Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385; (Indiantown branch) 9482; Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. investigation) 9382 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7216 (iv).

Trading Stamp Abolition, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 726 (i).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

Yukon Ter. Reforms, on M. (Mr. Thompson) to M. for Sup., 7041 (iv).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2437 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5486; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4767 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) 7729; (lands vested in Crown) 5986 (iv).

——— School Clause Amts.(remarks) in Com., 5867 (iii).

Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (renarks) in Com. of Sup., 6252 (iv).

Bell, Dr., and Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9305 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1073 (i).

Cold Storage, *re* Atlantic Steamers on M. for Sup., 8183 (v).

——— Thermograph Records, &c. (Ques.) 2774 (ii).

Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 7677 (iv).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv) .

Galena Oil Co., President's Name, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Geological Reports, Distribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sep., 9621 (v).

Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c. (Ans.) 1344 (i).

Grimsby, Establishment of Farm, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).

House of Commons, High Temperature, Regulation of (remarks) 9303 (v).

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2233 (ii).
——— Purchases *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).
Jams, Preserves, &c., Adulteration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
Kitchen, Mr., Contract for Murray Harbour Branch Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Mail Subsidies, &c., Total Vote (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9617 (v).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., Inquiry for, 9395 (v).
Oils for Illuminating Purposes, Testing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7617 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1322 (i).
Railway Commissioners B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1619 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections (M.) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2082 (ii).
St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion (Ques.) 2774 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 338 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1701, 1710 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c (exhibitions) 6273 ; (experimental farms) 6166 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294; (Mill street paving) 6301 (iv).
Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289; St. Peters (dredging) 6303; Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9374 (v) : (lowering floor of lock) 6302 ; (surveys) 6292 (iv).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 1231 (i) ; (long level deepening) 6291 (iv) ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1322 (i).
Civil Govt. —Interior (mines branch) 6265 (iv).
Customs (collectors' salaries) 409 (i).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9261 (v) ; (inspectors salaries, &c.) 6419 ; (maps, printing, &c.) 6426; (surveys, maps, &c) 6406 (iv).
Legislation—H. of C. (telephone evidence translation) 9621 (v).
Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (elevator attendance) 1667 ; (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (lighting) 1667; (Royal Mint) 609; (steel shelving) 1564; (telephones) 1669 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Grand Bend) 7553 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620; (Ottawa river works) 7613 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (N.W.T., Battle river) 7590; (Bryson) 7586; (colonization roads) 7594; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7608; N.W.T. (working expenses) 7633; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 2314 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287, 2298 (ii), 9498 (v); P.E.I. (agents' houses) 2180; (Murray Harbour and bridge) 2138 (ii).
Thermograph Records, Cold Storage on Steamers, &c (M. for ret.*) 2778 (ii).
See 'Cold Storage.'
Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 717, 1774 (i).
Ventilation in House of Commons, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9211 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml., *East Hamilton.*
Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 739 (i).
Auditor General's Resignation and Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6529 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9659; 9671 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5354; (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5616, 5635 (iii); (Crown Lands) 8173; (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8052 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7774, 7953 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5769; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5751 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6006 (iv); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5932; (Lt. Gov.'s powers) in Com., 5782 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7173 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (Rupert's Land) 8864 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, sec. 12 (distribution of seats) in Com., 8750; (Rupert's Land) Amt. 8761 (v).
Ballot Box Frauds, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4237; on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadians detained at U.S. Borders, Letter (read) 5920 (iii).
Circulars issued by Mr. Cote *re* Census Returns (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1098 (i).
Coal for Govt. Rys., from N. S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4267 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972 (iii).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 805 (i).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8687 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2106, 3212 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6609 (iv).
Fishing Leases granted to F. H. Markey, in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2903 (ii).
Gillies Brothers Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4123, 4205; on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 7853 (iv).
G.T. Pacific, &c., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. Act (Ques.) 2776 (ii).
——— Terminals, Plans deposited with Dept. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret. 2822, 2825 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Shell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
House of Commons, Supplies, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6615 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8678 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4194 (iii); in Com., 6152, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 69 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1956 (i).
——— Reply to Financial Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7446, 7467 (iv.).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c., in Com. of Sup., 9506 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Manufactures, Quotation from 'Industrial Canada' (read) 6654 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 521 (i).
Locomotives built and purchased for I.C.Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1966 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) 4023 (ii).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal : in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2135, 2165 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9478 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
Ontario Boundaries Extension, Cor. with Ross Govt., Inquiry for, 3590, 4078 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2716 (ii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 4969, 5738 (iii).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Pitblado, Isaac, Relief (B. 185) 1°*, 7906 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Bowman & Conmee's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4472, 4667 (iii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1292 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7590 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3236 (ii).
——— (express companies) Amt B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 521; in Com. on Res., 580 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Instructions, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instruction *re* Dom. Elections (M. for copies*) 697 (i).
——— Instruction *re* Form of Oaths, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Seamen's Act B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7434 (iv).

Barker, Mr. Saml.—*Con.*
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1204 (i).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9346 (v).
Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8683 (v).
Submarine Signalling Bells: in Com. of Sup., 2874, 2885 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Patent Record) 1473 (i).
Canals—Galops (enlargement) 1220 (i) ; Trent (Holland river) 9360 ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1292; (surveys) 1234 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (salaries) 79; Privy Council (salaries) 72; Sec. of State (salaries) 76 (i).
Customs (expenses) 262 (i).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2885 (ii).
House of Commons (Sergeant-at-Arms, salaries) 6610 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517, 6520 ; Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; (seed grain) 6516 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7515 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2729 (ii); (lighthouse repairs) 6638 (iv); (submarine signals) 2874 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 981 (i).
Miscellaneous (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2645 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Glace Bay) 1035; (Halifax, Dom. building) 1037; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney P.O.) 1045; Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607; Que. (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Grosse Isle) 1108 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers Generally (dredging) 805 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Baddeck) 7396; (Bridgewater) 7398; (Carlos Breakwater) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree) 7410 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7550; (Hamilton harbour) 7556; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Otonabee River) 7564; (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564; (Spanish river) 7565 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391 ; (St. François de Sales) 7391 ; (St. Fulgence) 7392 ; (St. Louis Feeders) 7385 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges (Dom. colonization roads) 7601 ; (traffic bridges) 7592 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings, &c.) 1970 (i); (bridge strengthening) 9386 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 ; (capital expenditure) 1956 (i); (double tracking) 9390; (engine houses) 9389 (v); (general vote) 7446, 7467 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977 (i); (Moncton accommodation) 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v) ; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 9501 (v); (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986; (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2041, 2135 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4686 (iii).
Woodi'll, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ques.) 2191 (ii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3921 (ii); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5933 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518; on M. for 3° on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8837 (v).
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8992 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1001; in Com., 644 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 9081 (v).
Citizens' Bank of Canada (B. 133) 1°*, 4271 (iii); in Com., 5973 (iv).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Dredges, Hiring, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp *re* Documents, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii), 5963, 6834, 6961 (iv).
House of Commons, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 1568 (i).
Immigrants, Number arriving in 1904, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Jams, &c., Adultaration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1712 (i).
Lump-jaw in Cattle (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9470 (v).
Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com of Sup., 471 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages sent to Postmasters, Cor., &c. (read) 6834 (iv).
See 'Franking', &c.
——— Packages, Inquiry for, 6961 (iv).
Proyl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1167 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 595 (i).
Shelburne P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Spirits in Bond, Age, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1700 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (experimental farms) 6166; (bulletins) 6928 (iv); (Year Book) 1475 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Dom. Lands (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Excise (methylated spirits) 1691; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Canals Celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (International Congress, Reception at Quebec) 9622 (v).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, maintenance) 2618; (schools of navigation) 2640 (ii); (winter mail service) 6467 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 471 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i); N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); N.S. (Shelburne) 1043 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9544 (v); (H. of C. improvements) 1568; (Printing Bureau, addition) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall, grounds) 9551 (v); (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Collingwood) 7549; (Little Current) 7560; (Midland) 7561; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7561 (iv), 9600 (v); (Penetanguishene) 7563 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602 (v); (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (McPherson's cove) 1735 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Maskinongé river) 6842.
Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838; (William's Head) 1841 (i).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695.
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (standards) 1695 (i).
Telephone System, Investigation, &c., on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2684.
Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal.'

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4395 (iii).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3906 (ii).
Maple Product, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 1340 (i).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3498 (ii); in Com. (school clause amt.) 7160 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8298; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8570 (v).
See 'Manitoba.'
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9739 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor. O. C's., &c., *re* Dismissal (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
House of Commons, Duties of Clerks *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 98) 1°*, 2043; in Com., 2770 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
L'Union St. Joseph du Canada incorp. (B. 151) Pet. presented, 2490, 2491 (ii); 1°*, 5783 (iii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv.)
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (remarks) 4015 (ii).
Militia Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c. (Ques.) 7019 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i); in Com., 2533, 2537, 2958, 3199; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3395 (ii).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A.—*Con.*
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 2005 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 4968 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 570 (i).
'Renegade Liberals,' &c., Ref. to in speech on Autonomy Bill, 3527 (ii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employes, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 8655 (v).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6596 (iv).
Treadgold Concessions, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7085 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5262 (iii) ; (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6033 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2576 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 541 ; Cor. (read) 543 ; Tel. (read) 546 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3586 (ii).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 457 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 650 (i).
Coal Contracts *re* Penitentiaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coldwater and Lowering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1848(i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ques.) 6653 (iv).
Collingwood Public Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman, Dredging Contract *re* Port Arthur and Ft. William, Advertisements for Tenders, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
See 'Ft. William,' 'Dredges,' &c., 'Port 'Arthur,' &c.
Dredges built by Govt. at Toronto (remarks) 2456 (ii.
Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 5425 (iii).
Dredges imported and Entries at Customs (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 5595 (iii).
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
Exchequer Court Judgeship, Appnmt. of (remarks) 5209 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
See 'Conmee,' &c.
Gas Plant at Parry Sound, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (iv).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6479 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Grand Trunk Railway Co.s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii).
Hope Island Timber Cutting, Inquiry for Papers, 2759 (ii).
I.C.R., Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658, 6666 (iv).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. of as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).
Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
McCraney, Mr., Charges *re* Frauds *re* Census (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 650 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3968 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6808 (iv).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c. (Ques.) 5428 (iii).
——— Protest *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9557 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— on Statement of Dep. Min. (remarks) 2853 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5591 (iii).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) 2725 (ii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Owner's Name, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Penitentiaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 479 (i).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender (M.) to adjn., 4645, 4676 (iii.)
——— Advertisement for Tender, &c. (M.) to adjn., 4458 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

Postal Service, Patronage *re* Boots for Mail Carriers (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).

Pound Net Licenses issued (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Commissioners (appnmt. of chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 541 (i).

Sbaretti : *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.

'Sequin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9361; (surveys) 9356 (v).

Dom. Lands (Banff Park Waterworks) 9306 (v).

Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2730; (gas lights) 2725 (ii).

Pentitentiaries (Kingston) 477 (i).

Post Office (mail service) 9611 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (St. Boniface) 9549 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 ; (Saskatoon) 9550 (v).

Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (Neepawa) 9549; (Orillia) 9549; (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (post office fittings) 9551 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. Battery Point) 9552 ; (Phinney's Cove) 9557 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Crowe's Landing) 9600; (Honora wharf) 9597 ; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597 ; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Rama wharf) 9602; (Rosseau wharf) 9600 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Anse à l'Ilot) 9591 ; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Grande Rivière de Beaupré) 9592; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592; (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2456 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i); (Indiantown branch) 9482 (v).

Thessalon Postmaster, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6227 (iv).

Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ques.) 2191 (ii).

Watson, Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).

Waverly Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ques.) 5427 (iii).

——— (remarks) 5807 (iii).

Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*

Acetylene Gas Invention of Mr. Painchaud, *re* Safety (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 197) 1°*, 9179 (v).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co., on M. (Mr. Gallihier) to present Pet., 4550 (iii).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Atlas, Samples furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

Audit Act Amt., Govtl. Intention (remarks) 6112 (iv).

Auditor General's Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 97 (i).

Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5443, 5480 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3462 (ii); (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5601 (iii); (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language 8547, 8568 (v); (school clause amt.) 7134 (iv); 8387 (v); (Senate representation) 5675 (iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) Schools, 8831; Neg. (Y. 7; N. 138) 8832 (v).

Autonomy Bill Circular, signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, Printing, &c. (remarks) 3009 (ii).

See 'Sbaretti,' 'Saskatchewan.'

Banking Act Amendment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 607 (i).

——— (remarks) 6112 (iv).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6254 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* procuring for Electric Lighting, &c. (Ques.) 1504 (i).

——— utilization of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Waterways, Opening of Feeders: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).

Bic Wharf, Purchase of Land from P. Ross, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).

Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).

Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Work, &c. (Ques.) 7096 (iv).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).

Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).

Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6847 (iv).

Château Richer, Public Works, Dates of Payment, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).

——— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt. (remarks) 1015 (i)

Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6576 (iv).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9429 (v).

Curran Bridge and Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to on Nixon Charges, 8142 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Translation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Divorce Bills, Vote *re*, &c. (personal explanation) 6377, 6405, 6571 (iv).
Doutre, Mr. Alex., Dismissal and Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Edmonton Electoral District, Galician Vote, &c. (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv),
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., Before Commissioners, Montreal (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Canada Co.'s incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
First Minister's Salary, B. 201 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9790 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* (remarks) 8776 (v).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Franchise Act Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9199 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c. (Ques.) 3937 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9399 (v).
G.T.P. Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent (remarks) 699 (i).
G.T.P. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626 (iv).
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c., (Ques.) 1063 (i).
Harbour Commissions, Control of by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) on M. for 3°, 6377 (iv).
House of Commons, Accommodation, Doorkeepers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret. 3204 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 7421 (iv).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9794 (v).
Lachine Canals, Nuisances of Whistles, &c. (remarks) 9284 (v).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 207 (i).
Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 5137 (iii).
Library of Parliament, Enlargement of Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3202 (ii).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McGill University, School of Transportation, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4052 (ii).
Marconi Stations in Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ques.) 7097 (iv).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv).
Militia Officers, and Independence of Parlt. Act, Suggested Amt. (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ques.) 5315 (iii).
'Montcalm,' Str., Experiments *re* Icebreaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).
Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Buildings Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
——— Rep. of Supt. of Health (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8142 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322 (v).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Concentration of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).
Pearson, Geo., Relief B. 153 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 7623 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6948 (iv).
'Protestant School', Ref. to Mr. Fielding's Speech, 3482 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Depts., Line of Demarcation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
Public Works under Contracts, Supervision, Drawback (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., 771 (i).
Railways Act (Govt.) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members (M.) 7249 (iv).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iv).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Francois and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ques.) 1504 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Charges *re* 'J. I. Tarte' Dredge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2463 (ii).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Saskatchewan B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
Sbaretti's, M'gr., Explanation *re* Man. Boundaries, Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishop of Quebec (read) 4053 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Sorel Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 794 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Dom. exhibitions, B.C.) 9608 (v).
Adulteration of Food (patent medicines) 1725 (i).
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 9381 (v).
Canals—Lachine (Côte St Paul bridge) 6294 (iv) ; (electric appliances) 9354 (v); (enlargement) 6295 ; (Hanault, O. L., payments) 6299 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301 ; (power house flume) 6299 ; (repairs) 6306 (iv) ; (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v) ; (wall underpinning) 6298 ; (widening tailrace) 6299 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).
Canals—Trent (staff on dams) 9383 (v).
Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92 ; (Aud. General's Dept. (salaries) 77, 91 ; Finance (salaries) 119 ; (High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Justice (fees, witnesses and jurors) 135 (i) ; Post Office (contingencies) 6247 (iv) ; (salaries) 95 ; Public Works (salaries) 94 (i) ; Sec. of State (Civil Service Examiners) 6249 (iv); (purchase of books) 75 (i).
Customs—(contingent expenses, &c.) 256 ; Yukon (living allowances) 411 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).
Fisheries ('Petrel,' protection service) 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey (salaries) 9249 (v).
House of Commons (contingencies) 250 ; (debates) 239 (i) ; (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i) ; (sessional clerks) 6597; Library (books) 6944 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv).
Indians (land management fund) 236 ; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 225; Quebec (Oka band) 235; (St. Regis lockup) 237 (i).
Justice—Yukon (court fees, &c.) 137; (judges' allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6897, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (revolving lights) 2704 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948 (i).
Marine Hospitals (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv); (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Advisory Board) 436 (i); (permanent force) 9110 (v); (Royal Military college) 7000 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7276 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (hydrographic surveys) 6625 (iv).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 467 (i).
Pensions (Fenian Raid) 6956; (Militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (Compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Gallery) 6628; (inspector W. A. Cairns' salary) 6629; (mail service) 6629 (iv); (ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735; N.B. (Richibucto) 6731 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv).
Public Buildings, Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9544 (v); (Archives) 603 (i); (elevators) 9551 (v); (museum) 765; (Royal Mint) 606 (i).
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i), 6734 (iv); (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1114; (Magog) 1114; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal P. O. pneumatic system) 1135; (St. John's) 1143; (Valleyfield) 1144 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838; (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6839; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 787; Que. (Anse aux Beaufils) 7285; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Anse St. Jean) 7286; (Baie des Peres, Lake Temiscamingue) 7287; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287; (Bic wharf) 7288; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Chateauguay dredging) 6847, 7322; (Chateau Richer) 7290; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307; (Desjardins wharf) 7298; (Doucet's Landing) 6849, 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7301; (Fraserville harbour) 7323; (Gatineau Point) 7303; (Grand Piles dam) 7327 (iv); (Que. harbour improvements) 770 (i), 6724 (iv); (Isle St. Therese) 7376; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306; (Little Rapids dam) 6839 (iv); (Louise embankment) 770 (i); (Magdalen Islands) 7308; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Mistook wharf) 7310; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency Falls) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Nicolet pier) 7313; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314; (Ottawa river) 7376; (Peel Head bay) 7314; (Riviere du Lievre) 7325; (Riviere du Loup) 7325; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatiere) 7390; (Ste Famille wharf) 7390; (St. Fidele) 7391; (St. Francois, Orleans) 7391; (St. Francis de Sales) 7392; (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2463 (ii); (St. Louis river) 7379; (St. Louis river feeders) 7381; (St. Maurice dredging) 6851, 7326; (Saguenay dredging) 7377; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Terrebonne) 7394; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (balances, &c.) 7629; (clerical assistance) 7626; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895; (technical books) 7627; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Battle river) 7588; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7630 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (J. C. Taché, special service) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2287 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 9384; Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9381 (v).
Senate (contingencies) 6620 (iv).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).

Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal Code'.

Uniforms for Letter Carriers. Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Uniforms for Militia, Rules *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696, 9544 (v).

Yukon Customs Officials, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Yukon, Reforms *re* Condition of Govering, &c. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7066 (iv).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*

Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

American Currency circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 2°, 4360 (iii).

Bills from the Senate (M.) to place on Orders, 9278 (v).

Canadian Agency (B. 77) 1°*, 1671 (i); in Com., 9077; M. to ref. back to Banking and Commerce Com., 9078 (v).

Embargo on Canadian Cattle in G.B., on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Committee, 9003 (v).

Bickerdike, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 162 (i).

St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5109 (iii);

——— Edmonton Election (remarks) in Com., 5893 (iii).

——— Ref. to Speech *re* 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (remarks) in Com. on B., 5901 (iii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 106) 1°*, 2184 (ii); in Com., 4971; 3° m., 5113 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).

G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2390 (ii).

Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6657 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1717 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1361 (i).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., on Res., 737 (i), 2416; in Com., 2848 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3284 (ii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5997; (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6096 (iv).

——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5820 (iii).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Pen. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 485 (i).

Canada Eastern and I.C.R., Accounts *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9007 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 997; in Com. on B., 634, 1069 (i).

Census Enumerators, Appnmt of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).

Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1229 (i).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Corry Block, Rental paid by Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6821 (iv).

Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 804 (i).

Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).

Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6505 (iv).

Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ques.) 9697 (v).

Glanders, Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4218 (iii).

Halifax and Esquimalt Garrisons, Defence of by Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9115 (v).

Immigration, Contract with North Atlantic Trading Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).

Immigration Literature, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).

Indians, Medical Inspection, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).

I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2237 (ii).

——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).

Lumber for Govt. Use, Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident *re*, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2852 (ii).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6770 (iv).

Marconi Wireless Tel. System, on Govt. Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).

Marine Insurance, Reduction of Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2143 (ii).

North Hastings Census Enumerator, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2051 (ii).

Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ques.) 1504 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8686 (v).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4662 (iii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6877 (iv).

Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ques.) 8656 (v).

Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 1326 (i).

Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).

Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Poultry, Experimental, on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 303 (i).

Railway Commission Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1524, 1537 (i).

——— Report (remarks) 6139 (iv).

——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. (Ques.) 687 (i).

Royal Mint, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 608 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1169 (i) ; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1884 (i).

Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i) ; (experimental farms) 6183 ; (experimental farms bulletins) 6927 ; (live stock records) 6686 (iv) ; (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).

Canals—Lachine (electric installation) 1240 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 1508 ; (ditigation) 1523 ; (repairs) &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234 ; (electric plant) 1231 ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1326 ; (stone protection) 1498 ; (surveys) 1520 (i).

Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv).

Fisheries (fishery commission) 9173 (v) ; (inspectors' salaries) 2878 (ii).

Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671 (v).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 6392, 7693 ; (contingencies) 7710 ; (interpreters) 7705 (iv).

Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556 ; (medical attendance) 6555 ; (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6537 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6517 ; (salaries) 6516 (iv).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6515 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6899, 6955 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2865 (ii).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (wrecking plant) 958 (i).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6513 (iv); (permanent force) 9115 (v); (transports, &c) 6513 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2609 (ii); (ice breakers, repairs) 9304 (v); (life-saving stations) 2635 (ii).

Penitentiaries (Kingston) 477; (parole system) 469 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Vancouver) 1642 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1648 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1018; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont.—(Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1557; (Owen Sound) 9548 (v); (St. Mary's) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579 ; (Toronto P.O., pneumatic tube system) 1591 (i).

Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (improvements) 9549 (v); (museum) 755 ; (post office reconstruction) 1573 (i); (rents) 6821 (iv); (Royal Mint) 608; (telephones) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1111 ; (Levis) 1112 ; (Magog) 1114 (i).

Public Works—Dredging—General (vessel repairs) 7576; (P.E.I. plant) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson, &c. lakes) 7573 ; (Columbia river) 7574 ; (Fraser channel) 7574 ; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7574; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud cove) 7500 ; (Petit Rocher) 7500 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Frude's Point) 9582; (Glace Bay) 9578 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Cobourg 7549; (Collingwood) 6880, 7550; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Grand river dredging) 6873 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Meaford) 7560; (Newcastle pier) 7561 (iv) ; (Oshawa harbour) 9600 (v); (Owen Sound harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv); (Port Arthur) 799 (i); (Rama wharf) 9602 (v); (repairs, &c.) 7555; (Sarnia) 7564 (iv); (Saugeen) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Chateau Richer) 7295; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (East Templeton) 7303 (iv) ; (Grosse Isle) 1109 (i); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6460 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6840 ; (Magdalen Islands) 7309; (Maskinonge river dredging) 6846; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6452 ; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6852 (iv).

Public Works — Telegraph Lines — B.C. (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle-Edmonton) 9604; Que. (Descente des Femmes) 9604 (v); Yukon (Ashcroft and Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Quarantine (cattle) 6690; conc., 6917 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (book-keeping, &c.) 1928; (locomotives) 1964 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6429 (iv); (Memramock accommodation) 1977; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1970; (steel rails) 1996 (i), 2038 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (extra clerks) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance, &c.) 1537 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2695 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9039 (v).
Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7718 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).
Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
Year-Book Statistics, &c (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Bland, Mr. L. T., *North Bruce.*

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Kincardine) 7558; (Saugeen) 7565; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5497 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4784 (iii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co's (B. 56) 1°* 985 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 450 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. (B. 82) 1°*, 1745 (i); in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768 (ii).
Half-breed Scrip, Charges, &c. (personal explanation) 7812 (iv).
Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1241 (i).
Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ques.) 379 (i).
Northern Bank (B. 104) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2047 (ii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Militia and Defence) Kings, N.S.

Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Armouries, Construction of Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).
Cadets, Equipping and Practice, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9119 (v).
Camps of Instructions, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).
Cavalry Corps, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9126 (v).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Control by Can. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1403 (i).
——— Possession by Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).
Halifax and Esquimalt Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9678 (v).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Highland Cadet Corps, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 7814 (iv).
Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Judge Advocate General, Appmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 425 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6660 (iv).
——— Charges of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9710 (v).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 271 (i).
London Drill Hall, Sale of old Site (Ans.) 8384 (v).
London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) in Connection with London Election, 7251 (iv).
——— Telegrams (read) 7331 (iv).
Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medical Officers *re* Militia Districts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Militia Council, Appnmts. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 415, 416 (i).
——— Constitution, Duties, &c. (regulations read) 420 (i).
——— Memoranda, &c., Papers laid on Table, 9073 (v).
——— Memorandum *re* General Policy, Quotations (read) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).
Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs (Ans.) 5687 (iii).
Military School, Selection of Site (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7010 (iv).
Military Sites, Armouries, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).
Military Training Camp, Central, Site, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).
——— Camp at South Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (prop. res.) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6984; 2° m., 7263 (iv); on M. for 2°, 9179, 9195 (v).
Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1650 (i).
Militia, Canadian Garrisons, Defence of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9107 (v).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4549 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Militia Estimates, Delay in bringing down, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9099 (v).
——— General Statement : in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of (explanation) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Reduction of, (Ans.) 7019 (iv).
Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ans.) 8886 (v).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
Militia Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number, &c. (Ans.) 5315 (iii).
Miltimore, J. M., Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ans.) 6384 (iv).
Minnedosa Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ans.) 909 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ans.) 5977 (iv).
See 'Militia Act (B. 170).'
Portland Cement, Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Erection of Tank on Plains of Abraham (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Royal Military College Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 169), prop. res., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°*, 6984 ; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Military College Graduates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9118 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ans) 266 (i).
S. A. Veterans and King's Medals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9160 (v).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Militia (contingencies) 9068 ; (salaries) 9067 (v).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv) ; (armoury, Montreal) 9161 (v) ; (arsenal) 445 (i), 6513, 7012 (iv), 9170 ; (Esquimalt) 9170; (general statement) 9105 ; (Louisbourg Fort) 9170 (v) ; (pay and allowance) 415 (i), 6510 (iv) ; (permanent force) 9113 (v); (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i) ; (Royal Military College) 7000 (v), 9170 (v) ; (stores) 6513 (iv) ; (surveys) 439 (i) ; (transport, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1650 (i).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Toronto Drill Shed, in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ans.) 5132 (iii).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Partl. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, O.*
'Agnes Donahue,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 1507 (i), 6106 (iv).
Alberta, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 69.'
Allan SS. Co. Cold Storage System, Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 877 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Ry. Accommodation, Application *re* Wharf Connection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property (remarks) *re* Cor.. 1068 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i), 2440 (ii).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9666 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Mr. McDougall to Sec. of State (read) 4271 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 1151 (i).
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1459 (i) ; on M. for 2°, 2926, 2963 (ii) ; (amt.) 2979 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5400 (iii), 8092 (v).
——— on M. for Com., 5423 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5435, 5485, 5498 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 ; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946; (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii) ; Amt., 8526; (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8557, 8627 (v) ; (C.P.R. lands) 6062 (iv); (distribution of seats) Amt., 8004, 8011 (v); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7917 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5810; (H. of C. representation) in Com., 5752; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5955 (iii), 8169 (v); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171, 8260 (v); (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 5813, 5931 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 (v); (legislative assembly) 5815; readjustment of representation) in Com., 5753 (iii); (school clause amt.) 7103 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8389, 8420; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8285, (amt.) 8292; (seat of govt.) 8248 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5675 (iii).
——— on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Edmonton city) 8161; (Gleichen) 8153; (Lacombe) 8156; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150; (Macleod) 8150; (Medicine Hat) 8148; (Peace River) 8163; (Pincher

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy for Alberta, B. 69—*Con.*
Creek) 8153; (Ponoka) 8156; (Red Deer) 8155; (St. Albert) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Strathcona) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. lands, 8793 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, 8796; Amt. (schools) 8804, Neg. (Y. 41; N. 109) 8816 (v).
Autonomy for Saskatchewan B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 2°, 5424 (iii); (amt.) 8698; Neg. (Y. 37; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res., 8701 (v).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 8704, 8739; (laws, courts, &c.) 8759; (schools) Amt., 8759, 8884; (Senate representation) in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).
——— in Com. *re* Schedules (Moosejaw) 8758 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Alberta Boundaries, Population *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5919 (iii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Mr. Bulyea's Interview *re* Subsidies to Rys, &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).
——— Census of Town and Rural Population, &c., Inquiry for Estimates, 8092 (v).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re* (remarks) 2192 (ii).
——— Debate *re* Absence, &c (personal explanation) 2043 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736, 6836 (iv).
——— Edmonton Election and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country (remarks) 5886 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Min., on M. for Sup., 2493 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Rets. (remarks) 2594 (ii).
——— Meridian Divisional Line (remarks) 8635 (v).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Papers *re*, Inquiry for, 3008 (ii).
——— Responsibility, &c. (remarks) 2321 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, &c., Denial *re* Charge, 2570 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
——— Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
——— conference *re* boundaries (remarks) 8268 (v).
——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 5423, 5815 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 4750 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5474 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Change, Explanation *re* (remarks) 5673 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— printing, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).
——— School Clause, on Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5985 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5840; Quotations from Regina 'Leader, 5851 (iii).
See 'Manitoba,' 'Orangemen,' 'N.W.T.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9219 (v).
Banking Act Amendment, Legislation *re* (remarks) 2441 (ii).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Committee, 8652 (v).
Brunet, Mr., Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Budget, The, Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 4920 (iii).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9735 (v).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies, and Absence of Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3362 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re*, 4085. 4201 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 736 (i).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4690 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9779 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemptions, Interpretations *re* (Ans.) 731 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8987 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 1013; in Com., 625, 1080, 1469 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions 631 (i).
Census in Man. and N.W.T., Taking of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1080 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042, 2109 (ii).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202 (v).
——— Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* (remarks) 874 (i).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6580 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Colonial Conference, Par. in Montreal 'Star' *re* Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7098 (iv).

Colonial Stock Act and Provincial Trust Investments, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).

——— Inquiry for, 9540 (v).

Commerical Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9037 (v).

Committees, Sel., Com., Addition of Name (remarks) 624 (i).

——— Appnmt. of Mr. Bristol (remarks) 5210 (iii).

Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).

Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'

Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property (remarks) *re* Cor., 1068 (i).

Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9075; in Com., 9411; on M. for 3°, 9524 (v).

Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).

——— Rep. of Com. and Internal Economy (remarks) 9802 (v).

Demers, L. J., M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).

Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Allan SS., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 888 (i).

Dobey : *See* 'Thessalon.'

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).

Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. (B. 189) 1° m., 8775 (v).

——— (issue of writ) Amt. (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Dom. Elections Act Amt. Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9812 (v).

Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations, on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9787 (v).

Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).

Easter Adjournment (remarks) 4375 (iii).

——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5892 (iii).

Election of Members to Vacant Constituencies (B. 194) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9094 (v).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1400 (i), 3205 (ii).

Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).

First Minister's Salary (B. 201) in Com. on Res., 9726 (v).

Fiscal Year, Change of Date to March 31 (remarks) in Discussion of Estimates, 9095 (v).

Fishery Inspectors, N.S., Delay in appointing (remarks) 9687 (v).

Fisheries Protection Service, Neglect of Overseers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).

Fog Horn Nuisance at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).

Fort Lawrence, N.S., Pier, Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 5034 (iii).

Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 2113 (ii), 9198 (v).

Franking Privilege, Use of Stamp, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii).

Geological Survey Director, Delay in appointing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6485 (iv).

Gillies Brothers, Limited B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).

Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2609 (ii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649, 3880 (ii), 4126, 4202 ; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).

G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9529 (v).

G.T.P. Ry. B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7623, 7625 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).

——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* (remarks) 6134 (iv).

Guarantee Bonds : *See* 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Half-breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8529 (v).

Half-breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6504 (iv).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6566 (iv).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Halifax Garrisons, Explanation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax and Esquimalt, Naval Stations, Continuance of (remarks) 9677 (v).
——— Control by Canada (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1404 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax, New Public Building, Contract *re*, in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Inquiry for, 4552 (iii).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations B. 120 (Mr. Logan) in Com., 9700 (v).
——— (remarks) *re* Bill, 8177 (v).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Indian Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re*, Inquiry for Copy, 8178 (v).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks) 9690 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4187 (iii) ; in Com., 6139, 7584 (iv).
I.C.R., Appointments, *re* Train Service, of unworthy Persons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9520 (v).
——— Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation of Min of Rys., 6119 (iv).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
——— Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel. (read) 695 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Mr. Oliver as Minister (remarks) 4201 (iii).
Internal Economy Committee (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7914 (iv).
——— Treaty, Inquiry for 8385 (v).
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) Act Amt. B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742, 9750 ; in Com., 9794 ; on Amt., 9797 (v).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of, Appmnts, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv), 8002 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Property (remarks) 6661, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Steamer, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2600 (ii).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9082 (v).
Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, and in Com., 5136 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253, 7331 (v).
See 'McKenzie,' &c.
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2756 (ii).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Indian School Teacher, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6514 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8477 (v).
Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Ret. Officers, Special Officers (remarks) 1336 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate School Question, by Mgr. Sbaretti, 3848 (ii).
——— Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's, Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4843 (iii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3938 (ii).
——— Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, 'Race and Religious Cry', Charges by Mr. Paterson (reply) 4037 (ii).
——— Reply to O.C. of March 21st, 1905, from Man. Govt. (remarks) 3744 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba Election Returns, Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1405 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers (remarks) 1506 (i), 4678 (iii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays, &c., Cor., &c. (read) 9789 (v).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) 9800, 9810 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualification as Members of H. of C., Cor. asked for, 8997 (v).
Militiamen at London, Elections, Voting, &c. (remarks) 7253, 7331 (iv).
Ministerial Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position, &c. (remarks) 1336 (i).
See 'Cabinet'.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (remarks) *re* Question, 696 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2153 (ii).
Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6224 (iv).
Nixon, Robt., Charges against (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9323 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9448 (v).
——— Tel. *re* Contract, &c. (remarks) 8182 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2324 (ii).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) in Com. (amt.) 8769; Amt. (agents) 8770; Amt. *re* Govt. employees, 8771 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8764; in Com., 8765; on M. for 3°, 9408 (iv).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog,' Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8354 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2545, 3172, 3191; (amts.) 3199, 3201 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 8652 (v).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6135 (iv).
Papal Ablegate: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5798 (iii).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9036 (v).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee and Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4476, 4670 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4673 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Fog Alarms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System, and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 1394 (i).
Prorogation, Date of, &c. (remarks) 9790, 9811 (v).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7589 (iv).
Public Works Minister, Resignation of, &c. (remarks) *re* Rumour, 5035 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Railways and Canals Dept., Dep. Minister, Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of, Cor. *re* (read) 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5011 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
Returning Officers, for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for, 1336 (i).
Rets. and Repts., &c., Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances *re* Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Sbarretti, Mgr.: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
'Scotia,' Str., I.C.R., Certificates of Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8385 (v).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2116 (ii).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv), 9031 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1162, 1187 (i).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re*, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
Seymour, D. G., Complaints *re* obtaining Homestead Patent (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9033 (v).
——— Complaints *re* Location of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9294 (v).
Ships' Safety B. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 731 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341, 9587; on Senate Amts., 9815 (v).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*

Statutes Revision, Completion of (remarks) 745 (i).

——— Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against by Mr. Roche, M.P. (letter read) 9613 (v).

Supply B. 206 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9801 (v).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing road) 9378 (v).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i).

Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9367 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1327; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1231; (surveys) 1236 (i).

Civil Govt.—Interior (salary increases) 9070; Public Works (salaries) 9071; Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9065; Sec. of State (salaries) 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).

Customs (remission of duties *re* army and navy goods) 6724, 6813 (iv).

Dom. Lands (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 ; Mines Branch (smelting ores) 9303; Miscellaneous (maps, &c.) 9308 (v).

Excise (contingencies) 6724 (iv).

Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dogfish experiments) 9173; (fish curing) 9173; (fishery commission) 9172 (v); (inspectors' disbursements) 6632 (iv).

Geological Surveys, (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).

Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).

Immigration (seed grain supply) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. judges) 9683 ; (N.W.T. judges) 9683 ; (Three Rivers judgeship) 9682 (v) ; Miscellaneous (litigation matters) 7247 (iv).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7544 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2759 (ii); ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v); (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii); (ice boats) 9177 (v); (lighthouse repairs) 6641 (iv) 9036 ; (light-keepers' salaries) 9176 (v) (lightships maintenance) 2708 (ii); (NW.M. Police patrol boat) 9178 (v); (pilotage) 2760; (signal service) 2760 (ii); (wrecking plant. Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 897 (i). 9681 (v) ; (G.B. and Canada) 865 : (Manchester Line) 932; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 928 ; (St. John and Halifax) 923 ; (St. John and Minas) 926 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 7192 (iv), 8691 (v) ; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906 ; (wrecking plant) 960 (i).

Marine (hospitals) 9172 (naval militia) 9178 (v) (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 6512 (iv); (depots) 9114 (v); pay and allowance) 6510 (iv);; (permanent force) 9127, 9155 (v).

Miscellaneous (Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v) ; (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv), 8673 (v) ; (printing &c.) 6723 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence) 9616; (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8658 ; (Yukon) 8665 (v).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2600; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv); (ice-breakers, repairs) 9035 (v); (meteorological service) 2679; (schools of navigation 2640 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849, 1021; (Halifax detention building) 1037 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c., (H. of C.) 9546 (v).

Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 ; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours anad Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7395; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Clark's Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9578 (v); (Inverness Mines) 7403; (Judique) 7407; (Larry's River) 7407; (Mahone Bay) 7408; (Margaree) 7411; (Meteghan) 7413; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 ; (Scott's Bay) 7416 ; (Victoria Beach) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Collingwood) 7549 (iv) ; (Port Arthur) 784 : (Port Colborne) 815 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448, 2466 (ii) ; (St. Lawrence channel, suction dredge) 6437 (iv) ; (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation, &c. (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 7611 ; (cement testing) 7613 ; (Ottawa river survey) 7612 ; (surveys) 7611 ; (transportation commission) 7628 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592 ; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587 ; (colonization roads) 7595 ; Ottawa (repairs) 7585 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).

Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630 ; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 ; (Vancouver, Salt Springs) 7610 ; Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 ; N.W.T. (Edmonton and Qu'Appelle) 7633 ; (working expenses) 7633 ; P.E.I. (working expenses) 7632 ; Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (v).

Public Works—Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293 ; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii), 7496 (iv); (terminals, &c.) 9500 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9387 (v) ; (double tracking) 2027 (ii), 9391 (v) ; (expenditures) 2219 (ii) ; (general vote) 7476 (iv); (Halifax deep water dredging) 2026 ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (rolling stock) 9520 (v) ; (St. Lambert, &c., double tracking) 2183 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2153 (ii), 8692 (v).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (v).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacant Judgeship, Delay *re* Appnmt. (remarks) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).
Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5317 (iii).
Telegraph Lines in Can., Total Mileage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster Dismissal, Investigation, &c. (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6652 (iv).
——— Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6209, 6221 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3203 (ii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653, 4683; on M. for 3°, 4965 (iii).
Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt. (remarks) 2303 (ii).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).
——— Personnel and Duties, &c. (remarks) 9679 (v).
——— Progress, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
——— Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).
——— Rep. *re* C.A. Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).
See 'G.T.P.', &c.
Treadgold Concessions Inquiry, Instructions to Commissioners (remarks) 7101 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1379 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Union Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 702, 918 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8650; on M. for 3°, 8824 (v).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6048 (iv).
Voters' List *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8674; in Com., 9410; on Sen. Amts,. 9816 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).
Wire Fencing, Contract *re* Erection of, N.W.T. Boundary Line, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5692 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 5808, 5961 (iii).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Wireless Telegraph Regulations B. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9032 (v).
Worthington, Col., Militia Allowance and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., Cor., &c (read) 9149 (v).
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
Yukon Commissioner, Vacancy and Appnmt. (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Yukon Election, Cor. (read) *re* Ret. Officer, 1254 (i).
——— Delay in Opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 987 (i).
——— Ret. of Member (remarks) *re* Telegrams, 1066 (i).
——— Returning Officer, Information *re* (remarks) 1152 (i).
Yukon Territory Orders-in-Council, on prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 (v).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035, 7081 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Autonomy for Alberta, Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3252 (ii); (B. N. A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8581 (v).
——— in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7141 (iv), 8299; (Amt.) 8341; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8426, 8464; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8522 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8835; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8813; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8845; Amt. to Amt. dual language, 8845 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) Debate in Com. on School Clause (personal explanation) 7175 (iv).
——— on M. for 3° (personal explanation) *re* Not Voting, 8865 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools, 3863 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 3986, 4066 (ii).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) 1250 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 4433 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2581 (ii).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6255 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 537 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. by Govt. at Sault Ste. Marie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074, 1099 (i).
Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal from Thessalon Post Office (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii), *See* 'Thessalon.'
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Ft. William Station, Plans *re* deposited with Ry. Dept. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Request *re* Investigation of (Ques.) 5479 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans of Terminals, Copies Deposited in Ry. Dept. (M. for ret.) 917 (i), 2816, 2836 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. (Ques.) 1064 (i).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6658 (iv).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Cos., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1151 (i).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6279, 6357 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ques.) 6476 (iv).
Municipal Telephone System, Present Status of Port Arthur and Fort William Application (Ques.) 595 (i).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1*, 2184 ; in Com., 2772 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462, 4465 (iii).
——— Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Application *re* Telephones (Ques.) 595 (i).
——— Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners (M. for copy) 1386, 1391 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2203, 2685 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners, Appnmt. of Chairman. B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 537 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1407 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock, Construction, Total Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1189, 1791 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1873 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303 (iv); Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335, 1406 (i); Welland (claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Acton Vale) 1106 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blind River dredging) 6870; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Sault Ste. Marie harbour) 6881 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (steel rails, &c.) 1995 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1253 (i).
Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c., Ques. wthdrn., 6105 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ques.) 6105 (iv).
——— (M. for cor.) 3202 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. to adjn., 6649 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants, Inquiry for 6239 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Algoma East and West, &c., Revision, &c. (Ques.) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instructions, &c. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5169 (iii).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 6653 (iv).

Brabazon, Mr. G. H., *Pontiac.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c. (Ques.) 192 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden to M. for 2°, 5140 (iii).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2430 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4846; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5537 (iii).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 699 (i).
Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ques.) 7096 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* (remarks) 280 (i).

Broder, Mr. A.—*Con.*
'Scout,' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c) 9490 (v).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c. (Ques.) 4809 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Rouville.*
Adulteration of Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1711 (i).
Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5211 (iii) ; in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) (dual language) 8558, 8599 (v) ; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7131 (iv) ; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8333 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8393; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).
Beauharnois Canal, Waterways, Opening Waterways, &c.; in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Bout de l'Isle, Repentigny and Charlemagne Ferry Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).
Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049; in Com., 9077 (v).
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).
Cast Iron, Furnished Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ans.) 2328 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4265 ; on M. for 3°, 5139 (iii).
Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
Debates, Official, and Internal Economy Com., Reps. *re* (remarks) 9802 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4975 (iii).
Election Officers : *See* 'Returning.'
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration from Ireland and Scotland (Ans.) 586 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, N.B., Number of Fish, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 590 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1760 (i).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9398 (v).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4202 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7302 (iv).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments (Ans.) 585 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Ret., 3204 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. (B. 176) 1° m., 7421 (iv); in Com., 8676; on Sen. Amts., 9411 (v).
Inland Revenue Dept., Rep. (presented) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).
Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ans.) 584 (i).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* (Ans.) 584 (i).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6352 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Mgr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3985 (ii).
Maple Products, Adulteration of (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ans.) 2329 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, &c., Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).
Montreal P.O., St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) 1°*, 7906 (iv).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order *re* Relevancy of Debate, on Ms. to adjn. (remarks) 4673 (iii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 582 (i).
Ry. Debts : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7355 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge Dispute, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
St. Louis, Certificate *re* Reinstatement (Ans.) 591 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 582 (i).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 368 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9586; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v).

Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699 (i).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v).

Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs officers) 1689 (i); (contingencies) 6724 (iv); (Frechette, L. A., translation) 1690 ; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (methylated spirits, purchase) 1690; preventive service) 1688; (provisional allowances, B.C., &c.) 1690 ; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).

Legislation (voters' lists) 6954 (iv).

Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 7626 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284; (St. John drill hall) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Anderson Lake) 7573; (Arrow Head) 7574; (Chilliwack) 7573 ; (Columbia river) 7573 ; (Fraser channel) 7574; (Golden) 7574; (Langley) 7575; (Revelstoke) 7573; (Salmon river) 7575 ; (Thompson river) 7575; (Victoria) 7576; (Williams Head) 7576 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Gimli wharf) 7573 ; (Lake Dauphin) 7569; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573; (White Mud) 7573; (Winnipegosis) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 ; (Chance harbour) 7497; (Clifton breakwater) 7497; (Dipper harbour 7498; (Durham wharf) 7498 (Great Salmon breakwater) 7498 ; (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Petit Rocher) 7500; (Pointe du Chene) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Richibucto pier) 7501; (St. John harbour) 7503; (St. John tributaries) 7501; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple river) 7396; (Baddeck) 7396; (Barachois) 7396; (Bass river) 7397; (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397; (Bear Cove) 7397; (Beckerton) 7397; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Bridgewater dredging) 7398; (Broad Cove) 7398; (Canning wharf) 7402; (Carlos breakwater) 7398; (Chezzetcook) 7402; (Clark's harbour) 7398; (Country harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden breakwater) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby Pier) 7402; (Eel river) 7407; (Freeport) 7402; (Gabarus) 7402; (Georgeville) 7402; (Harrigan cove) 7403; (Indian Harbour) 7403; (Inverness Mines harbour) 7403; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (Judique) 7407; (L'Ardoise) 7407 ; (Larry's river) 7407 ; (Litchfield) 7407; (Little Brook) 7407;

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

(Lunenburg) 7408 ; (Mabou bridge) 7408 ; (Main-a-Dieu) 7409; (Mahone bay) 7408; (Malignant Cove) 7409: (Margaree Harbour) 7409; (Margaretville) 7412; (Meteghan cove) 7413 ; (Mill cove) 7413 ; (New Campbellton) 7413; (Newport) 7413; (Noel wharf) 7413: (Ogden's Pond) 7414; (Pembroke breakwater) 7414; (Pleasant bay) 7414; (Plympton) 7414; (Port Greville) 7414; (Port Hood) 7414; (Port La Tour) 7415; (Scott's Bay) 7415; (Shelburne) 7418; (Skinner's cove) 7418; (Summerville) 7418; (Three Fathom harbour) 7418; (Victoria beach) 7418; (Wallace harbour) 7419; (West Arichat) 7419; (White Head) 7419; (Wolfville wharf) 7419; (Yarmouth) 7419 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546 ; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Beaverton harbour) 7546 ; (Belle River) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7547 ; (Bronte) 7548 ; (Cobourg) 7548 ; Collingwood) 7549 ; (Depot Harbour) 7552 ; (Goderich) 7553 ; (Grand Bend) 7553 ; (Haileybury wharf) 7556 ; (Hamilton harbour) 7556 ; (Kincardine) 7558 ; (Lake Temiskaming wharfs) 7559; (Little Current) 7560 ; (Matchedash bay) 7560 ; (Meaford) 7560 ; (Midland) 7560 ; (Newcastle pier) 7561 ; (Oliphant wharf) 7561 ; (Otonabee River) 7564 ; (Ottawa locks) 7561 ; (Owen Sound) 7561 ; (Parry Sound) 7562 ; (Pembroke wharf) 7562 ; (Penetanguishene) 7563 ; (Petewawa) 7562 ; (Point Edward) 7563 ; (Port Bruce) 7563 ; (Port Burwell) 7563 ; (Port Dover) 7564 ; (Port Hope) 7564 ; (Port Stanley) 7564 ; (repairs, &c.) 7555 ; (Rondeau harbour) 7564 ; (Sarnia dredging) 7564 ; (Saugeen) 7565 ; (Spanish river) 7565 ; (Thessalon) 7565 ; (Thornbury) 7565 ; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567 ; (Toronto harbour) 7566 ; (Wiarton) 7569 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse à Beaufils) 7285 ; (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285 ; (Anse St. Jean) 7286 ; (Barachois de Malbaie) 7287 ; (Batiscan channel) 7322 ; (Belœil guide piers) 7287 ; (Bic wharf) 7288 ; (Canton Fabre) 7288; (Chambord wharf) 7289; (Champlain wharf) 7290; (Chateauguay, dredging) 7322 ; (Chateau Richer) 7290 ; (Descente des Femmes wharf) 7307 ; (Desjardins wharf) 7298 ; (Doucet's Landing) 7298; (eastern channel) 7330; (East Templeton) 7300; (Escoumain wharf) 7303 ; (Fraserville harbour) 7323 ; (Gatineau Point) 7303 ; (Grand Mechins) 7303 ; (Grande Piles dam) 7326 ; (Grosse Isle pier) 7305 ; (Isle St. Therese) 7376 ; (Lake St. John dredging) 7306; (Lake Temiscamingue) 7287 ; (Laprairie ice piers) 7306 ; (Lavaltrie wharf) 7306 ; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307 ; (Little Pabos) 7307 ; (Lower St. Lawrence) 7308 ; (Magdalen Islands) 7308 ; (Maskinongé dredging) 7325 ; (Mille Vaches) 7310 ; (Mistook wharf) 7310 ; (Mont Louis wharf) 7310 ; (Montmagny wharf) 7311 ; (Montmorency Falls) 7311 ; (New Carlisle wharf) 7312; (Nicolet pier) 7313 ; (Notre Dame du Portage wharf) 7314 ; (Ottawa River) 7375 ; (Peel Head bay) 7314 ; (piers, bridges, &c.) 7305 ; (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf)

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
7314; (Rimouski pier) 7320; (Rivière Ouelle) 7375; (Rivière du Lièvre) 7325; (Rivière du Loup) 7325; (Rivière Verte) 7390; (Sacré-Cœur) 7390; (Saguenay river) 7377; (St. Alexis pier) 7390; (St. André de Kamouraska) 7390; (Ste. Anne de la Pocatière) 7390; (St. Charles Borromée) 7390; (Ste. Famille wharf) 7390; (Ste. Fidèle) 7391; (St. Francis de Sales) 7391; (St. François, Orléans) 7391; (St. Fulgence) 7392; (St. Gédéon Islands) 7392; (St. Jean, Orléans) 7393; (St. Louis, feeders) 7380; (St. Louis, improvements) 7379; (St. Maurice dredging) 7326; (St. Simeon) 7393; (Terrebonne) 7394; (Yamaska river) 7394 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 7637 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; (working expenses) 7579; Generally (new plant) 7578; (vessel repairs) 7576; Man. (snag boat) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577; (working expenses) 7579; P.E.I. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.,) 7611; (architects, &c.) 7618; (art gallery) 7618; (balances, &c.) 7628; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical salaries) 7620; (Ottawa river surveys) 7612; (surveys, &c.) 7611; (technical books) 7627; (telegraph staff) 7620; (transportation commission) 7627 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592; N.W.T. (Battle river) 7587; (colonization roads) 7594; (Shellmouth) 7591; Ottawa (bridge repairs) 7585; Que. (Bryson bridge) 7585 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau river) 7630; (St. Maurice) 7579; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — B.C. (Kamloops) 7610; (Vancouver and Salt Springs) 7610; (working expenses) 7635 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633; (working expenses) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; (working expenses) 7632 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Que. (Bersimis, &c.) 7609 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1696; (inspectors' salaries) 1692; (metric system) 1698; (standards) 1695 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3658 (ii).
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c. (Ans.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7566 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection (B. 188) prop. Res., 8385; in Com. on Res., 8674; 1°*, 8676; in Com., 9409; on Sen. Amts., 9816 (v).
Wharf Building, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7316 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contributions by Provincial Govts., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Brown, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
James Bay and Interprovincial Ry. Co.'s (B. 150) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5783 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 7322 (iv).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4552 (iii).
Cast Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2376 (ii).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers & St. Maurice.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4861 (iii).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B 45 (Mr. Porter) in Com. (amt.) *re* Race Courses, 5137 (iii).
La Compagnie Electrique de Trois Rivieres, &c (B. 57) 1°*, 986 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3986 (ii)
Orangemen, Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8351 (v).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co. (B. 173); Pet. presented, 6826, 7017 (iv), 1°*, 7175 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) on prop., Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2408 (ii).
SUPPLY:
House of Commons—Library (books) 6947 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (eastern channel) 7330; (Grande Piles dam) 7327; (St Maurice dredging) 7326 (iv).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Douphin) 7570; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7603 (iv).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*

Budget, on The, 8965 (v).
Facer Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 27) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1285 (i).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4016 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 716 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp., (B. 72) 1°*, 1592; 2° m., 1757 (i).
Canada Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B 55) 1°*, 908 (i).
Fitz-Simmons, ane Marie Relief (B. 130) 1°*, 4081 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) 1°*, 1504 (i).
Hersey, A. T., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv).
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1788 (i).
London and St. Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 32) 1°*, 493 (i).
McCormack & Sharples, Messrs., Patent Relief B. (M.) to receive Pet., 6558 (iv).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 625 (i).
Pearson, Geo., Relief (B. 153) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 7623 (iv).
Prior, James Arthur Relief (B. 127) 1°*, 3091 (ii).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 48) 1° m., 817 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s (B. 110) 1°*, 2184 (ii)

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2843 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5307 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7853; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8444 (v).
Autonomy Bill 69, School Clause Amts., Explantation *re* (remarks) 5819 (iii).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9556 (v).
Budget, on The, 8938 (v).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 165) 1°, 6232 (iv).
Damen, Wm., Patent Relief (B. 129) 1°*, 3834 (ii) ; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6379 (iv).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Estimates, Delay in bringing down, Obstruction, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Freight Rates, Advancement of, Rebate, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
Gold Medal Furniture Mfg. Co. Patent Relief (B. 102) 1°*, 2184; in Com., 3399 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9405 (v).
Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 166) 1°, 6232 (iv).
I.C.R., Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2243 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6128 (iv).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief (B. 152) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; in Com., 6275, 6347 (iv) ; 3° m., 6376, agreed to (Y. 38; N. 13) 6377 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6805 (iv).
Molson's Bank B. 33 (Mr. Ames) in Com., 755 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup. 2158 (iii).
Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney *re* Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6865 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2717, 2763, 3134 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commission, Advancement of Freight Rates, Rebates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).
Red Deer Valley and Coal Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1671; 2° m., 1757 (i); in Com., 2325 (ii).
Sterling Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 182) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9363 (v).
Justice, Administration of (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7538 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2733 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9556 (v) ; Ont. (Sault Ste. Marie wharf) 6885 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2158 (ii).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 99) 1°*, 2108 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii).
Trelawney, A. H. H. S., Relief (B. 198) 1°*, 9278 (v).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5657 (iii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4263 (iii).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ques.) 2065 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6365 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. (M. for copies) 2100 (ii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1190 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1059 (i).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4833 (iii) ; in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7889 (iv).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 744 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° (remarks) 5090 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P.O. Dept. (Ques.) 1758 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8225 (v).
I.C.R. Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3195 (ii).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ques.) 3671 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 347 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Montmorency wharf) 6867 (iv).

Christie, Mr. P., *South Ontario.*
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6282 (iv).
Port Perry Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6181 ; (live stock records) 6687 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7616 (iv).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8994 (v).

Clare, Mr. G. A.—*Con.*
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ques.) 6827 (iv).
——— Plant established at Kingston (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
I.C.R., Supplies of Oils, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Labour Union Labels, B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 ; in Com., 722 (i).
SUPPLY :
Customs (contingencies) 261 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Wellington St. pavement) 1572 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2290 (ii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5695 (iii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 306 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687 (i).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 80) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., *Centre Toronto.*
Sovereign Fire Ins. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 26) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1755 (i).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*
Agricultural Exports and Imports to U.S., &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).
——— Duties paid, &c. (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Res., 2418 (ii).
Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of (M. for copies of cor.*) 3204 (ii).
Budget, on The, 8957 (v).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price *re* Erection (Ques.) 587 (i).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Revenue and Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).
Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395 (v).
Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Ice Jam on Thames River (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Imports and Exports, Duties paid, &c (M. for ret.) 3203 (ii).

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Erection of Wire Fencing (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
——— Fencing Contract, Cor. *re* (read) M. to adjn., 5577 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2095 (ii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 337, 1181; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1881 (i).

SUPPLY :
Customs (expenses) 261 (i).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1683 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1551 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6711 (iv).
Thames River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
——— Ice Jam (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
——— Lake St. Clair, &c., Surveys, Completion and Cost (Ques.) 590 (i).
Tobacco and Cigars, imported from U.S., Duty paid, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1683 (i).
Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ques) 1933 (i).
Veterinary Surgeons, Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6707 (iv).
Wire Fencing *re* Boundary Line, N.W.T., Erection of, Contract *re* (M.) to adjn., 5578
See 'N.W.T.'

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i).
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9225 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1813 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 643 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6487 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2217 (ii).
Murray Canal Inspector, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2163 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7696 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1332 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re* on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5015 (iii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7432 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 363 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6935; Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6926 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (inspectors) 1511 (i).
Canals—Trent (surveys, &c.) 1482 (i); (surveys) 9355 (v).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1332; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 9258 (v).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7694; (interpreters) 7704 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6540 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1655; N.S. (Antigonish) 1017; (Canso) 1026 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i); (Rideau Hall maintenance) 9551 (v); Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1120 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse aux Gris Fonds) 7285; (Chateau Richer) 7292; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6459 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (expenditures) 2218; Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (ties, &c.) 6431 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2163 (ii).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1472 (i).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*
Adulteration of Food, Jams, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1718 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2423 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4580; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5550 (iii); in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7974 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5848 (iii).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1553 (i).
Brantford Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 219, 860 (i).
Budget, on The., 8936 (v).
Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ques.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2358 (ii).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Improvements in Corridors, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1566 (i).
Indian Schools Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 230 (i).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6131 (iv).
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6802 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5590 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5716 (iii).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, &c. (Ques.) 5977 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2656 (ii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1613 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5021 (iii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 329, 1155, 1208, 1793 ; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 1868 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1718 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6179 (iv).
Indians—Ont., &c. (schools) 230 (i).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2656 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 219 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1657; N.S. (Antigonish) 860; Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1566 (i).
White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8356; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8516 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 86) on Sen. Amts., 9817 (v).

Costigan, Hon. John, *Victoria, N.B.*
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1822 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Route, &c. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. (B. 101) 1°*, 2108 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co., Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4607; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5562 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9407 (v).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Cor., Pets, &c. (M. for copies) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6760 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Alexander Gibson Ry. Co., Purchase, &c. (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, Ownership of Land by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 4920 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4532 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase, &c., Cor., Number of Officials, &c (M. for ret.) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Roadbed Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
'Canadian Citizenship' Political Speech by Min. of Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ques.) 729 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 170 (i).
Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White (M. for cor.) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 107 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ques.) 9696 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Rates, *re* Fredericton Increases (remarks) 6591 (iv).
——— on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6123 (iv).
——— remarks *re*, 6588 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2223 (ii).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Construction (Ques.) 728 (i).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment, M.P., and Min of Mar. and Fisheries *re* (M. for copies*) 1399 (i).

Crocket, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (fertilizers) 1726 (i).
Militia (cavalry corps) 9125 (v).
Post Office (provisional allowances) 170 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Moncton accommodation) 1948 (i); (revenue collections) 2223 (ii).

White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. (Ques.) 107 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2205; Cor., &c. (read) 2206 (ii).

Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Daniel, Mr. John W., *St. John City.*

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Budget, on The, 8978 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 634 (i).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).

Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendations, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6344 (iv).

Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com. 6378 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).

Halifax Garrison, Defence by Canadian Troops (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9131 (v).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ques.) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amount, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

I.C.R., Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 910 (i).

——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2226; Letter from C. W. Stewart (read) 2227 (ii).

——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).

——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, &c., on M. for Sup., 6827, 6829 (iv).

'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Letter Carriers, Contract *re* Boots, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

Live Stock Record Association, incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5926 (iii).

Magdalen Island SS. Subventions, Res. of Mar. Board of Trade (read) 907 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* St. John River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6986 (iv).

——— on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6999 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).

Preferential Tariff, Imports, Value, &c. (Ques.) 152 (i).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).

Royal Military College Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967 (iv).

St. John and Digby Mail Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade (read) 905 (i).

St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract (Ques.) 2776 (ii).

St. John Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i).

St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subvention, Memorial from St. John Board of Trade (read) 903 (i).

St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).

St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).

Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).

Submarine Signal Bells on 'Lurcher' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6940, 7015; (experimental farms) 6168 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (enlargement) 6294 (iv).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Customs (revenue cruisers) 409 (i).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection) 9241 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 (i).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7513 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (submarine signals) 2873 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (France and Can.) 7095 (iv); (G.B. and Canada) 864; (St. John and Digby) 904; (St. John and Halifax) 925 (i); (St. John, Halifax and London) 903 (i), 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7176 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2686 (ii).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv); (pay and allowance) 417 (i); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238; (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2615; (obstructions, removal) 2647; (schools of navigation) 2643 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots, &c.) 211; (provisional allowances) 168 (i).

Daniel, Mr. John W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (St. John drill hall) 1049 (i); (St. John drill hall) 7504 (iv); (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John Quarantine) 1052 (i); Richibucto) 6814 (iv); N.S. (Antigonish) 855 (i); Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6816 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Chance harbour) 7497; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (Salmon river) 7499; N.S. (Shelburne) 7418 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310; (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2299 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (advertising) 2236; (revenue collections) 2225 (ii).

Transportation Commission, Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour, Inquiry for, 2595 (ii).

——— Preliminary Rep. (remarks) 731 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1358 (i).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).

'W. S. Fielding' Dredge, Completion and Placing, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St John's and Iberville.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir W. Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R.L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3450 (ii); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839 (v).

Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 16) 1°*, 317 (i).

Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Effront, Jean, Patent Relief (B. 33) 1°*, 493 (i).

Fish imported into New York, Prohibition of, Legislation *re* on M. for Com. of Sup., 6188 (iv).

Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).

Goodwin Car Co. Patent Relief (B. 17) 1°*, 317 (i).

Hersey, Arthur, Relief B. 167 (M.) to employ Stenographer, 8527 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 300 (i).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7353 (iv).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 724 (i).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5197 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 2203 (ii).

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup. 8229 (v).

I.C.R., Freight Rates (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement, 6590 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Immigration (printing, &c.) 7711 (iv).

Desjardins, Mr. S., *Terrebonne.*

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ques.) 7810 (iv).

Doncaster Indian Reserves, Abolition of (Ques.) 7812 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).

Tison, R. Aimé, Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 116) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 60) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 114) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Rys. Co.'s (B. 113) 1°*, 2185 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9598; (Stokes Bay) 9598 (v).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middldsex.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5100 (iii).

London Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1875 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London P. O.) 1563 (i).

Quarantine (cattle) 6690 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*

Agents' Dwelling Houses, I.C.R., Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Aliens employed at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1415 (i).

Alien Labour and Ry. Employees : *See* 'Père Marquette.'

Amherst, Wharf Connection *re* I. C. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry., Amounts paid for Damages (Ans.) 2063 (ii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Mothersill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

Atwater Bridge, Lachine Canal, Name of Contractor, Price, &c. (Ans.) 7261, 7422 (iv).

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 1524 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Water Power, Negotiations *re* for Electric Lighting (Ans.) 1504 (i).

Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ans.) 8384 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchases, on Inquiry for Papers, 2685 (ii).
See 'Ry. Act. B. 132.'

Canada Eastern Ry., Improvement of Roadbed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).

——— Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret. 734 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).

——— Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).

'Canadian Citizenship', Political Speech *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).

Canadian Fast Mail Service (announcement) 9279 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9782 (v).

Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Cardinal Canal, Claims from Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).

——— Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ans.) 2064 (ii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Site, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

Coal for Govt. Rys., Purchase from N.S. Mines, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 2191 (ii).

Cornwall Basin Dredging Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).

Cornwall Canal, Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. (Ans.) 686 (i).

——— Employees during Election Campaign: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Cornwall Canal, Extra Employees, during Oct. and Nov. (Ans.) 107 (i).
See 'Williamsburg.'

Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ans.) 3360 (ii).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Culrute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).

Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).

Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6345 (iv).

Fort Lawrence Pier, N.S., Name of Contractors, Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 5034 (iii).

Ft. William Telephone System, on Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).

Fredericton Station Agent, Mr. O. White, Dismissal, on Inquiry for Ret., 698 (i).

——— Dismissal, &c., (Ans.) 107 (i).

Freight Rates on I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.', 'Ry. Rates.'

Galena Oil Co., Purchases from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (remarks) 8004 (v).

Govt. Railways, Rails laid and disposed of, &c., Number of Tons, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2066 (ii).

Grain exported through Govt. Elevators (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Awarding of Contracts, Specifications, &c., Answers (read) to Mr. Foster's questions, 9782 (v).

——— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).

——— Interim Rep. (presnted) 6310 (iv).

——— Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9815 (v).

——— Plans *re* Termini, &c. (Ans.) 1151 (i).

——— Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2820 (ii).

——— Proposed Route West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).

——— Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ans.) 3009 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys through Madawaska, Route, &c. (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Approval of Location (remarks) 6138 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3879 (ii), 4126, 4218 (iii).
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R. (Ans.) 59, 109 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) for Cor., 165 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence river, Govtl, Action *re* (remarks) 700 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry., Running Rights (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii); in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R., Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— (remarks) 68 (i).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ans.) 383 (i).
I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
——— Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 1886, 1891 (i).
——— Appointments to Train Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9521 (v).
——— Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1343 (i).
——— Coal carried free to Ottawa in 1902-3 (Ans.) 2192 (ii).
——— Coal, Free Transportation in 1902-3, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
——— Coal purchased, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
——— Employees, Messrs. Weldon, &c. Political Partisan (Ans.) 1146 (i).
——— Employees, Pensions, Govt. Legislation *re* (remarks) 9289 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Financial Statement in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
——— Fish Traffic : *See* 'Fish.'
——— Freight Arrangements and Traffic Diversion, on Cor. of C. W. Stewart (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I. C. R., Freight Rates, Increase of, &c (Statement) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, M.P., 6112 ; Cor., &c. (read) 6115 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Taylor's Statement. 6587 (iv).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 451 (i).
——— Locomotives, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
——— Parlour Cars, Net Profits, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Passes for Councillors at Quebec (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1925 (i).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Estimate of Cost, &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
——— Snow Blockade, Delay in Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2029 (ii).
——— Superannuation Scheme (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays, on M. (Mr. Daniel) to Com. of Sup., 6828, 6830 (iv).
——— Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6827 (iv).
——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i); 2215 (ii).
——— Train Service, *re* Snowstorms (explanation) 726 (i).
——— Trains stalled by Snowstorms, *re* Telegrams, &c., 696 (i).
See 'P.E.I.'
James Bay Ry. Co., Maps *re* Location (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Kitchen, Mr., Contract *re* Murray Harbour Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Lachine Canal Water Power at Côte St. Paul, Use by Manufacturers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1518 (i).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
——— Whistles, Nuisance of (remarks) 9284 (v).
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McGill University School of Ry. Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus (Ans.) 7261 (iv).
Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Municipal Telephone System, Application before Ry. Commission *re* Port Arthur, &c. (Ans.) 595 (i).
Murray & Cleveland, Claims for Extras *re* Galops Canal: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Amount due Contractors (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
——— Completion, &c. (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Delegation *re* (Ans.) 265 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2127 (ii), 9482 (v).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase (Ans.) 584 (i).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5738 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Pêre Marquette Ry. Employees, on Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners' on M. (Mr. Boyce) for copies of Cor., 1393 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2203 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9380 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
P.E.I Ry., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table, 8528 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Steam Communication, Delays in Mails, &c. (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. and Murray Harbour Branch, Expenditure up to Jan., 1905 (Ans.) 106 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Stanley Bridge Branch, Surveys, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
P.E.I. and Steam Communication, Delay in Mails, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Survey, West Cape Branch (Ans.) 590 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Delay to Travellers, &c., Refund of Expenses (Ans.) 4807 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 291 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. (B. 53) 1°*, 817; 2° m., and in Com., 1673 (i).
Ry. Act (I.C.R. and C.A.R.) Amt. (B. 132) 1° m., 4186 (iii) ; in Com., 6139, 7583 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister, Retirement of, &c. (remarks) 9678 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 908 (i).
Railway Commission Board, Maintenance, in Com. of Sup., 1525 (i).
——— Salaries, Private Secs., &c. (Ans.) 688 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Cars (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees (Ans.) 684 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
——— Rep., Non-Production (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
——— Rep. (presented) 6346 (iv).
——— Rep. on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6136 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5005, 5013 (iii).
Ry. Report, Delay, &c. (remarks) 602 (i).
Railway Subsidies in Joliette Co., Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2066 (ii).
Ry. Surveys, *re* Joliette County, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1346 (i).
Returns, Delay *re*, on Inquiry for, 1594 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 4458 (iii).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5035 (iii).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Contractors, Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, U.S. and Canadian Contractors (Ans.) 589 (i).
'Scotia' Str., Certified Engineers, &c. (remarks) 8386 (v).
Sidings and Spur Lines, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).
Standard Gauge Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I., Survey, Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Beauharnois (repairs) 6307 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (bank strengthening) 9378 (v) ; (culvert St. Therese Island) 6301 (iv); (macadamazing roads) 9378 (v.)

Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv) ; (enlargement) 1219 ; (lock repairs) 1494 (i), 9381 (v).

Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230; (enlargement) 1220 ; (leakage) 1492 (i) ; (shoals) 9354 (v).

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500 (i).

Canals—Lachine (Atwater Avenue bridge) 1240 (i) ; (electric appliances) 9354 (v), 1240 (i) ; (enlargement) 6294 (iv) ; (gasoline boat) 1421 (i) ; (Hanault, L. O., Payments to) 6299 ; (lockgates suspension) 6300 (iv) ; (machinery for shops) 1240 (i); (Mill St. paving) 6301 ; (power house flume) 6300 ; (repairs) 6306 (iv) ; (St. Gabriel basin) 9378 (v); (Wall Basin No. 2) 1421 (i) ; (wall underpinning) 6298 (iv) ; (wharf below dock) 1421 (i).

Canals—Miscellaneous (additional remuneration) 1547 ; (arbitrations, &c.) 1508 ; (inspections and surveys) 1509 (i);(remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v) ; (surveys) 1520 ; (tolls, repairs, &c.) 1546 (i).

Canals—Murray (repairs) 1495 (i).

Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, upper entrance) 6289 (iv).

Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).

Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (booms and piers) 1499 (i) ; (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).

Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6303 ; (repairs) 6308 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334, 1402 (i).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).

Canals—Trent (construction) 1420; (construction and surveys) 1479 (i); (dredge engine) 9381 (v) ; (Geo. Matthews Co., damages) 6303 (iv) ; (Holland river) 9359 (v) ; (improvements) 1499 (i) ; (lowering floor of lock) 6302 (iv) ; (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v) ; (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv) ; (staff on dams) 9383 (v) ; (surveys) 6291 (iv), 9354 (v) ; (surveys of dams) 9376 (v).

Canals—Welland (bridge building) 1234 (i) ; (electric lighting power) 9377 (v) ; (electric plant) 1231 (i) ; (long level deepening) 6290 ; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309 ; (obstruction, &c.) 1231 ; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232 ; (Port Colborne, elevator) 1266, 1288 ; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; (Port Colborne, level) 1263 ; (stone protection) 1496 ; (surveys) 1234, 1520 ; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6305 (iv).

Canals—Williamburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).

Civil Govt.—Railways (law clerk) 9066 ; (private sec.) 9062 (v) ; (salaries) 93 (i); (salary increases) 9062 (v).

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2277; (surveys, &c.) 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9498 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6431 (iv); (additional sidings and spurs) 1970;

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Railways—*Con.*

(advertising) 2236 (ii); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; (Antigonish accommodation) 1967 (i) ; (bridge strengthening) 1912 (i), 9384 (v); (Campbellton) 1968 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432 (iv); (double tracking) 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v); (Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (engine houses) 9389 (v); (financial statement) 7445 (iv); (grades and curves) 1987 (i); (Halifax accommodation) 9391 (v); (Halifax dredging) 2026 ; (Halifax terminals) 2032; (ii); (increased facilities) 9482; (Indiantown branch) 9482; (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Memramcook accommodation) 1977; (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946 (i), 9391 (v); (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (original construction) 1912 (i); (Pictou accommodation) 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204; (rolling stock) 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv); (rolling stock, statement read) 9501 (v) ; (St. Cyrille diversion of line) 1969 ; (St. Fabien subway) 1980 (i) ; (Ste. Flavie accommodation) 9390; (St. John accommodation) 9389 (v); (St. Lambert double tracking) 2183 (ii); (St. Moise station) 1976; (semaphores) 1986 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988 (i), 2038 (ii) ; (Sydney accommodation) 1912; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (Truro accommodation) 9391 (v); (water service) 2170 (ii); (working expenses) 9384 (v).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Atlantic and Lake Superior investigation) 9383 (v) ; (engineers, &c.) 1521; (extra clerks) 1521 (i); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (litigation) 1522 (i); (school of transportation) 9381 (v); (statistics) 1521 (i).

Railways — P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv) ; (Cardigan branch) 2171 (ii); 9482 (v); (Charlottetown, accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown, track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown agent's house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Kensington station) 2178; (M.C.B.) couplers) 2178 ; (Morell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray branch) 2038; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2127 (ii), 8692 (v); (Summerside improvements) 2176 ; (Vernon River branch) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1525 (i).

Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims *re* Surveys, &c., 9494 (v).

Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (read) 1288 (i).

——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry., Ref. to in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

——— *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Trent Valley Canal, Damages *re* Flooding, Claims of Mr. James Clark, on M. (Mr. Ward) for Cor., 1396 (i).

——— Surveys *re* Rice Lake, &c. (Ans.) 153 (i).

Truro Dining Room, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2256 (ii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8315, 8639 (v).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 589 (i).
——— Extra Employees, for Oct., Nov. (Ans.) 453 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, &c. on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2099 (ii).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 193 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2209 (ii).
See 'Fredericton,' &c.
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canal Water Power Leases, Dates of Rental, Claims, &c. (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Wire Fencing Contract: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Woodill, S., Emplymt. on I.C.R. (Ans.) 2192 (ii).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Debates, Official (M.) to conc. in 7th Rep., 9801 (v).

Fielding, Hon. W. S., (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
Adjournment, 24th May, (M.) 6384 (iv).
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6110 (iv).
American Currency circulated in Can., Prevention *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment (remarks) 6825 (iv).
Audit Act Amt. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
——— Progress *re* (Ans.) 2190 (iv).
Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9640 (v).
——— (remarks) 9541 (v).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Inadequate Supply, &c. (remarks 4272 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
Auditor General's Resignation, &c., and Amts. to Audit Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 1935 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5435, 5479 (iii), on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 2979; amendment to Clause 16 (presented) 2840 (ii).
——— in Com. (compensation *re* lands) 5817; (B.N.A. Act) 5730; (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5950; (laws, courts, &c.) 6102; (subsidy to provs.) 6091 (iv).
——— Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
——— Changes *re* Financial Clauses remarks) 2046 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6736 (iv).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5431 (iii).
——— Production of Cor., &c (remarks) 2593 (ii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5830 (iii).
——— 'Yellow Dog,' *re* Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle' (remarks) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt. Govs.', &c., 'Saskatchewan,' 'N. W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Act Amt. (B. 181) 1° m., 7642 (iv); in Com., 8688 (v).
Banking Act Amts. (remarks) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Circulation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, Amendments *re* Clerical Errors, &c. (remarks) 8383 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Boyd, Mr. Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ans.) 6654 (iv).
Budget, The (financial statement) 8888 (v).
——— Resolutions *re* Ways and Means (M.) 8914 (v).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for, 2762 (ii), 4920 (iii), 7100 (iv).
——— Statement *re*, 8763 (v).
Cabinet Ministers Ex-, Annuity Bill (No. 203) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com. on Res., 9733; 1°*, 9739; in Com., 9792; (amt.) 9796 (v).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re* Works (Ans.) 7096 (iv).
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'I.C.R.'
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4691 (iii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9778 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Chateauguay River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6847 (iv).
Citizens' Bank of Canada, B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Collingwood Govt. Dry Dock, Payments by Govt. *re* Bounty (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Conroy Bros. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
——— Retention of Mr. Conroy's Cheque (remarks) 6654 (iv).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9038 (v).
Cordage Plant at Kingston, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 2329 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4260 (iii).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 190) 1° m., 8997; in Com., 9761 (v).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy in Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Debates Official, on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9809 (v).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4974 (iii).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French (Ans.) 6826 (iv).
Dredging, Cost of hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6842 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provs., Number of Vessels, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).
Dundonald Park, and Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Estimates (1905) Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
———1906 (presented) 8718 (v).
——— Further Supplementary, 1906 (presented) 9392 (v).
——— Criticism of (remarks) 9052 (v).
——— Delay in bringing down and efficient Critism. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9090 (v). *See* 'Interior.'
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada : incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381, 6608 (iv).
First Minister, Salary Increase (B. 201) M. for Com. on Res., 9700; in Com. on Res., 9725; 1° of B., 9726; in Com., 9790 (v); on M. for 3°, 9791 (v).
Fitz-Simmons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Fort William and Port Arthur Dredging, Number of Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Islands Sale (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6737 (iv).
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
G.T.Ry., Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii), 4208 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7626, 7677 ; on M. for 3°, 7863 (iv).
G.T. Pacific Ry., Agreements with National Transcontinental Ry. (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
——— Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2839 (ii).
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2016 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Guarantee Bonds : *See* 'Inland Revenue.'
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Immigration Contract : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8681 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re*, &c. (remarks in Com. on B. 200, 9689 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4192 (iii).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) 9029 (v).
——— (Ans.) 2492 (ii).
Interior Estimates, Obstruction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6655 (iv).
——— Trade Relations with Dom. (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742 ; (amt.) 9797 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6667 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9706 (v).
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 193) in Com. on Res., 1°, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9033 (v).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, (Ans.) 4921 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
London Bye-Election, Resignation of h. m. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir Wm. Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6602 (iv).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6797 (iv).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9789 (v).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 2333 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on M. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote in Com. of Sup., 9329, 9769 (v).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8765 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9452 (v).
——— (remarks) 8182 (v).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 8984, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4965 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Ottawa City Act (1899) Amt. (B. 180) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; in Com., 8686 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First.'
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
——— Obligations of Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2664 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuity : *See* 'Cabinet Minister.'
'Protestant Govt.', Formation of, &c., ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3006 (ii).
'Protestant Schools,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill, 3484 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provincial Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 7100 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Quebec Citadel Walls, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
Richibucto Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) in Com., 3669 (ii).
Rolled Oats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984, 9763 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com., on Bill 99, 3651 (ii).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7181 (iv).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of, B. 70, in Com. on Res., 8700 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9730 (v).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills (M.) 9280 (v).
Setters' Effects, Duty *re* in Com. on Ways and Means, 8997 (v).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9348, 9587 (v).
Sovereign Fire Insurance Co. of Canada B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1756 (i).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
Supply Bill (No. 206) M. for Com., 9798 ; 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9801 (v).
SUPPLY :
Charges of Management (contingencies) 8691 (v) ; (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv), 9052 (v).
Civil Govt., Auditor General (salaries) 6721 (iv); Finance Dept. (salaries) 9060 (v); Finance (private secretary) 6268 (iv); Gov. Gen.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv), 9053 (v); Interior (mines branch) 6265; Miscellaneous (charwomen) 6268; Public Works (salaries) 6724 (iv), 9071 (v); Sec. of State (Civil Service examiners) 6249; (salaries) 6248 (iv), 9071; Trade and Commerce (contingencies) 9034 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Inspection of Staples (contingencies) 6901 (iv).
Justice, Administration of (miscellaneous) 6721 (iv).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6722, 6897 ; (H. of Commons) 6298 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 9622 ; (Canada and Mexico) 9622, 9680 ; (Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie) 9616; (Port Essington, B.C., &c.) 9616; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 9617 (v); (St. John, Halifax, &c.) 6901; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv), 8691 (v).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238 (iv); (Bank of Commerce, compensation, Yukon) 9615 (v); ('Canada Gazette') 6723; (Can. Mining Institute grant) 7247 (iv); (canals celebration, Sault Ste. Marie) 9621; (Champlain's monument) 9340 (v); (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal services *re* Sunday Observance) 6722; (Pacific Cable grant) 7239 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9614 (v);

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Miscellaneous—*Con.*

(printing, &c.) 6723, 6901 (iv); (Public Accounts evidence) 9616 (v); (relief of distressed Canadians) 7247; (tariff commission) 9614 (v).

Ocean and River Service (ice-breaking steamers) 9620 (v).

Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6722 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (improvements) 6735 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6823; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Richibucto) 6730, 6813 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (i).

Public Works—Buildings — Ont. (London drill hall, electric wiring) 6732 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator, salaries) 6816; (grounds) 6817; (heating, &c.) 6816; (lighting) 6816; (Major's Hill Park) 6817; (repairs, &c.) 6815; (Rideau Hall) 6823; (telephones) 6814; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle repairs) 6734 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 6891; P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Fort Lawrence) 6838 (iv); (Frude's Point) 9583 (v); (general vote) 7238 (iv); (Glace Bay) 9577 (v); (L'Ardoise breakwater) 6838 (iv); (Marble Mountain) 9580; (Petite Rivière) 9581; (Phinney's Cove) 9559 (v); (Port Hawkesbury wharf) 6837 (iv); (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's wharf) 6873; (Blind river dredging) 6870; (Collingwood harbour dredging) 6879; (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Haileybury wharf) 6887; (Honora wharf) 6887; (Little Current channel) 6886; (Otonabee river) 6887; (Owen Sound Harbour) 6886; (Point Edward dredging) 6869; (Whitby harbour dredging) 6880 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateauguay dredging) 6847; (Doucet's Landing) 6849; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Maskinonge river) 6842; (Montmorency wharf) 6852; (Pierreville wharf) 6868; (Que., harbour improvements) 6724; (St. Alphonse de Bagotville wharf) 6868; (St. Maurice river dredging) 6851; (Sorel ice piers) 6841; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (cement testing 7616; (Deep Waterways Commission) 6894; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606; N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6894; Quebec. (J. C. Taché, special) 6897; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7475 (iv); (rolling stock) 9514 (v); P.E.I. (working expenses) 6901 (iv).

Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 9037 (iv); (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Transportation Commission (expenses) 8692 (v).

Unprovided Items (general) 6902 (iv)

Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9681 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v).

Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks)) 5210 (iii).

Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6220 (iv).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4681 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Straightening River Don (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Erection of, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

Transportation Commission, Information *re* (remarks) 9680 (v).

Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).

Ways and Means, The Budget (financial statement) 8888 (v).

——— Resolutions (m.) 8914 (v.)

——— (M.) for Com., 9798, in Com., 9801 (v).

Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4691 (iii).

White Lead, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9761 (v).

Wines, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983, 9762, (v).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Yarmouth, N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9691 (v).

Finlay, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7895 (iv).

Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1817 (i).

Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6245 (iv).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*

Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5879 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Pierreville pier) 9581 (v).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney (Minister of Agriculture). *Brome.*
Agriculture, Dept. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ans.) 268 (i).
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re* (remarks 990 (i).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Subsidy Increases (Ans.) 108 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (prop. res.) in Com., 676, in Com. on Res., 736 (i), 2413 (ii); 1° m., 2441; in Com., 2841, 2844 (ii).
Archives, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 6826 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4481 (iii); in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8563 (v); (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5755 (iii). *See* 'Manitoba'.
Binder Twine Sale : *See* 'Cordage.'
Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance, &c. (Ans.) 8886 (v).
Butter shipped in Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 882 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).
——— on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9022 (v).
Census and Statistics (B. 5) M. for Com. on Res., 820; in Com. on Res., 990; 1°*, 52; 2° m. and in Com., 625; M. for Com., 1013; in Com., 1069, 1467 (i).
Census and Statistics Act (N.W.T.) Amt. (B. 163) 1° m., 6105 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8774 (v).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).
Census and Statistics, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).
Census, Total Expenditure for 1901, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ans.) 588 (i).
Census (1901) Vol. 2 (presented) 50 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs Close's Scheme, on M. for Sup., 2126 (ii).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, Thermograph Records, &c. (Ans.) 2775 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8201 (v).
Cold Storage *re* Steamship Service, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Stmnts. of Mr. E. D. Smith (remarks) 874 (i).
Copyright Photographs, Legislation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 1849 (i).
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. (Ans.) 6827 (iv).
Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c. (Ans.) 7810 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*
Facer Steel Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Franking Privilege, Extension of Time after Prorogation (remarks) 9395.
Freight Rates on Cattle : *See* 'Holstein.'
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Fruit Growers Ass'on., P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ans.) 381 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155) in Com., 5979 (iv).
Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ans.) 3010 (ii).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ans.) 3361 (ii).
Glanders, &c., Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
——— Spread of among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. (B. 174) 1°*, 7420 (iv); in Com., 9395 (v).
Hog Plague in Essex and Kent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6712 (iv). *See* 'Veterinary.'
Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7507 (iv).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ans.) 8885 (v).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— (statement) 7908 (iv).
Lake Ramsay and New Ross Post Office Mail Service (Ans.) 9696 (v).
Lefebvre, A. P., Postmaster at Markstay, Investigation *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 7096 (iv).
Lesser Slave Lake, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 7019 (iv).
Liege Exhibition, Expenditure *re*: in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. (B. 148) 1° m., 5076; in Com., 5922; 3° m., 5927 (iii).
Live Stock Records of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i), 2185 (ii).
Lump-jaw in Cattle, Prevention of (remarks) on Conc., 6917 (iv).
Maladie du Coit among Horses, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Mange among Horses, Stamping out (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3973 (ii).
Maps, Sale by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Montreal Dom. Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor., &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5701 (iii).

Northwest Territories, Cost of Surveys, Number of Miles, &c., on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Ret., 1396 (i).

Patent Acts Relief, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6559 (iv).

'Patent Record,' Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).

Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9059 (v).

Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6961 (iv).

Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5023 (iii).

See 'Holstein,' &c.

Seeds, Sale and Inspection (B. 7) prop. Res., 52; in Com., 54; 1°*, 66; 2° m., and in Com., 322, 1155, 1161, 1788; 3° m., 1868; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1872; on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 1884 (i); on Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv).

Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter., Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1842 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830; (aid to societies) 1829; (archives) 1823 (i), 6679; on conc., 6918, (iv); (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (creameries) 6938, 7014 (iv); (criminal statistics) 1473 (i); (dairying) 6932 (iv); (Dom. exhibition, B.C.) 9608 (v); (exhibitions) 1831 (i), 6269 (iv); (experimental farms) 6165 (iv), 9608 (v); (experimental farms, bulletins, &c.) 6926 (iv); (fumigating stations) 1831 (i); (live stock records) 6680 (iv); ('Patent Record') 1472 (i); (quinquennial Census, N.W.T.) 9608 (v); (statistics) 1828; (Year-book) 1474 (i).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (archivist) 9053; (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057 (v); (salaries) 91 (i), 9056; (private secretary) 9054; Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 868 (i).

Miscellaneous (International Congress, reception at Quebec) 9622 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).

Post Office (mail service) 9610; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii), 6690; on conc., 6912 (iv); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1838 (i); (organized districts, salaries) 2302 (ii); (Public Works Health Act) 1845; (Public health, organized districts) 1842; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841; (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).

Fisher, Hon. Sydney—*Con.*

Thermograph Records, Ret. laid on Table, 7016 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1374 (i).

Veterinary Inspectors *re* Hog Plague, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1934 (i).

See 'Hog,' &c.

Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Year-book Statistics, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice). *Quebec County.*

Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).

Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ans.) 8147 (v).

See 'Naturalization.'

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 738 (i).

Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5458; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5317; in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601; (arbitration *re* assets) 5946 (iii); (B. N. A. Acts) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8527; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8583, 8631 (v); (B.N.A. Act, 1867 to 1886) 5672; (B.N.A. Act) 5719 (iii).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6060 (iv).

——— (Crown Lands) Amt., 8171, 8256-7 (v).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7739 (iv); 8090 (v).

——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (executive council) 5781 (iii).

——— (H. of C. representation) Amt. in Com., 5685, 5750 (iii).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8168, 8170 (v).

——— (joint stock companies) in Com. (amt.) 6083 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918, 5946, 5986 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783 (iii), 6101 (iv); (amt.) 5812, 5927 (iii), 8240, 8244 (v).

——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).

——— (readjustment of representation) in Com. (amt.) 5753 (ii).

——— (school clause) in Com. (remarks) 5817 (iii).

——— (school clause) Explanation *re* Amendments (read) in Com., 5983 (iv).

——— (school clause amt.) 7121 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8394, 8414; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8504; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8292 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (seat of government) 5781 (ii), 8249 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Glechen) 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157 ; (Macleod) 8151 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16, schools, 8805 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) schools, 8837 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., sec. 19 (annual subsidy) Amt. 8760 ; (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt., 8758 (v).
——— (representation, H. of C.) Amt., 8703 (v).
——— (schools) Amt., 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation) Amt. in Com., 8703 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8877 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5878 (iii).
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Explanation *re* School Clauses (remarks) 5674 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2568 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated by Jacques Cartier Club to 'Catholic Quebec,' 2570 (ii).
——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1755 (i).
——— School Clause, Amts. Explanation, &c. (remarks) 5818 (iii).
——— Schools Clause 16 (statement) *re* Drafting, 4828.
——— Statement *re* School Attendance (remarks) 8095 (v).
See 'Mackenzie District B. 157,' 'Manitoba,' 'N.W.T., B. 156.'
Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup, 9214 (v).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Bissonette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Denial *re* Telegrams, 546 (i).
B.C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ans.) 382 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
B.C. Legislation, Disallowance of (Ans.) 189 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 9738 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4240 (iii).
See 'G.T.R.', 'I.C.R.', &c.
Canada Evidence Act (B. withdrawn) 9075 (v).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9532 (v).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c. (Ans.) 730 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1099 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 187 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 8528 (v).
Controverted Election (Dom.) Act Amt. (B. 159) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. (B. 196) 1°, m., 9075; in Com., 9411; 3° m., 9524 (v).
Davie, Geo. T., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) on Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Edmonton Election, Printed Lists of Voters, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5862 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 987 ; in Com., 1401 (i), 2106, 3208 (ii).
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Extradition Cases before Commissioner at Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 3937 (ii).
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. (B. 52) 1° m., 818 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 (v).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition Case, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine (Ans.) 3938 (ii).
Govt. Contracts Work (B. 51) 1° m., 818; 2° m., and in Com., 1672 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration (B. 199) 1° m., 9279; in Com., 9529 (v).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4208 (iii).
——— Statement *re* C.A.R. Amalgamation, &c., 4222 (iii).
G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621, 7626, 7677 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4259 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).
Highway Crossings : *See* ' Ry. B. 2.'
Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health (B. 200) 1° m., 2° m., and in Com., 9688 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A.Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4195 (iii); in Com., 6143, 7584 (iv):
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, Information *re* (remarks) 68, 165 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 204) M. for Com. on Res., 9702; in Com on Res., 9740 ; 1°*, 9760; in Com., 9702; (amt.) 9798 (v).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of, &c. (remarks) 7424 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appointments (statement read) 8002 (v).
Justice, (Penitentiaries) Rep. (presented) 271 (i).
Keewatin District (B. 158) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
Kentville Rifle Range, Purchase of Site, Statement (read) 9706 (v).
——— Investigation, Rep. of Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
——— (remarks) 7584 (iv).
Killam, Judge : *See* ' Ry. Commn. B. 36 '.
Kingston Penitentiary Supplies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9083 (v).
Lewis, Edward Norman, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., (amt.) 5136 (iii).
Mackenzie District (B. 157) 1° m., 6103 (iv).
——— (M.) to withdraw, 8176 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation (denial) *re* Drafting, &c., 4013 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 4044 (ii).
Martineau Defalcations and Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).
Montreal Sheds, Harbour Commissioners, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) in Com., 8685, 8689 (v).
Newspaper Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Nixon, Robert, Investigation *re* (remarks) 9788 (v).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°*, 6104 (iv).
Northwest Territories (B. 160) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m., 8763; in Com., 8765 (v); 3° m., 9408 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5694 (iii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; in Com., 8769; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8771 (v).
Northwest Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).
Opposition Leader, Indemnity : *See* ' Senate and House of Commons,'
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2547, 3181, 3187 (ii).
Owen, Thomas David Patent Relief B. 177 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8652 (v).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 467 (i).
Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7443 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Political Crisis in Quebec, &c. (remarks) 754 (i).
Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters (Ans.) 592 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T.: *See* ' Autonomy.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823 (i).
Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 36 : *See* ' Railway Commissioners.'
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 309; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Rys., &c., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85 ; N. 45) 314 ; on Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B.) wthdrn., 6103 (iv).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. (B. 36) Res. prop., 319; M. for Com. on Res., 493 ; in Com. on Res., 563 ; 1° m., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596, 1599 ; 3° m., 1802 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1627 (i).
Ry. Debts Bill : *See* ' Exchequer.'
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9528 (v).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plants, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2477 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* ' Autonomy B. 70.'
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2120 (ii), 7436 (iv).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 369, 1790 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity (B. 202) M. for Com. on Res., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726, 9733 ; in Com., 9791 (v).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9341 (v).
Statutes, Revision of (remarks) 745 (i).
Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ans.) 8656 (v).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 87 ; Justice (salaries) 72 ; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 103 (i).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection) 9238 (v).
Justice, Administration of (B. C. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (Exchequer Court, salaries) 125; Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 123 ; N.W.T. (court room, Prince Albert) 124 (i) ; (N. W. Judges) 9683 (v) ; (maintenance of prisoners) 122 ; (miscellaneous) 102 ; (stenographers, Sup. Court) 125 (i).
Justice—N.S. (Judges' salaries) 124 (i).
Justice—Supreme Court (salaries) 125 (i) ; (Three Rivers Judges) 9682 (v).
Justice—Yukon (court fees) 137 ; (Judges' travelling allowances) 126 ; (law books, &c.) 136 ; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 ; (witnesses, &c., fees) 135 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937 ; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967 ; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 ; (wrecking plant) 958 (i).
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244 (iv), 8672; (Dominion and Provincial legislation) 9685 (v); (litigation matters) 7247 (iv); (Sabbath Day legislation) 9684; (W. A. Duncan's account) 9864 (v).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 480 ; (Edmonton Jail) 481 (i), 9684 (v) ; Penitentiaries (general) 465 ; (contracts *re* supplies) 479 ; (Kingston) 477 ; (parole system) 465 ; (Prince Albert Jail) 481; (Regina Jail) 481; (St. Vincent de Paul) 480 ; (Stoney Mountain, Man.) 481 (i) ; (Stoney Mountain school) 9684 (v).
Post Office (detective service) 209; Yukon (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1111; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1125 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Château Richer) 7290; (Montmorency wharf) 7312 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. (B. 205) M. for Com. on Res., 9705; in Com. on Res. and 1°* of B., 9760 (v).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5210 (iii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4684 (iii).
Trading Stamps, Legislation *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7020 (iv).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 719, 1774 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Chas.—*Con.*
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.,' 'Boundary.'
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 958 (i).
See 'St. Lawrence.'
Yukon Elections, Delay in opening Ballot Boxes (remarks) 988 (i).
Yukon Judges, Salaries and Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Yukon Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 453 (i).

Forget, Mr. R., *Charlevoix.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5206 (iii).
Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 397 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E., *North Toronto.*
Address, on The, 21 (i).
Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1712 (i).
Agents, I.C.R., Policy *re* Dwelling Houses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
'Agnes G. Donohue,' Schr., Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).
Alberta Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Allan Strs., List of Sailings, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation *re* (remarks) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 136 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 5976 (iv).
Archives Building, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
Armouries, Construction of, Generally; in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service. Tenders *re* (Ques.) 3670 (ii).
Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Conditions of Lease *re* Land (Ques.) 2491 (ii).
Audit Act, Progress *re* (Ques.) 2190 (ii).
Auditor General and Audit Act (notice of motion) 9541 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9631 (v).
Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 51, 97 (i).
Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5487 (iii); on M. for 1°, 1435 (i); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3363 (ii).
——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).
——— (compensation *re* lands) in Com., 5817 (iii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Autonomy, Provincial, for N. W. Ters. B. 69
——— (distribution of seats) 7725 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7823, 7923 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6016 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5929, 5943 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7122, 7137 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6087, 6098 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Amendments *re* (remarks) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval by Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2270 (ii).
——— Changes *re*, &c. (remarks) 2046 (ii)
——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets., Inquiry for, 3091 (ii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec, on Ques. of Order, 2570 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Mis-statement of Speech by Mr. Belcourt, 3517-20 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5818 (iii).
——— Second Reading *re* (remarks) 2022 (ii).
——— (remarks) 262 (i).
See 'Manitoba.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, License granted (Ques.) 452 (i).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
——— Industry, Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation from Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 6, 524 (i).
——— Re-Hearing of N. W. Cases, &c. (remarks) 56 (i).
——— Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Budget, on The, Reply to Financial Statement, 8915 (v).
——— Inquiry *re*, 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii), 7100 (iv).
Burford Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Business of the House, Notices of Motions, &c. (remarks) 9523 (v).
See 'Govt. Legislation,' 'Morning,' &c.
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3566 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2631 (ii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Communication (remarks) 66 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canal Inspectors, Qualifications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
Carpets purchased by Govt., Value, &c. (remarks) 8266 (v).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada, B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2769 (ii).
Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 625 (i).
Centre Toronto Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 2777 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Charges by P.M.G. *re* Resignation in 1896 (remarks) 841 (i).
Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).
Cold Storage : *See* 'Statements.'
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6579 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in G.B., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110 (1).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (M.) to ref. back to Com. *re* Amt., 9699 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).
Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Officers' Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9761 (v).
Dismissals from Public Offices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2767 (ii); on M. for 3°, 2768 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Officials' Salaries, on Statement (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9289 (v).
——— Open to Applicants, Ref. to by Prime Min. (remarks) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Dredge used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c., (M. for ret.*) 2334 (ii).
—— (remarks) 1940 (i).
Easter, Adjournment (remarks) 4458 (iii).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and effcient criticism (amt.) to Sup., 9085 (v).
——— (remarks) 9051 (v).
Estimates, of the Interior, Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9276 (v).
Exports and Imports Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Facer Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1339 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6312, 6337 (iv).
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 172 (i).
Freight Rates on Rys.: *See* 'Holstein.'
Gamebridge, Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret. (remarks) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 8004 (v).
See 'Ritchie.'
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).
Glanders among Horses, Expenditure *re* by O. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Gold Medal Furniture Co's Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Govt. Legislation, Inquiry for, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 820 (i).
Govt. Railways, Rails taken up and renewed, Tons, Disposition of, &c. (M. for ret.) 2066 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2614 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies, in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
G.T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9280 (v).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4205, 4214 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7678 (iv)
G. T. P. Ry. Commission, Appnmts. of Staff, Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
——— (Ques.) 688 (i).
——— Estimates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2182 (ii).
——— Interim Rep. (remarks) 6310 (iv).
——— Surveys, Information *re*, Mr. Hay's Address, &c. (remarks) 2007 (ii).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept. &c. (remarks) 2018 (ii).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2829 (ii).
——— Winnipeg Terminals, Contracts, &c. (remarks) 9541 (v).
——— Winnipeg Terminals, Cor. *re* (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Issue to U.S. Citizens (remarks) 6311 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re*, &c., on M. for Sup., Cor. &c. (read) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claim (personal explanation) 7916 (iv).
——— Mr. Chaffey's Letter (read) 8183 (v).
——— Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 7723 (iv), 8179 (v).
——— O. C. *re* Judge Myers (remarks) 8003 (iv).
——— Patents issued, &c. (remarks) 8003 (v).
——— Inquiry for papers, 7099, 7422 (iv).
——— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for (remarks) 7020 (iv).
——— Investigation, Progress *re* (remarks) 9725 (v).
——— Complete Ret. (remarks) 9179 (v).
——— Further Papers, Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 8777 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor. O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Halifax Equipment, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers in Mar. Provs., Criticism *re* Votes for, 9101 (v).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Charges against Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Hay transported over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt. &c. (M. for copies) 164, 280 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, Murray Harbour Branch Ry., in Com., of Sup., 2147 (ii).
See 'Murray'.
Holstein Breeders, Complaint *re* Freight Rates on Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
Homestead inspectors and Govt. Officials, acting as Political Organizers, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9255 (v).
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Nixon,' 'Leach.'
House of Commons, Furniture, Purchase of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Official Duties of Staff, Statement *re* (remarks) 9077 (v).
——— Purchases, Audit of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
See 'Library,' 'Ventilation.'
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Immigration in B.C., Authority for Inspection, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, Statement from Toronto Labour Council, on M. for Sup., 7504 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion, 7424 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ques.) 380 (i).
Indian Dept., Promotions *re* Senority of Service (remarks) in Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6921 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— Information *re* (remarks) 165 (i).
See 'G.T. Ry., B. 199.'
I.C.R., Chapman, F. B., Emplymnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1342 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1954 (i).
——— Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 451 (i).
——— Hay: *See* 'Hay.'
——— Parlour Cars, &c., Net Profits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
——— Passes issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
——— Railway Rates, Increases, &c. (remarks) on Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 6118 (iv).
——— Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount (Ques.) 688 (i).
——— Rolling Stock, Equipment, Additions from 1900 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Interior, Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i)
Internal Economy Board, Rep. of Proceedings (remarks) 9077 (v).
International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Grant) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
International Postal Supply Co., Renting of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7219 (iv).
Japanese Trade with Canada, Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods (remarks) 6656 (iv).
——— on Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7816 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9743 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
——— (remarks) 9709, 9711 (v).
Killam, Hon. Mr. Justice, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commissioners Board (remarks) on B. 36, 524 (i).
'Kingsford' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agents (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Letter Carriers, Sick Leave, Payment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
Library Accommodation, Extension of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
London Militiamen at London Election (remarks) 7358 (iv).
Losses sustained for Damaged Goods, *re* 'Minto' Str. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Expenditure *re* Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).
Mails carried free by Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3951 (ii).
——— Letter to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla (read) 3957 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 'naming Member,' 3859 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.'
Manitoba Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers (remarks) 1633 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
Martineau, Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit (remarks) 112 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Meeting after Six o'clock Recess (remarks) 450 (i).
Melfort Mail Service, Charges *re* Delays (remarks) 9790 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 243 (i).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ques.) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) *re* Cor. with Mr. E. F. Clarke, 9772 (v).
Metric System, *re* Weights and Measures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Council, Constitution, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 419 (i).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Military Heads, Appnmt. to Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905 ; on M. for 2°, 7263 (iv), 9179 (v).
Militia Armouries, &c., Supervision of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Militia Canadian Garrisons, Mr. Broderick's Proposition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9109 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) to M. for Sup., 6999 (iv).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 2185, 2326 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to, &c. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, B. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) on M. for 1°, 9029 (v).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9082 (v).
See 'Business.'
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2134 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry., Construction, Tenders, Plans, Specifications, &c. (M. for copies *) 2334 (ii).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Appnmt. as Dom. Lands Agent, Macleod, N.W.T. (remarks) 5718, 6111 (iv), 9076 (v).
——— Charges *re* (M.) to adjn., 8098 (v).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8697 (v).
——— 2nd Investigation *re* Charges, Letter from Mr. Beere (read) 9787 (v).
Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Nixon, Mr. (M.) to cancel Vote for Salary, in Com. of Sup., 9316, 9329 (v).
——— Reduction of Salary (Amt.) on conc., 9769, Neg. (Y. 30; N. 66) 9770 (v).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
See 'Half-breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9321 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9442 (v).
N.W. Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission (remarks) 56 (i).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 162 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 460 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i), 2051 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5587 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
N.W.T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c. (M. for O.C.*) 164 (i).
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9718 (v).
N.W. Ters. Land Sales, Inquiry for Ret., 1154 (i).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5965 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. for 1°, 317; on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1889 (i); in Com., 3186 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Parliament Buildings, Addition to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5801 (iii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Personal Explanation : *See* 'Resignation.'
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bills, Ques. of Order, 2320 (ii).
Petroleum Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7440 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pneumatic Tube System, Cost, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4469 (iii).
——— Circular Letter of Acting Minister of Public Works (remarks) *re* Cor., 4667 (iii).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contracts *re*, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Rates Increases, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Post Office Clerks, Examination for Statutory Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9058 (v).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland (remarks) 833 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Tunnelling, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2811 (ii).
Prohibitionist Principles, on Charges by P.M.G. (explanation) 842 (i).
Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Accounts Rep., Inquiry for, 97 (i).
Public Buildings, Comparison with U.S. System of Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).
Public Buildings in Towns, &c., Amounts first voted, population, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Public Building Sites, &c., Non-partisan Selections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 429 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Public Works, Rep. of Minister, Delay, &c. (remarks) 601 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Tronsfer to Marine Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 772 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 823, 826 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 494, 524; in Com. on Res., 572; in Com., 1616., (i).
Railway Commission, Board of Maintenance, 1534 (i).
——— Number and Names of Employees, &c. (Ques.) 684 (i).
——— Staff Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Blair, Inquiry for, 1539 (i).
Resignation in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 841 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, Delay, &c. (remarks) 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for, *re* Public Works, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for, 1594 (i), 2262 (ii), 5600 (iii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7337 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, O.C. and Rep. &c., Inquiry for, 8098 (v).
Ritchie, James, Inspector of Masons *re* Trent Valley Canal, Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
See 'Gamebridge.'
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6969; in Com., 7262 (iv).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99, 3651 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishment. &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2079, 2092 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7187 (iv).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
Saskatchewan, Creation of Province : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c., (Ques.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 2115 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (shipping masters) Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7428 (iv), 9030 (v).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 52; in Com., 355, 1203 (i).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Distribution, Preparation, &c. (Ques.) 2328 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2006 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation (remarks) 1853 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymnt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
——— Resignation, &c. (remarks) 115 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 973 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co., on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 875 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1699, 1712 (i).
Agriculture, &c. (creameries) 6938 (iv) ; (criminal statistics) 1473; (i) ; (dairying) 6936; (live stock records) 6680 (iv); (Patent Record) 1472 (i).
Canals—Cornwall (repairs at locks) 1494 ; Grenville (guide piers) 1500 ; Miscellaneous (inspections, &c.) 1509; (staff and

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
repairs) 1546; Murray (repairs) 1495; Trent (improvements) 1499; (surveys) 1489; Welland (stone protection) 1496 (i).
Charges of Management, 69 (i); (Receiver General's Office) 9053 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture Dept. (archivist) 9053; (private secretary) 9054 (v); (salaries) 92; Auditor Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 258, 405; (inspectors salaries) 405 (i); (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78, 118 (i), 9061 (v); Geological Survey (salaries) 122 (i), 9249; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 9053 (v); (salaries) 70 (i); High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (contingencies) 116; Interior (salaries) 114 (i); Conc. (salaries) 6909 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v); Inland Revenue (salaries) 89 (i), 9069 (v); Justice (salaries) 72; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2443 (ii), 9051; Militia (contingencies) 9068 (v); (salaries) 112 (i), 9067 (v); Post Office Dept. (salaries) 95 (i), 9058 (v); Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i); Public Works (salaries) 95 (i); Railways and Canals (law clerk) 9066; (private sec.) 9063 (v); (salaries) 93; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424; (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv); (land agents) 9251; (maps, printing, &c.) 6424 (iv); (outside salaries) 9251, 9289 (v); (roads and bridges) 6423; (surveys, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Excise (additional remuneration) 1688; (allowance to customs collectors) 1689 (inspections, &c.) 1693; (inspectors' salaries) 1679; (L. A. Frechette, translation) 1690; (methylated spirits) 1691; (preventive service) 1688; (travelling expenses) 1689 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) conc., 9685 (v).
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6613; (committee expenses) 6594; (leather trunks) 6606; (library books) 6945 (iv); (messengers) 243 (i); (pages) 6613 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i); (sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 6611; (sessional clerks) 6595; (sessional messengers) 6612; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Immigration (agents in Can. and G. B.) 9226, 9308; Amt. on conc., 9769; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227; (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (salaries) 9313 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9340 (v).
Indians—Generally (land management fund) 237; (legal expenses) 237 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9336 (v).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 225 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v); (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236 (i); (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7227 (iv).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' salaries) 123; N.W.T. (maintenance of prisoners) 122; Supreme Court (salaries) 125; (Three Rivers Judgeship) 9683 (v); Yukon (living allowances) 130; (maintenance of prisoners) 135 (i).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7535 (iv).
Legislation — Debates (expenditure) 6592 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967; (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i), 9680 (v); (Canada and Mexico), on conc., 6909 (iv); Canada and S. Africa) 973; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool) 902; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 933; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle) 938; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 919; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 937; (Quebec and Gaspé) 927; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971; (St. John and W. Indies) 7177 (iv); (St. John and Westport) 966; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 939; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441 (i), 6512 (iv); (arsenals) 446 (i); (depots) 9113 (v); (Dom. arsenal) 6513 (iv); (Militia Council) 9109; (ordnance) conc., 9686 (v); (pay and allowance) 413 (i), 6511; (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv); (surveys) 440 (i); (transports, &c.) 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 6959 (iv); (Champlain's monument) 9340; (Dom. and Provincial legislation) 9684 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957 (iv.); (noon gun, &c.) 121 (i); (Pacific cable grant) 7277; (Paris agency) 6958; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2614; (schools of navigation) 2639 (ii).
Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 481; (Edmonton Jail) 481; (general) 465; (parole system) 465 (i).
Pensions (Fenian raid) conc., 6961; (militiamen, 1885) 6957 (iv).
Post Office (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (letter carriers) 174; (mail service) 177; (mail service) Amt. *re* Thessalon Postmaster on conc., 9772; (postal maps, engraving) 9060 (v); (provisional allowances) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 166; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633 (i); (Winnipeg immigration building) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048 (i); (generally) 7284 (iv); (St. John detention building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P.O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1020; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034; (Halifax Dom. building) 1036; (Halifax

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Immigration building) 1036; (Inverness) 1041; (Shelburne) 1043; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547; (Bowmanville) 1549; (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hawkesbury) 1560; (London military stores) 1562; (Military College) 1561; (North Bay) 1564; (Oshawa) 1564; (St. Mary's) 1579; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (additions, &c.) 9542 (v); (archives) 603; (coal sheds) 1565; (elevator attendants) 1667; (lighting) 1667; (museum) 755, 765; (Post Office reconstruction) 1574; (Royal Mint) 608-620; (telephones) 1669; (Wellington St. paving) 1572; (western block, addition) 766 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance) 1666 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Annapolis) 9576; (Baddeck wharf) 9585; (Battery Point) 9552; (Boisdale wharf) 9585; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island cove) 9584; (Irish cove) 9578; (Kelly's cove) 9582; (Parker's cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579; (Petite Riviere) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9552; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney quarantine station) 9578; (Tatamagouche wharf) 9579; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 785 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Louise embankment) 772 (1).
Quarantine (cattle) 6700; on conc., 6911 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2278 (ii), 6427; (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings) 6432 (iv); (Amherst accommodation) 1983; Drummondville improvements) 1960 (i); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell diversion) 1940; (Moncton accommodation) 1946; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (St. Fabien subway) 1981 (i); (station accommodation) 6429 (iv); (steel rails, &c.) 1989; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i); (ties, &c.) 6429 (iv); (water service) 2170 (ii); (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways and Canals—Miscellaneous (litigation) 1522; (engineers, &c) 1521 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178 (ii); (Bloomfield agent's house) 6432 (iv); (Cardigan branch) 2172 (ii); (Charlottetown track extension) 6433 (iv); (Freetown station house) 2180; (Georgetown station) 2179; (M.C.B. couplers) 2178; (Morrell bridge swing span) 2177; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2134 (ii); (working expenses) 6908 (iv).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1534 (i).
Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204 (iv); (salaries) 981 (i); (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1698 (i); (inspection of staples) 9681 (v); (metric system) 1699; (standards) 1695; (travelling expenses) 1695 (i).
Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250; (local council grant) 9250 (v).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americanization (remarks) 7646 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6203, 6212 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Amt. to Reduce Vote, on conc., 9772 (v).
Timber Lands, sold or leased by Interior Dept., Descriptions, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9698 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Toronto Observatory, Govt. Policy *re* Removal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* Trench (remarks) 5807, 5922 (iii).
Transportation Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* (remarks) 321 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Inspector Ritchie's Dismissal (M. for cor.*) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return (remarks) 4750 (iii).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8695 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, Constructed by Govt. since 1896 (M. for ret.) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 8178 (v).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wines, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9762 (v).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.,' &c.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona,' in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation *re* (remarks) 9690 (v).
Yukon, Member-elect, Delay in Gazetting (remarks) 454 (i).
——— Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7035 (iv).
——— Salaries and Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 214 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Allan Fast SS. Service, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 894 (i).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Crown Lands) 8260; (seat of Govt.) 8244 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Dismissals from Public Offices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 140 (i).
I.C.R. Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans (Ques.) 1146 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt as Chairman of Ry. Commisson (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 535 (i).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Service, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 188 (i).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee (remarks) 113 (i).
Military Medical Officers, Appnmts., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6985 (iv).
Militia Buildings, Architects, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Pneumatic P.O. System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. *See* 'Autonomy.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 297 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of, B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 535 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7363 (iv).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).
St. John River, N.B., Govt. Policy *re* Wharfs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Sackville Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c. (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Site, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 428 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of (Ques.) 688 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture (creameries) 7016 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1500; (Williamsburg (steam hoist) 1495 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120 (i).
Justice—Man., &c. (Judges' travelling allowances) 122; N.S. (Dodd, Judge, salary) 124; Yukon (law books) 136; (living allowances) 127 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948, 951 (i); (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i).
Militia (Dom. arsenal) 445 (i); (Dom. arsenal) 7012 (iv); (medical officers) 417; (rifle, &c., grants) 444 (i); (Royal Military college) 7002 (iv).
Post Office (inspectors' salaries) 144; (provisional allowances) 170; (Ry. mail clerks) 139 (i).
Public Works—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; (St. John quarantine) 1052; (Woodstock armoury) 1057 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1021; (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough armoury) 1578; (Sandwich) 1580; (Stratford armoury) 1581; (Toronto warehouse) 1586 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Post Office reconstruction) 1574 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; (Quaco harbour) 7501; (St. John harbour) 7503; (St. John tributaries) 7502; (Salmon River) 7499; (tidal waters) 7503 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7397; (Beckerton) 7397; (Breton Cove) 7397; (Clark's harbour) 7398; (Country harbour) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Digby Pier) 7402; (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Mahone bay) 7408 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Yamaska River) 7394 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7455 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Clerk of Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).

Gallery, Mr. D., *Montreal, St. Anne.*
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site, *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1121 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Revenue) 1121; (Montreal P. O. improvements) 1129; (Montreal P. O., pneumatic system) 1135 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 136) (M.) to present Pet., 4550; Pet. (presented) 4644; 1°*, 4807 (iii); in Com., 5976 (iv).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034 ; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C. P. R. lands, 8795 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6066 (iv).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 'Yellow Dog,' Ref to in Newspapers (remarks) in Com., 5896 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8873 (v).
Budget, on The, 8971 (v).
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4694 (iii).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 11) 1°*, 317 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9763 (v).
G.T.P. Ry. Plans *re* Terminals, Deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2827 (ii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue (guarantee bonds) B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8680 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740, 9796 (v).
Kaslo and Lardeau-Duncan Ry. Co.s (B. 141) Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii); 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 506 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s (B. 137) 1°*, 4550 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 493 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1706 (i).
Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2054 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s (B. 12) 1° m. 316 ; in Com., 1283, 1888 (i), 2532, 2714, 2951, 2958. 3177; 3° m., 3393 (ii).
Pacific Bank of Canada (B. 175) 1° m., 7420; 2° m., 7625 (iv).
Private Bills Petitions (M.) to extend time, 4375 (iii).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 506 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7346 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 7438 (iv).
Spirits imported in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8680 (v).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Justice—Yukon (law books) 137 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8641 ; on M. for 3°, 8828, 9045 (v).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 4550 (iii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4689 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9763 (v).
Yukon, Reform *re*, Condition of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7069 (iv).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 270 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Carbide Manufacture, Willson Patent, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com. on Res., 1002 (i).
Cold Storage Plants for Bait, &c. (Ques.) 1505 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c. (M.) to adjn., 6312 (iv).
Fishing Bounties Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson (M. for copy*) 1770 (i).
Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to Life-saving Crew (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ques.) 6475 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).
Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismisals, &c. (Ques.) 6475 (iv.)
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 (Ques.) 584, 910 (i).
Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ques.) 1504 (i).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes made, &c. (Ques.) 583 (i).
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c (Ques.) 584 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4458 (iii).
Submarine Signal Apparatus (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
SUPPLY :
House of Commons (rooms) 251 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 896; (Magdalen Islands) 907 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; N.S. (Antigonish) 855, 1015; (Inverness) 1040; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 13) 1° m., 317 (i).
Money transmitted by Mail, Par. in 'Le Soleil' &c. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 4807 (iii).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Fraserville harbour) 7323 (iv).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. (B. 59) 1° m., 986 ; in Com., 1399 (i), 2106, 3205 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) in Com., 6380, 6607 (iv).
Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 47) 1°*, 728 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4944 (iii).
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 493 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1286 (i).
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 493 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1291 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossing) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 302 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Grenville (guide pieds) 1501 ; (Port Colborne elevator) 1269, 1291; (summit level) 1263; (stone protection) 1497 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1269 (i).
Welland Canal Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. (M. for ret.) 2097 (ii).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4696 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Canada Temperance Act Amt. (B. 128) 1° m., 3359 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9412 ; Res. of Boards of Trade and Cor., &c. (read) 9413 (v).

Gervais, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Crown Casualty Co. (B. 125) Pet. presented, 2322 ; 1° m., 2593 (ii).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. (presented) 493 (i).
——— (M.) to conc. 683 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. (presented) 4457 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 4550 (iii).
——— 3rd Rep. of Com. (presented) 4549 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc. 4551 (iii).
——— 4th Rep. (presented) 4983 (iii).
——— (M.) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— 5th Rep. (presented) 7096 (iv).
——— 6th Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).
——— 7th Rep. (presented) 9773 (v).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep. of Com., 9804 (v).
Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal, via G.T.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
G.T.P. Ry. Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees (M. for ret.*) 1770 (i).
——— (Ques.) 686 (i).
I.C.R. Passes for Quebec Councillors (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 (i).
Montreal P. O., Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73) 1°*, 1592 (i).
Postal Facilities, Montreal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time for Pets. (M.) 2203 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4370 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Canal and Lake Champlain Co.'s (B. 43) 1°*, 625 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (pneumatic tube system, Montreal) 1131 (i).
Worthington, Col. and Independence of Parlt. Act, *re* Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9164 (v).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
SUPPLY :
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 949 (i).

Gladu, Mr. J. E. O., *Yamaska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B. N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8621 (v).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 164) 1°, 6232 (iv).
Railway Commision Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6238 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4987 (iii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 35) 1°*, 493 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, &c., Ques. of Privilege, 6736 (iv).

International Bridge and Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) on Sen. Amts., 9695 (v).

James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

——— Maps *re* Location, &c. (Ques.) 2190 (ii).

Murphy, Edward Albert, Relief (B. 126) 1°*, 3091 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).

Private Bills Pets. Extension of Time (M.) *re* Report, 318, 448 (i), 2491 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Rama wharf) 9602 (v).

Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

——— (B. 146) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4th Rep. (M.) to conc., 6310 (iv).

——— 2nd Rep. (M.) to conc., 4081 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9396 (v).

Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*

Adulteration of Food, Prosecutions under Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5910 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act, Convictions *re* (Ques.) 3010 (ii).

Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* (Ques.) 2493 (ii).

Seaforth Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*

Autonomy and Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1752 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5153 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1863 (i).

Criminal Code (1902) Amt. (B. 67) 1°*, 1421 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9436 (v).

Dominion Elections Act (1900) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 263 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 100) 1°*, 2108 (ii).

Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s (B. 40) 1°*, 625 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1770 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G., *South Lanark.*

Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).

Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act (remarks) on conc., 6912 (iv).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).

Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9657 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481 (iii).

——— in Com. (B.N.A. Act) 5728 (iii).

——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6055 (iv).

——— (distribution of seats) 7735 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8019; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7852 (iv).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5947 (iii).

——— (joint stock companies) 6084 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown) 5946 (iii).

——— (law, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7125 (iv).

——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

——— Printing and Distribution (remarks) 1754 (i).

Bank Notes, Circulation and Printing *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 196 (i).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8654 (v).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Purchase, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2685 (ii).

——— Purchase by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).

See 'I.C.R.' &c., 'Transportation.'

Canada Eastern Ry. Co., Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 734 (i).

——— Litigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Senate Amts., 9078 (v).

Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 627, 659 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4269 (iii).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1942 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3205 (ii).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6488 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2765 (ii).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1672 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, &c., 821 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4203 ; on M. for 3°, 4233 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7677; on M. for 3°, 7861 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i).
G.T.P. Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Reps. *re* (remarks) 228 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 71 (Mr. J. T. Schell) in Com., 4258 (iii).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6565 (iv).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6501 (iv).
——— Charges, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7672 (iv).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 200 (i).
Immigration in B.C., Medical Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9334 (v).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4190 (iii); in Com., 6140 (iv).
I.C.R. and G.T.R. Arbitration, &c. (remarks) 68 (i).
——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1906 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1950 (i).
——— Rates, Increases *re*, on Explanation Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
——— Reply to Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 7447, 7457 (iv).
Judges taken from Bench for Appointments (remarks) 517 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. on B. 36, 517 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 274 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2140 (ii).
Nixon, Robt., on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to cancel Vote, in Com., of Sup., 9330 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 99 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2056 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Fence, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5693 (iii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5970 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2542 (ii).
Poonamalie Dam, Pet. *re* Repairs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1291 (i).
Postmasters acting as Partisan Officials (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6245 (iv).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Act Amt. B. 54 (Mr. Hyman) on M. for 1°, 819 (i).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2295 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 283; in Com., 1787 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1602 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1622 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1533 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman, on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 517 (i).
Ry. Debts. : *See* 'Exchequer.'
Railway Rates, Discriminating *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5016 (iii).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2325 (ii).
Resignations in 1896, Charges of P.M.G. (personal explanation) 839 (i).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of Establishing &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2080 (ii).
Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 389 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 1798 (i).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1866 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9340 ; on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 (v).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Carillon and Grenville (guide piers) 6305 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (culvert, St. Thérèse Island) 6302 (iv) ; (macadamizing roads) 9378 (v).
Canals—Cornwall (concreting apparatus) 6298 (iv).
Canals—Farran's Point (gas plant) 6308 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (electrical installation) 9354 ; (enlargement) 6294 ; (lock gates suspension) 6301; (Mill St. paving) 6301; (power house flumes) 6300 ; (repairs) 6307; (wall underpinning) 6299 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (remuneration to lockmasters) 9384 (v).
Canals—Rapide Plat (enlargement, Upper entrance) 6289 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (extension) 1333 (i).
Canals—St. Lawrence (shoals) 6289 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (landing wharf) 6302 (iv).
Canals—St. Peters (dredging) 6304 ; (repairs) 6308 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1335 (i).
Canals—Soulanges (construction) 6290 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Geo. Matthews Co. damages) 6303 (iv); (Holland River) 9359 (v); lowering floor of lock 6303 (iv); (McLaren's creek bridge) 9379 (v) ; (Peterborough dam) 6303 (iv); (staff on dams) 9383 (v); (surveys) 6291 (iv) ; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v).
Canals—Welland (elevator at Port Colborne) 1266, 1291 (i); (long level deepening) 6290; (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309 (iv); (Port Colborne level) 1263 (i).
Charges of Management (Receiver General's Office) 6249 (iv).
Civil Government—Customs (salaries) 80 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (clerical assistance) 6248 (iv); (salaries) 70 (i); Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); Labour Department (salaries, &c.) 100; Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 102 (i), 6266 (iv); Post Office (contingencies) 6240, 6245 (iv); Railways and Canals (private sec.) 9062 (v).
House of Commons (sessional messengers) 249 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection) 9239 (v).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).
Justice, Administration—N.W.T. (miscellaneous) 101 (i).
Legislation (House of Commons) 6268 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 884 (i).
Miscellaneous (Pacific cable grant) 7277 (iv).

Haggart, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works Buildings, Ottawa (museum) 757; (Royal Mint) 623 (i).
Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6912 (iv).
Railways and Canals—Generally (litigation) 1522 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2295; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2282 (ii); (surveys) 7496 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9384, 9388 (v) ; (general vote) 7447, 7457 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 7942 (i); (working expenses) 9384 (v).
Railways—P.E.I. (Hillsborough bridge) 2040 (ii); (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2140 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1533 (i).
Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1307 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6210 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3668 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1687 (i).
Transportation Commission, Rep. *re* C.A.Ry. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1267, 1291 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 701, 1776 (i); on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal, &c., on M. for Cor., 193 (i).
Wire Fencing Contract : *See* 'N.W.T.'
Wright Electoral District, Issue of Warrant, &c. (remarks) 98 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4409 4415 (iii).
Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172, 2° m., 7261 (iv).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s (B. 85) 1°*, 1788 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Georgian Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 97) 1°*, 2005 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Agriculture Committee, 2nd Rep. on M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).
Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Allans, SS. Owners, Contract *re* Cold Storage (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679, 742 (i), 2419; in Com., 2841 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5440; (subsidy) 5572 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4811 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5642 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6041 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8511 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088; letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (read) 6092 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5433 (iii).
Autonomy B. (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8750 (v); on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8873 (v). *See* 'Lt. Govs.,' 'N.W.T. B. 160.'
Bank Note Circulation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Parmelee) on M. for 1°, 1671 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston Penitentiary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8653 (v).
Bronte Lighthouse, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii); 9176 (v).
Buffalo Specimen *re* Exhibition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege (remarks) 1814 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4412 (iii).
Canada Life Assurance Co., ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canadian Agency B. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 9049 (v).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9004 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1074 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1074 (i).
Clinton P. O., in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8236 (v).
Colson, F., Emplymt. in Sec. of State's Office (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Cullers, Abolition of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. 9761 (v).
Desks in Chamber, Inconvenience of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1569 (i).
Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4971 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) in Com., 4700 (iii).
Fertilizers, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5979 (iv).
Government Contract B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2621 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1919 (i).
Grain Inspectors, and Recommendation from Boards of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7234 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4216 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7621 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7624 (iv); 7682 (iv).
Highway Crossings: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons Furniture, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Locked Drawers for Private Papers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1959 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7223 (iv).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Lowville to Milton Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).
Metric System, Adoption of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Murray Harbour Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2169 (ii).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8768 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
N.W.T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5585 (iii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario Fire Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Cost of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1572 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4966 (iii).
Pacific Bank of Canada B. 175 (Mr. Galliber) on M. for 1°, 7420; on M. for 2°, 7625 (iv).
Patent Act Reliefs, (remarks) *re* Amts., 6559 (iv).
Penny Banks Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business (Ques.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1295 (i).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages (remarks) 6962 (iv).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6951 (iv).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Buildings, Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 308 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1676 (i).
Ry. Commission B. 36 (chairman) on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1630 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Relevancy of Debate, 558 (i).
'Reptile Press', &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sec. of State's Dept., Number of Employees (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 339, 375, 1188; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Sorel Workshop, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
Spirits in Bond (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8681 (v).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (violations of Act) 1701 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (bulletins) 6928 ; (exhibitions) 6272 ; (experimental farms) 6165 (iv).
Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1501; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1295; (stone protection) 1496; (surveys) 1235 (i).
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6251 (iv).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
SUPPLY —*Con.*
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1682 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6603 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6392 ; (agents, G. B. &c.) 7700; (printing contingencies) 7712 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6556; (travelling expenses) 6557 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6544 ; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7523 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 2868 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subvention (Can. and Mexico) 898; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (G.B. and Can.) 865; St. John and W. Indies) 7199 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Acadamy of Arts) 7238 (iv). Bank of Commerce, Yukon, compensation) 9615 (v); (consolidation of statutes) 7244; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959, 7242; (Pacific Cable grants) 7240; (Paris agency) 6958 (iv); (Printing Bureau machinery) 9615; (tariff commission) 9614 (v); (tuberculosis grant) 7248 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv) ; (govt. service) 2616 (ii).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 469 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 9609 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 852 ; Ont. (Toronto P. O. pneumatic system) 1591; Ottawa (archives) 605 ; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i) ; (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9606 (v) ; (Printing Bureau) 1576 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 ; Ont. and Que. (new plant) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B.C. (Salmon river) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (general) 7237 ; (Margaree) 7412 ; (Scott's bay) 7416 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bronte) 7548 ; (Owen Sound) 7562 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Chateau Richer) 7292 ; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6454 ; (St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe waterways) 7384 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects, &c.) 7618; (cement testing) 7614 (iv); (temporary clerks) 9605 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7595 ; Que. (Bryson) 7586 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7579 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Ont. (Pelee Islands) 7609 (iv) ; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7452 (iv) ; (traffic arrangements) 1919 (i).
Trade and Commerce (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (metric system) 1694 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers (M. for copies) 1767 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1682 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 704 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4702 (iii); in Com., 8316, 8637; on M. for 3°, 9040 (v).
Ventilation in H. of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appmnt. of Mr. Binks (Ques.) 8146 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4684 (iii).
White Lead, Tariff *re*, in Com. on B. 190, 9761 (v).
Yukon Ter. Reforms, &c., on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5522 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4878 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5619 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands) 8265 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7828, 7886, 7947, 7984 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8518 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8248 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6088 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. on Schedules (Macleod) 8151; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8869 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2557 (ii).
Belly River Bridge Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission (remarks) 6836 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Establishment of in Alberta (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Frank, Town of, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Freight Rates on Cattle: *See* 'Holstein.'
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Half-Breed Claims, Unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9813 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-Residents (remarks) on M. for Sup. 6504 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Holstein Breeders Association, Office of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6686 (iv).
Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* Placing of Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5925 (iii).
Macleod Land Office, Reopening of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).
Macleod, Mounted Rifles, Trouble *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Macleod, Mr. Nixon, acting as political Organizer during elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Maladie du Coit, Disease among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6987 (iv).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
Provl. Govt. N.W.T.: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1188 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic, N.W. Ter. Prevention of, &c. remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1705 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv); (experimental farms) 9608 (v); (live stock records) 3686 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6403 (iv); (agents, &c.) 9329 (v); (interpreters) 7702 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9169 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720 (iv).
N.W.M. Police (Yukon) 8669 (v).
Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).
Public Works—General (clerk of works) 1644 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (Saskatchewan survey) 9603 (v).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (Belly River) 7592; (colonization roads) 7594 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631 (iv).
Quarantine—Public Health (organized districts) 1841 (i).
Yukon Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9251 (v).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association (B. 93) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2769 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. J. J.—*Con.*
Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, &c. (remarks) 1754 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2795 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 201 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9791 (v).
Storm Signals in Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (storm signals) 9176 (v).
Militia (permanent force) 9163 (v).
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2655 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2174 (ii); (Cardigan branch) 9484; (Georgetown accommodation) 9486 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Famine *re* Cattle Feed, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2655 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria & Haliburton, O.*
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511 (iii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3766 (ii).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8833, Neg. Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5615 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5732 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7953, 7971 (iv).
——— (election of members) 5769, 5810 (iii).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (ii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Edmonton city) 8161; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts. (M.) that Com. rise, 5833 (iii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Autonomy Bill, Preparation of Maps *re* Schedules (remarks) 5477 (iii).
Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
Bowman and Conmee, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 797 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3569 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1811 (i).
C.A. Ry. and L.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Purchase, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 735 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9018 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5688 (iii).
——— (remarks) 6653 (iv).
Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
See 'Can. Cattle.'
Director of Operations, *re* Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Dobey, Mr. : *See* 'Thessalon.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Working Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 803 (i).
Dress Regulations for Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1266 (i).
Franking Privilege, Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5134 (iii).
Freight Rates, Statement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
See 'Ry. Rates.'
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6694 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt. on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2835 (ii)
——— Surveys, Rep. in Ry. Dept, &c. (remarks) 2017 (ii).
G.B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt. (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
Gregory, Col., Retirement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Military Defences. Govt. Control, &c., Par. in 'Journal' (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1402 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9572 (v).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water (remarks) 701 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Efficiency, &c. (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Huron County Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Immigrants : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Reserves, abandoned by Indians, Sales, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Inter-Imperial Parlt., between G.B. and Her Colonies (prop. res.) 2334, 2395 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Japan, Trade Relations with Dom., on Stmt. (Mr. Fisher) 7910 (iv).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Purchase of Site, on Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9708 (v).
——— Rep. *re* Evidence (remarks) 8698 (v).
Labour Union Labels : *See* 'Union.'
Letter Carriers, Brantford, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of (Ques.) 271 (i).
London, Bye-Election, Resignation of H. M. for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
London Militiamen at Niagara (remarks) *re* London Election, 7249 (iv).
McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Man. Boundaries Extension, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* 'Political Debts,' 3858 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Mr. Speaker's Ruling (personal explanation, 3879 (ii).
Medical Officers and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medical Officers *re* Militia, Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9713 (v).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 7267 (iv), 9189 (v).
Militia Camp : *See* 'Kentville.'
Militia Council, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— Regulations, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1261 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9453 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Order in the House (remarks) 323 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5744 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings leased by Govt., Payment of Taxes, &c. (Ques.) 379 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 271 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c. (M.) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
——— (Ques.) 1065 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4655 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep., 4644, 4921 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4462 (iii).
Post Office, H. of C., Locked Boxes, &c. (remarks 8387 (v).
Post Office in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1067 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5006 (iii).
See 'Freight.'
Railways (Govt.) Act Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6155 (iv).
Red Deer, Battleford, Calgary Ry. Co.'s B. 19 (Mr. Logan) on M. for 1°, 318 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions, &c., Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
Rooms for Members, Rearrangement, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 7262 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 323; Leter from Mr. Hogg (read) 1793 (i).
Sessional Clerks, Employed to get Data for Speeches (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6601 (iv).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1861 (i).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).

SUPPLY :
Canals—Soulanges (gasoline boat) 1421; Trent (construction) 1420; (surveys) 1480; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1266 (i).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i); (sessional clerks) 6597, 6601 (iv).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6388 (iv).
Labour Dept.—(Labour Gazette) 7512 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900; (St. John, N.B., and Belfast) 902 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 441; (pay and allowance) 416; (surveys) 439; (target ranges) 445 (i).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660; (Yukon force) 8662 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg military) 1636 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1050 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant shed) 6734 (iv); (Prince Albert 1639; (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 850; (Inverness) 1042; (Shelburne) 1044; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6733 (iv); (Owen Sound) 9548 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition to H. of C.) 9543 (v); (archives) 606; (Royal Mint) 608 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9560 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Beaverton) 7546; (Blanche river) 7547; (Bracebridge) 7548 (iv); (Port Arthur) 785; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 782 (i); (Richelieu dredging) 7377 (iv); St. Mary's Current) 814 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 6694 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7447 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2035 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6221 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8825 (v).
Ventilation, H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).
White, Mr. Odbur, Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2210, 2235 (ii).
Wire Fencing, N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re*, Omission from 'Hansard,' of Question (remarks) 5582 (iii).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Minister of Public Works), *London.*
Acetylene Gas Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052-3 (i).
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, &c., (Ans.) 1760 (i).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 4371 (iv).
Armouries, Construction of Generally, in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
—— Erection of, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Bic Wharf, Land purchased from P. Ross (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Brantford Parade Ground (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Brantford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 861 (i).
Breakwaters, Wharfs, &c., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).
Carpets, Purchase by Govt. for Parliament Buildings, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8236 (v).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended (Ans.) 2773 (ii).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association B. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com., 2770 (ii).
Centur" Life Insurance Co.'s B. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2767 (ii).
Chatham Armoury, Contract, Price, &c., *re* Erection (Ans.) 587 (i).
Civil Servants Guarantees, &c., *re* P.O. Dept. (Ans.) 1758 (i).
Clinton P.O. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 854 (i).
Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1552 (i).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, Construction *re* (Ans.) 912 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Contract *re* (Ans.) 729 (i).
Frank, Grant to Settlers, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 728 (i).
Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 759 (i).
Glace Bay, N.S., Purchase of Site for Building (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4229 (iii).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Survey *re* Wharf (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost (Ans.) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Ice Jams on Thames River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).
Immigration Property, Leased by Govt. (Ans.) 914 (i).
I.C.R. Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 712, 1778 (i).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Library Accommodation in Archives Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ans.) 5785 (iii).
Mail Distributing Stations, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 915 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2762 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements, B.C., Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052, 2325 (ii).
Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Boyce) in Com., 2772 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5964 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— List of Buildings rented (read) 1664 (i).
——— Taxes paid, &c. (Ans.) 380 (i).
Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, on Inquiry for Copy of Instructions, 822 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3180 (ii).
Parliament Buildings, Additions to H. of C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Penetanguishene Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat (Ans.) 2063 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tender of Conmee and Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4651 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* (remarks) 5963 (iv).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2263 (ii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1065 (i).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, &c., Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 589 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tender *re* (Ans.) 1760 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Wharf Accommodation (Ans.) 1763 (i).
——— Winter Communication, Tunnel, &c., on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2813 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974.
Public Buildings, U.S. System of Renting, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1025 (i).
Public Works Act Amt. (B. 54) 1° m. 819 (i).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 731 (i).
——— Delay in bringing down (remarks) 602 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railway Commission, Rental of Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Returns *re* Public Works, on Inquiry for, 9688 (v).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Royal Mint, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1594 (i).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1759 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 592 (i).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 776 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station, Acetylene Gas Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. Joseph Pier, Lake Huron, Delay in Completion (Ans.) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Rep. *re* Investigation into defective Boilers in Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2472 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 2777 (ii).
Seaforth P. O. Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 859 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Shed, Immediate Erection of (Ans.) 5784 (iii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater, in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 94 (i).

Public Works — Buildings, B.C. (Fernie) 1641; (Vancouver) 1642; (New Westminster, Indian Branch) 1641 (i); Dom. (heating) 1670; (rentals) 1663 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1649; (clerk of works) 1642 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1633; (Dom. renewals) 1634 (i); (St. Boniface) 9549 (v) ; (Selkirk) 1634 ; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i); (Winnipeg customs) 9549 (v); (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i), 9550 (v) ; (Winnipeg militia stores) 1635 (i); (Winnipeg postal station 9549 (v); (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1048; (St. John drill hall) 1049; (St. John immigration shed) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1052 ; (Woodstock armoury) 1057.

Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Calgary P.O.) 1638; (court house) 1638; (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Edmonton) 9550 (v); (Medicine Hat) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Prince Albert) 1638; (Red Deer court house) 1639; (Regina P. O.) 1639; (Saskatoon) 1640; (Strathcona Horse barracks) 1637 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 846, 1018; (Canso) 1023; (Glace Bay) 1034; (Halifax, Dom. buildings) 1036; (Halifax, immigrant building) 1037; (Inverness) 1041; (Shelburne) 1043; (Sydney Mines) 1045; (Sydney P.O.) 1044 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 1547; (Bowmanville) 1549 ; (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1551; (Cobourg armoury) 1554; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (Hawkesbury) 1560; (Kingston barracks) 1560; (Kingston stables) 1561; (London barracks) 1562; (London military stores) 1562; (London P.O.) 1563; (military college) 1561; (military college drill hall) 1561 (i) ; (Neepawa) 9549 (v) ; (North Bay) 1563 (i) ; (Orillia) 9549 (v) ; (Oshawa) 1564 (i); (Owen Sound) 9547 (v); (Peterborough armoury) 1578; (St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; (St. Mary's public building) 1578; (Sandwich) 1579; (Simcoe) 1581; (Stratford armoury) 1581; (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto customs) 1581; (Toronto drill hall) 1582; (Toronto postal station) 1591; (Toronto P.O.) 1590; (Toronto warehouse) 1583 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (addition and alteration) 9542 (v) ; (archives) 603 (i) ; (astronomical observatory) 9542 (v) ; (coal sheds) 1565 (i); (eastern block) 9547; (elevators) 9551 (v); (elevator attendants) 1667; (heating, &c.) 1667; (H. of C. improvements) 1565 (i); (improvements) 9549 (v); (lighting) 1667; (museum) 754 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9605 ; (rentals, &c. statement (read) 9605; (post office fittings) 9551 (v); (reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575 ; (repairs, &c.) 1663 (i) ; (Rideau Hall, maintenance) 9550 (v) ;

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY —*Con.*

Public Works—*Con.*

Royal Mint) 606 ; (steel shelving) 1564 (telephone) 1669; (Wellington St. paving) 1571; (western block, addition) 765 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Souris) 1047 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Chicoutimi) 1106; (Dom., renewals) 1108 ; (Grosse Isle) 1108 ; (Lachute) 1111 ; (Levis) 1112; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1114; (Montmagny) 1117; (Montreal barracks) 1118; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal military buildings) 1125; (Montreal P.O. improvements) 1127; (Montreal warehouse) 1119 (i) ; (Quebec hospital) 9547 (v) ; (Quebec Immigration pier) 1138; (St. John's) 1143; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139; (Valleyfield) 1144 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (maintenance, &c.) 1666 (i).

Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 9604 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Dipper harbour) 9588 (v); (St. John harbour) 9588; (tidal water wharfs) 9590 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W. T. (Saskatchewan surveys) 9603 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis) 9576 (v); (Apple River wharf) 1728 (i); (Baddeck wharf) 9585; (Barrington wharf) 9581; (Battery Point) 9552; (Bourgeois inlet) 9581; (Devil's Island) 9551; (Economy wharf) 9579; (Frude's Point) 9581; (Glace Bay) 9577; (Half Island Cove) 9584; (Irish Cove) 9578; (Kelly's Cove) 9582 ; (Marble Mountain) 9580 ; (Parker's Cove) 9552; (Parrsboro harbour) 9579; (Parrsboro pier) 9578 ; (Petite Rivière) 9580; (Phinney's Cove) 9553; (Pierreville pier) 9581; (Porter's Lake) 9583; (Pugwash wharf) 9578; (Ray's Creek) 9576; (River Hebert) 9578; (Round Hill wharf) 9552; (Sydney Quarantine station) 9578 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579; (Toney river) 9581 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595; (Crowe's landing) 9600; (Echo Bay) 9598; (Honora wharf) 9597; (Manitoulin wharf) 9597; (Meaford harbour) 9599; (Midland harbour) 9601; (Owen Sound) 9600 (v); (Port Arthur) 784; (Port Colborne 815 (i) ; (Rama wharf) 9602 ; (Rosseau wharf) 9600; (Saugeen) 9602; (Severn River) 9602; (Stokes Bay) 9598; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Higgin's pier) 1734 ; (McPherson's Cove) 1735; (Miminegash breakwater) 1735(i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs) 1737; (Richmond Bay) 1738; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Anse I'Ilot) 9591; (Beauce wharf) 9591; (Disraeli wharf) 9593; (Douglastown) 9592; (English river) 9591; (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592; (Grondine wharf) 9592 (v); (harbour improvements, Que.) 770 (i) ; (Hospital wharf, Grosse Isle) 9608; (Lake Megantic) 9591; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Lotbiniere wharf) 9592 (v); (Louise embankment) 7700; (Newport breakwater)

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
9592 ; (Oshawa harbour) 9660 ; (Percé wharf) 9592 ; (Petite Riviere) 9591 ; (Riviere aux Renards) 9592 ; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591 ; (St. Genevieve piers) 9592 ; (St. Jean des Chaillons) 9592 (v) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2472 (ii) ; (St. Mary's current) 814 (i) ; (Sorel deep water wharf) 9593 (v).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (temporary clerks) 9605 (v); (C.P.R. account) 9604; N.W.T. (QuAppelle-Edmonton) 9604; (Descente des Femmes) 9604; (Grosse Isle system) 9604; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 9605 (v).
Public Works — Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay survey) 9547 (v).
Thames River Survey, Lake St. Clair Region, Completion and Cost (Ans.) 591 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com. (amt.) 4259 (iii).
Toronto Harbour Works, Tenders *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ans.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* (remarks) 5921 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* (remarks) 9687 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Ventilation in H. of Commons, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Mr. Manny's Offer (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9544 (v).
Wharfs, Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8181 (v).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1728 (i).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, &c., Constructed by Govt., on M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 2777 (ii).
Whitby Wharf Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2190 (ii).
Wire Fencing Contract, on Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 5962 (iii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 677, 742 (i).
Assiniboia and Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation and Amts. to Audit Act, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6523 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5461 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5650 (iii).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8061 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7781, 7820, 7939, 7982 (iv).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (election of members) 5779 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5996 (iv).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5682 (iii).
——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8152; (Ponoka) 8156; (Sturgeon) 8162 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Rural and Town Populations (remarks) 8094 (v).
——— Edmonton Election Contest (remarks) in Com., 5888 (iii).
——— date of election (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2587 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5852 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Explanation *re* Amts. (remarks) 5819 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Mr. Belcourt's Charges, 3521 (ii).
See 'Edmonton,' 'Man.'
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied, &c (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
See 'I.C.R.'
'Canada'-'Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2638 (ii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 668; in Com. on Res., 1008; in Com., 1070 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1076 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com.of Sup., 8204 (v).
Commercial Agencies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7211 (iv).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4976 (iii).
'Druid,' Expenditure *re* Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Edmonton Election, Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 (iii).
——— List of Voters, Names (read) 5855 (iii).
Exports and Imports, Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Cup., 7215 (iv).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2900 (ii).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Government Contracts B. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1673 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3885 (ii), 4130, 4202 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
——— Summary Statements of C. A. Ry., 4231 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage, 4223 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes), Ques. of Order, 2402 (ii).
Immigrant SS. Contracts: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Index to Hansard (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
I.C.R. and C. A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 133 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4196 (iii); in Com., 6141 (iv).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1903 (i).
——— Dining Cars, Losses *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Private Cars, Number, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2259 (ii).
——— Sidings and Spur Lines, in Com. of Sup., 1974 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2248 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2234 (ii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 710 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
London Malitiamen and London Election (remarks) 7253 (iv).
Mail Bags, Locks, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*con.*
Manitoba Boundaries, 'Race and Religious Cry', Ref. to by Mr. Paterson (remarks) 4028 (ii).
——— M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4073 (ii).
Metric System, Adoption *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Midland Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2738 (ii).
Military Equipment for Defences, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 447 (i).
Montreal Bridge and Terminal Co.'s B. 138 (Mr. Piché) on M. for 2°, 4703 (iii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2133 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agents, Charges Against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8109 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9441 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5714 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5589 (iii).
Oils, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 4969 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7281 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5792 (iii).
'Patent Record', Supply to Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).
Père Marquette Ry. Co., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7916 (iv).
Petroleum, Bounties *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contracts, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, &c., on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4467 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2678 (ii).
Public Works Rep., Date of Issue (remarks) 755 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3244 (ii).
Railway Commission B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 1623 (i).
Railway Commissioners' Board, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Car (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Railway Commission Rep., Non-Production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6235 (iv).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1577 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Election, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7339 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2297 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Wrecking Plant, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
'Scout,' Str., Claims *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7425 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).
Separate Schools, Issue of Circulars, &c. (remarks) 2410 (ii).
Statements of Mr. E. D. Smith *re* Cold Storage (remarks) 874 (i).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1723 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829; (archives) 1826; (Can. exhibit, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i); (experimental farms) 6172 (iv); (statistics) 1827 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (surveys) 1521 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360 (v).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6267 (iv).
Excise (inspectors' salaries) 1687; (methylated spirits) 1692 (i).
Fisheries (protection service) 2909 (ii).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6601 (iv).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 6557 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v); (provisions, &c.) 6550; (seed grain) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6534 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).
Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6537 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7226 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7511 (iv).
Legislation (House of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2704; (salaries) 2703 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 900 (i), 9622 (v); (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 935; (Halifax and Newfoundland) 906; (Manchester Line) 933; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 943; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i); (St. John and W. Indies) 7200 (iv); (wrecking plant) 959 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7246; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 7241; (Mining Institute grant) 7248; (Pacific cable grant) 7240 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Aberdeen boilers) 6465; (Arctic expedition) 6471 (iv); (govt. steamers) 2608; (life saving awards) 2624; (life saving stations) 2635 (ii); (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6743 (iv); (schools of navigation) 2642 (ii); (steamers, maintenance) 6464 (iv); (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 1670; (repairs, &c.) 1665 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1642 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Virden drill hall) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, military stores) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1637 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Woodstock armoury) 1061 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Saskatoon) 1641 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 860; (Sydney Mines) 1045 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550; (Guelph armoury) 1555; (Hamilton drill hall) 1559; (London military stores) 1562; (St. Mary's) 1578 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (coal sheds) 1565; (heating, &c.) 1667; (improvements) 1569; (lighting) 1668; (Museum) 756 (i); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9607 (v); (post office reconstruction) 1574; (repairs, &c.) 1663; (telephones) 1669; (Wellington St., paving) 1571 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Magog) 1116 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Man. (snag boat) 7577 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—B. C. (repairs, &c.) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 1744 (i); (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.W.T. (repairs, &c.) 7573 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Apple River wharf) 1730 (i); (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Cunningham Point) 7402; (Devil's Island) 7402; (Digby pier) 7402; (Janvrin's Island) 7406; (L'Ardoise) 7407; (Lunenburg) 7408; (Main-à-Dieu) 7409; (Margaree) 7409; (Port Hood) 7414; (Scott's bay) 7415 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg) 7546; (Bayfield pier) 7546; (Belle River) 7546; (Cobourg) 7549; (Collingwood) 7549; (Depot Harbour) 7552; (Goderich) 7553; (Grand Bend) 7554; (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; (Little Current) 7560; (Matchedash bay) 7560; (Oliphant harbour) 7561; (Owen Sound) 7562; (Point Edward) 7563; (Port Burwell) 7563; (Sarnia) 7564 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (creosoted timber) 1737; (Point Prim Island) 1737; (Rustico) 1738; (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289; (Chateau Richer)

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works.—*Con.*
7294; (Lake St. Peter piers) 6461 (iv); (St. Lawrence channel) 2476 (ii); (St. Simeon) 7393 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (architects) 7618, 7620; (cement testing) 7613; (clerical assistance) 7620 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7594, 7598 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Gatineau River) 7631; (St. Maurice) 7582; (Upper Ottawa Co.) 7629 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Dom. generally) 7636 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 7633 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraphs—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7636 (iv).
Post Office (mail bags, &c.) 209 (i).
Quarantine, &c. (public health, organized districts) 1845 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2289 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9495; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (additional sidings and spurs) 1974; (bridge strengthening) 1921 (i); (Cape Road crossing) 6432; (general vote) 7455 (iv); (gratuities) 2183 (ii); (locomotive machinery) 6428 (iv); (Mitchell bridge) 1940 (i); (revenue collections) 2219 (ii); (rolling stock) 1987 (i), 9519 (v); (St. Moise station) 1976; (steel rails, &c.) 1990; (Sydney Mines extension) 1988 (i); ties, &c.) 6430 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2175; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2133 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 2696 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7208; (commercial agencies) 7211; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspectors, &c.) 1692; (electric light inspection) 1696; (metric system) 1698 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 710 (i).
See 'Labour.'
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Broder) in Com., 9410 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal from I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2211 (ii).
Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Wrecking Plants, Bonus to Capt. Leslie (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8398 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9400 (v).

Jackson, Mr. S. J.—*Con.*
Grasshopper Scourge, Man., Relief to Farmers (Ques.) 909 (i).
Manitoba Voters Lists, Control of by Dominion Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6783 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction, &c. (Ques.) 909 (i).

Jackson, Mr. Wm., *West Elgin.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2439 (ii).
Poultry Experiments on Farms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6171 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6621 (iv).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) *re* in Com., 5877 (iii).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5776 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8461 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Bills from the Senate (M). to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2398 (ii).
Hersey Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
I.C.R., Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1931 (i).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 8475 (v).
Marine Officers at Halifax, Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8139 (v).
'Orangemen,' Attack *re* Quotations from Quebec Papers *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Printing Bureau, Outside Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6949 (iv).
Ry. Commissioners, (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 553 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4999 (iii).
Rifle Range in Cape Breton (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c., of Exports carried, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7520 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2698; (lightships) 2753 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and Canso) 938; (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).
Militia (association rifle grants) 9169 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2598 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Cow Bay, Port Morien) 7399 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9512 (v); (steel rails) 2001 (i).

Telephone Grievances, on M. (Mr. Maclean), Discussion out of Order, 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1773 (i).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8828; Ques. of Order, 8829 (v).

Wrecking Plants in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) *re* Discussion, 2480 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. T. G., *West Lambton.*

Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief (B. 154) 1°*, 5919 (iii); in Com., and 3°, 6377 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Howe, Relief (B. 167) 1°*, 6232; in Com., 7624, 7682 (iv).

International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1933 (i); in Com., 3135 (ii).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1357 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4922 (iii).

C.A.R. and I.C.R. : *See* 'Ry. B. 132.'

Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4692 (iii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 640 (i).

Criminal Code (trading stams) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Dumping Clauses, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. (M. for copies) 695 (i).

Fog Horns : *See* 'Toronto Island'.

Hay, Free Transportation over I.C.R., &c. (Ques.) 59 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Coal, Free Transportation, Quantity in 1902-1903, &c. (Ques.) 2065 (ii).

——— Coal carried to Ottawa free in 1902-1903 (Ques.) 2192 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).

——— on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 1897 (i).

——— Passes Issued, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

——— Purchases by Tender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

——— Supplies, Purchase of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2251 (ii).

——— Traffic Arrangements with other Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Can., on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7911 (iv).

Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4921 (iii).

Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Pneumatic System in Toronto P.O., in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

P.E.I. and I.C.R., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid (Ques..) 383 (i).

Printing Bureau, Printing of Reps., &c., in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).

Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Railway Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6141, 6150 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1836 (i).
Canals—Miscellaneous (repairs, &c.) 1547 (i); Trent (Holland River) 9360; (Surveys) 9354 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London, barracks) 1562; (London, military stores) 1562; (Toronto, barracks) 1590; (Toronto, customs) 1581 ; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, postal station) 1592 (i); (Toronto, P.O.) 1590; (Toronto, warehouse) 1587 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 1565; (paving Wellington street) 1571; (post office reconstruction) 1573; (Printing Bureau) 1575; (steel shelving) 1564 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lachute) 1112; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i), 9386 (v); (double track) 1933 (i), 9390 (v); (revenue collections) 2204 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (school of transportation) 9382 (v).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Cardigan branch) 2171; (Summerside improvements) 2177 (ii).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1524, 1542 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horn, Testing, &c., Complaints *re*, Cor., &c. (read) 9281 (v).
Trading Stamps: *See* 'Criminal.'
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9410 (v).
Western Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 108 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 4692 (iii).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5256 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3583 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3200 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 7581 (iv).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8643 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3532 (ii); in Com. on Res., 5483 (iii).
——— (Alberta boundaries) in Com., 5661 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6072 (iv).
——— (Crown Lands) 6036 (iv). 8257 (amt.) 8259 (v).
——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8026; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7825, 7848, 7888, 7940 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5755 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).
——— (seat of govt.) 8256 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5676 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6089 (iv).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8862 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8704 (v).
——— in Com., Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8761 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) 8871 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy Bill, Census Statistics *re* Population (remarks) in Com. on B., 8093 (v).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2521 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) *re* Draft Bill, 1902, 4348 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5842 (iii).
See 'N.W.T., B. 156.' 'Priv., Ques. of.'
Bredt, P. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 189. 265 (i).
C.P.R. Tax Exemption, Interpretation *re* (Ques.) 730 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8995 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, &c., Ref. to by Prime Minister (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Electoral Lists for N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c. (Ques.) 190 (i).
See 'Homestead.'
Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes, Lease to F. H. Markey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Glanders arong Horses, Compensation *re* Slaughter (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6697 (iv).
Govt. Officials in N.W.T., acting as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9267 (v).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9494 (v).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Sentence and Imprisonment, &c. (Ques.) 1849 (i).
Homestead Entries, Bogus Entries by Land Companies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Henry Entennier's Location (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9268 (v).
See 'Entennier.'
Homestead Inspectors, Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
Homestead Inspectors acting as political organizers (remarks) in Com of Sup., 9261; Prime Minister's speech (quoted) 9263 (v).
Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Indian Reserves, Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 (v).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Election Campaigns (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9713 (v).
Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Agents, 8772 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Porter, S., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
——— Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) *re* Separate Schools, Par. in 'Globe,' 3649 (ii).
School Lands, Sold by Auction, in N.W. Ters., Number of Acres (Ques) 730 (i).
Schukin, Ivan, Cor. *re* Homestead Patent concelled (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6408; Cor., &c. (read) 6410 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ques.) 264 (i).
——— Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
Smart, Mr. Jas., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts—Agriculture, &c. (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v).
Dom. Lands (homestead inspectors) 6408 (iv), 9261; (land agents) 9252; (land sales) 9267 (v).
Govt. of N.W.T. (general vote) 9622 (v).
Immigration (agents G.B., &c.) 7698 (iv).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6545; (surveys) 6552 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 6901 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6697 (iv).
Weights and Measures (inspection of staples) 9616, 9682 (v).
Wire Fence, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5697 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5055 (iii); (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8022; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv); (election of members) in Com., 5772 (iii); (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8510; on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8322 (v); (Senate representation) in Com., 5682 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, 8866 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Attack on Orangeism (remarks) in Com., 5902 (iii); School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5866 (iii).
Bank Notes lost in Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6261 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 642 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8210 (v),

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6843 (iv).
Dunnville Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Fishing Rights, Lease to F. H. Markey, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
Grenville Canal, Lumber for Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys. 6134 (iv).
Jams, &c., Prosecutions *re* Adulteration, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1721 (i).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 915 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6792 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Order with or without Tender (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Marine, Deptl. Supplies, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5790 (iii).
Patent Medicines, Inspection *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Public Works Labourers, Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 335, 1799 (i).
Sorel Workshops, Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2488 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1703, 1727; (jams, &c.) 1721 (i).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Can. exhibits at Imperial Institute) 1837 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6541 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2607; (winter mail service. P.E.I.) 2678 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (St. Peter's Bay) 1739 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6432; (Maskinonge River dredging) 6843; (Montmorency wharf) 6855 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Mr. J. B. Dobey, Irregularities, &c., on M. for Sup., 6205 (iv).
Welland Canal, Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
Wire Fencing, Contract *re* N.W.T. Boundary Line, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5698 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H., *Saskatchewan.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4329; in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).

Lamont, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8068; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7893 (iv).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5768 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6021 (iv).
——— (schools) Amt. 8491 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (Distribution of seats) 8712, 8743 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5825 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1°*, 986 (i); on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Edmonton, Yukon & Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1241 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Location of Line from Winnipeg (remarks) 9814 (v).
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Estate of Lord Selkirk, Cor. with Rev. Mr. Taylor (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3424 (ii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7946 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5948 (iii).
——— (Lt. Gov.'s powers) 5781 (iii).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5764 (iii).
——— School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5827 (iii).
Dom. Lands, B.C., Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, &c. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3208 (ii).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Name, Guarantee, &. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
G.T.P Ry. Terminals, Plans deposited with Govt., on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2824 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Inverness Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. (Ques.) 8885 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9741 (v).
Kaslo Postmaster, S. H. Green, Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. (Ques.) 2331 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
Killarney and Little Current, Contractor *re* Mail Service (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Labour Union Labels: *See* 'Union.'
Lake Ramsay and New Ross Postoffice Mail Service (Ques.) 9696 (v).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6275, 6347; on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 3) 1°*, 9; B. (withdrawn) 733 (i).
——— (B. 44) 1° m., 684; 2° m., 918, 1399 (i).
——— on M. for Adjnmt., 3249 (ii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to, in New Westminster, B.C. (Ques.) 4371 (iii).
Postmasters acting as Ret. Officers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6244 (iv).
Railway Act (1903) Amt. (B. 2) 1°*, 9; 2° m., 281; in Com., 312, 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).
Railway Commission Rep., Non-production of (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6236 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to M. for 3°, 1885 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Welland (lowering head of lock No. 1) 6309; (Vanderburg, Stephen, claims *re* injuries) 6306 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6244 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Military College stables) 1562; St. Catharines drill hall) 1578; Ottawa Post Office reconstruction) 1573 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1732; Ont. (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Thessalon Postmaster, Dismissal *re* Irregularities (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1776 (i).
Welland Canal Employees during Oct., Nov. (Ques.) 453 (i).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8565, 8615 (v).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4745, 4753 (iii).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com., 4972; on M. for 3° (amt.) 5113 (iii).
Fishery Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 5978 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2288 (ii).

Laurier. Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 36 (i).
——— (M.) to present to His Ex., 50 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Address, The, Reply to from His Ex. (presented) 1340 (i).

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. (remarks) 6108, 6137 (iv).

Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).

Alberta Bill: *See* 'Autonomy.'

Alberta Steamer Service, Number of Navigable Miles, &c. (Ans.) 6904 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Amts. *re* (remarks) 6232 (iv).

See 'Telegraph,' &c.

Animals slaughtered under Contagious Act, Compensation (remarks) on conc., 6914 (iv).

Anthracite Coal and Ry. Co.'s Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) to present, 4550 (iii).

Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage (remarks) 4753 (iii).

Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3670 (ii).

Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Lease of Land, &c. (Ans.) 2492 (ii).

Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment (M.) 2112 (ii).

Associated British Canadian Society and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ans.) 2189 (ii).

Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Payments to (remarks) 7021 (iv).

Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).

Auditor General and Audit Act, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. of Sup., 9627 (v).

Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 271 (i).

——— Part I (presented) 109 (i).

——— on Inquiry for, 51, 97, 1151 (i).

Aud. General's Resignation, Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ans.) 590 (i).

Autonomy (Alberta) B. (No. 69) in Com. on Res., 5434, 5479 (iii); 1° m., 1421 (i); 2° m., 2915 (ii); (M.) for Com., 5423 (iii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5601 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719 (iii), 8526 (v).

——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8564, 8571 (v).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6051 (iv).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7724 (v); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8010; on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7821, 7922 (iv).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5954 (iii).

——— (legislative assembly) 5815 (iii).

——— (schedules *re* constituencies) 5815 (iii).

——— (school clause amt.) 7145 (iv), Amt. (m.) 8269; on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8495 (v).

——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).

——— (Subsidy clause) in Com. on Res., 5489 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*

Autonomy (B. 69) 3° m., 8777 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Scott) C.P.R. Land Taxes to M. for 3°, 8792 (v); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8852 (v).

——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8153; (Macleod) 8152; (Pincher Creek) 8153 (v).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. (No. 70) 2° m., 5424 (iii) 8698; in Com., 8702 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 8705 (v).

——— (Moosejaw) 8758 (v); 3° m., 8866; on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8874 (v).

Autonomy Bills, Alberta, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2913 (ii).

——— Approval by Cabinet (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2268 (ii).

——— on Constitutionality of, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2196 (ii)..

——— Debate *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2045.

——— Delay in Printing (remarks) 1671 (i).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv).

——— Franchise System (remarks) 5477 (iii).

——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2502 (ii).

——— Information asked for in Rets., on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).

——— on Inquiry for Papers, &c. (remarks) 2595 (ii).

——— Lt. Gov. Salaries) (prop. res.) 8693 (v).

——— Meridian Divisional Line between Alberta and Saskatchewan, Letter (read) 8634 (v).

——— Notice of Amendment, &c. (remarks) 2761 (ii).

——— Notice of Procedure (remarks) 3169 (ii).

——— Number of Votes polled, Census, &c., (List read) in Com. on Bill, 7733 (iv).

——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).

——— Population *re* Saskatchewan Boundaries (remarks) 5920 (iii).

——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1755, 1788 (i), 8762 (v).

——— Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1751 (i).

——— Ry. Subsidies to Provs., &c. (remarks) 4202 (iii).

——— (remarks) 262 (i).

——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1866 (i).

——— Resolutions *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).

——— Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses (prop. res.) 2914 (ii).

——— Schedules *re* (remarks) 4375, 4750 (iii).

——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5576 (iii).

——— Schedules *re* Saskatchewan (remarks) 5475 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Autonomy (B. 69) Second Reading, &c. (remarks) 2022, 2112 (ii).
See 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ballot Boxes, Payments to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 989, 1337 (i).
Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ans.) 1342 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ans.) 587 (i).
——— Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ans.) 911 (i).
Banking, Act Amt., Legislation (remarks) 2442 (ii).
Binder Twine Mounties paid, &c. Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. and Re-hearing of N.W. Cases (remarks) 56 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No .36, 511 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Tel., 697 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. Alex. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2328 (ii).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Congratulations to *re* Election (remarks) 624 (i).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 8655 (v).
Bredt, Mr. Emplymt. by Govt., 190, 265 (i).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Dissallowance of (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, on Inquiry for Ret., 1152 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation of (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Business of the House, Ms. for Sup., &c. (remarks) 1241 (i)..
——— notices of motions (remarks) 9523 (v).
——— Cold Storage discussion (remarks) 8181 (v).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Cabinet Changes, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (remarks) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Vacancy (remarks) 4086 (iii).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3562 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (remarks) 3450 (ii).
——— Minister of Public Works, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn. 5474 (iii).
——— Representation in N.W. Ters. (remarks) 3252 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' 'Resignation,' 'Hudson,' 'Ministers,' 'Oliver,' 'Public Works.'
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4236 (iii).
Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of by G.T.R. (remarks) 69 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
C.P.R. Land Taxation, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) 2023 (ii).
Canadian detained on U.S. Borders (remarks) 5921 (iii).
Canadian Shippers via Atlantic SS. Co.'s and Armour's Contracts (remarks) *re* B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Carbide purchased by Marine Dept., Quantity and Price (Ans.) 915 (i).
Castonguay, A. B., Cause and Report *re* Dismissal (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 631 (i).
Château Richer, Removal of Obstruction (remarks) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmastership Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. (Ans.) 9081 (v).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt. (Ans.) 1341 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ans.) 1936 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Civil Service Appnmts. since 1896 (Ans.) 585 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv).
Civil Service Examiners Rep. (presented) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service List (presented) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2108 (ii).
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Discussions (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7099 (iv).
Colson, F., Appnmt. and Salary (Ans.) 8147 (v).
Commercial Agencies in G.B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Collection of Taxes on (remarks) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 7 (i).
——— Lists (presented) 60 (i).
——— (conc.) 111 (i).
——— Addition of Names (M.) 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5210, 5576 (iii).
——— Changes of Names (M.) 227 (i).
Commodities, Packing and Sale (B. 152) 1°*, 5960 (iii).
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser (Ans.) 7020 (iv).
Criminal Code (appeals) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) on M. for 3° (amt.) 9699 (v).
Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9430; on M. for 3°, 9525 (v).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry., Passenger Rates, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6836 (iv).
Debates, Official, Sel. Com. (M.) 111 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 3090 (ii).
——— 4th Rep., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 5034 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
'De Lévis,' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 914 (i).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Decease of (remarks) 5139 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act Amts., Bills, Consideration during Recess (remarks) 9813 (v).
Dom. Lands, Open to Applicants, Ref. to in Speech (Ans.) 1935 (i).
——— Sale, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 2006 (ii).
Dukus Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Easter Adjournment (M.) 4750 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4375, 4458 (iii).
Election, General, 10th Rep. (presented) 8001 (v).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of qualified Electors, &c. (Ans.) 7422, 7684 (iv).
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands (Ans.) 190 (i).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 188 (i).
Estimates (1905-6)—(presented) 58 (i).
Estimates, Delay in bringing down and efficient Criticism, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) 9096 (v).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt. (Ans.) 585 (i).
See 'Wire.'
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re*, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6312, 6339 (iv).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Canadian Shippers.'
Georgian Bay Canal, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Jurisdiction Ontario and Dom. (remarks) 6487 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Lake Huron, &c., Fisheries, Requests *re* Investigation (Ans.) 5479 (iii).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep. (presented) 625 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays (M.) 3361 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays (M.) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Graeme, Hunter, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ans.) 2189 (ii).
Grain Inspectors, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Survey Board, Pets. *re* Appnmts., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor. 1766 (i).
——— Recommendation of Montreal Board of Trade (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7232 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3649 (ii), 4205, 4226; on M. for 3° (remarks) 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. of Rys, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 918 (i).
——— Question answered by Govt. (remarks) 1596 (i).
——— Surveys, Information given out of Dept. of Rys., &c. (remarks) 2008 (ii).
——— Surveys, Reps. to Commission, &c. (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Survey of Route Moncton to Winnipeg Information *re* (remarks) 6135 (iv).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor., &c. (remarks) 9812 (v).
——— Terminus at Port Arthur, Ques. of Order, 6138 (iv).
Grass Seeds, Quantity exported (Ans.) 913 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2392 (ii).
Half-Breed Claims unsettled, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9814 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges, *re* Mr. McDonald, &c., on M. (Mr. Foster) 7675 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 7100 (iv).
——— Further Papers, on Inquiry for, 9029 (v).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers, *re* Charges (remarks) 8180 (v).
——— Instruction to Judge Myers, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— Investigation, Appmnt. of counsel (remarks) 8528, 8697 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6569 (iv).
——— Patents *re* (remarks) 6907, 7020 (iv).
——— Statements *re*, 8777 (v).
Halifax Fishery Awards, Payments to Provs., Ref. *re* (Ans.) 2065 (ii).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contract, Cost of, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
Herring Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c. (remarks) 4552 (iii).
High Court of Justice, Ont., Appnmt. *re* (remarks) 5209 (iii).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5609 (iii).
Immigrants deported, Nationalities, Number, &c. (Ans.) 1847 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 1592 (i).
Immigrants, Examination *re* Qualifications (Ans.) 2188 (ii).
——— False Representations to (remarks) *re* Bills, 8178 (v).
——— Number arriving in 1904 (Ans.) 1148 (i).
——— Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 593 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Indian Dept., Promotion of Mr. Bray (statement) 6920 (iv).
Indian Affairs, Report (presented) 111 (i).
I.C.R. and C.A. Ry. Act (running rights) Amt. B. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 4191 (iii).
I.C.R., Sydney Station, Collections for Freight, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1768 (i).
Interior, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 4200 (iii).
——— Appnmt. of Dep. Minister (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 453 (i).
——— Minister of (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Vacancy *re* Interior Dept. (remarks) 3362 (ii).
See 'Cabinet.'
Internal Economy Committee (M.) 8 (i).
——— Rep. *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9076 (v).
International Waterways Commission, Appnmt. of (remarks) 701 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7218 (iv).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
'James W.,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango' (remarks) 4199 (iii).
Johnson, T. G., Late, M.P., Decease of (remarks) 8694 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9752 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. 36, 511 (i).
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ans.) 915 (i).
Labour, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 703, 918; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Leach, R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1065, 1151 (i).
Lead Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N.W.T. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Library and Printing Com. (M.) to add Name, 5686 (iii).
Life Boat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 912 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of (Ans.) 914 (i).
Live Stock Record Association B. (remarks) 5808 (iii).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Lloydmaster and Meridian Line between Provs. of Alberta and Saskatchewan (remarks) 8634 (v).
Lobster Canning Licenses in District No. 1, Govtl. Intention (Ans.) 910 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ans.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
London Militiamen and London Elections (remarks) 7256 (iv).
London and North Oxford Bye-Election, Issue of Writs (notification) 6311 (iv).
See 'Returning,' &c.
Lowville to Milton, Mail Service, Cost of Contract, &c. (Ans.) 9080 (v).
McCormack & Sharples, Messrs, Patent Relief, on M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive Pet. (objection) 6559 (iv).
Manitoba Boundaries, Former Pets. *re* (remarks) 4084 (iii).
——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement (remarks) 4844 (iii).
——— O.C. of March 21st, 1905 (remarks) 3745 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Demands from Man. Govt. (stmnt.) 3834; Cor., &c. (read) 3841 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3947 (ii).
Manitoba Election Returns (remarks) 1672 (i).
——— Duties of Returning Officers) 1507, 1633 (i), 4679 (iii).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief *re* Grasshopper Scourge (Ans.) 909 (i).
Man. and N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Resignations, &c., 1904 (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Manitoba School Fund, Amount paid, Amount claimed (Ans.) 379 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. (Ans.) 7097 (iv).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders, Report (presented) 54 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Contracts *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c. (remarks) 323 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Sheds, Claims of P. Lyall & Sons (Ans.) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Ques., 697 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 403 (i).
Morning Sittings (M.) 9081 (v).
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) on conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Mr., Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8116 (v).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 6048 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 8698, 9788 (v).
See 'Half-Breed.'
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9446 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Pay (B. 8) prop. Res., 59; in Com. on Res., 98 (i); 1°*, 110; 2° m., and in Com., 459 (i).
N.W. Ters. B.: *See* 'Autonomy'.
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections, Statement of Policy, on M. for Sup., 9721 (v).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases (remarks) *re* Question, 5478 (iii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appmnt. as Minister of Interior (notification) 4200 (iii).
Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt., on Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3591 (ii).
——— Cor. with Ross Govt., on Inquiry for, 4078 (ii).
Ontario-Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com. (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1888 (i); in Com., 3176 (ii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ans.) 382 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
Oxford, N., Issue of Writ, &c. (remarks) 6136 (iv).
——— Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8475 (v).
Pacific Cable Grants by Imp. Govt., Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Papal Ablegate: *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries'.
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to Transcontinental Ry. Commission (remarks) 699 (i).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5799 (iii).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands to in New Westminster, B.C. (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. of Business, &c. (Ans.) 687 (i).
Petroleum Crude, Bounties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiments *re* Cause (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, Ques. of Order *re* Irrelevancy of Debate, 4666, 4674 (iii).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. (Ans.) 8656 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 190 (i).
Postmaster General's Dept. Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Post Office Assessment System, Collections *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Regulations *re* Distribution of Packages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6835 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agents, Salary, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
——— Visit to Canada (Ans.) 451 (i).
P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Subsidy, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ans.) 591 (i).
Printing Bureau, Enlargement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, &c., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Grant) 448 (i).
Prorogation, Probable Date (remarks) 9801 (v).
Provincial Autonomy: *See* 'Autonomy.'
Provincial Rights, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1749 (i).
Provincial Stock as Trust Investments in G.B., Cor., &c. (remarks) 9540. (v).
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment of, on M. (Mr. Carvell) for Ret., 2103 (ii).
Public Works, Minister of, Rumour *re* Resignation (denial) 5035 (iii).
Public Works, Acting Min. of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1938 (i).
Public Works, Delay in Rep. (remarks) 601 (i).
Public Works Portfolio (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Quebec Bridge *re* G.T.P. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2296 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (explanation) 825 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 823 (i).
Ry. Act (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 282; in Com, 1787 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Quels. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 511 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 Ques. of Order, in Com., 1621 (i).
Ry. Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 54 (i).
——— Board of Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1534 (i).
——— Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).
——— on M. for Sup., 6233 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 2262 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4751 (ii).
Royal Military Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6971 (iv).
Royal Mint, Ottawa; in Com. of Sup., 612 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Delay *re* Payments (remarks) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers at Elections, Instructions *re* Form of Oath, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7333 (iv).
See 'London.'
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 6653 (iv).
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Fall of 1904 (Ans.) 1344 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 7684. (iv).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5622 (iii).
——— Conference *re* (remarks) 8268 (v).
Saskatchewan Prov., Permanent Capital (remarks) 1596 (i).
See 'Autonomy.'
Sbarretti, M'gr. : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries.'
School Lands sold by Public Auction in N.W. Ters. (Ans.) 730 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Investigation *re* (remarks) 4842 (iii).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 8147, 8656 (v).
——— Deptl. Report (presented) 5428 (iii).
Selkirk Ret. Officer, Occupation (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9729 (v).
Separate School Pamphlet, Preparation by Official Authority (Ans.) 2006, 2328 (ii).
Sessions, Earlier Meeting (remarks) in Discussion on Estimates, 9096 (v).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall, Purchase of Site, &c., (Ans.) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation (explanation) 1851 (i).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption (Ans.) 688 (i).
Smart, Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation (remarks) 115 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Smart, Resignation and Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 4371 (iii).
Speaker, Election (M.) 1 (i).
——— Dep. (M.) to appoint, 50 (i).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau (remarks) 7724 (iv).
Supply Bill 168, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 6966 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c.—Experimental Farms (bulletins) 6931 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 118 (i); Geological Survey (contingencies) 6248 (iv) ; (salaries) 122 ; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 120; Indian Affairs (salaries) 116; Interior (contingencies) 116; (salaries) 114; Militia (salaries) 112; Miscellaneous (noon gun, &c.) 121; N.W.M. Police (salaries) 78; Privy Council (salaries) 71 (i).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
House of Commons—Library (salaries) 6944 (iv).
Indians Generally (agricultural grants) 237; (land management fund) 236; (legal expenses) 237; (St. Regis lockup) 237; Mar. Provs. (schools) 225; Ont. (blankets, clothing) 225; (medical attendance) 223; (surveys) 236; Que. (Oka band) 235; (schools) 225 (i).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspectors) 7224 (iv).
Legislation—General (printing, and binding, &c.) 6948; (laws, printing, &c.) 6948; (voters' lists) 6954; H. of Commons) 6269 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and New Zealand) 7094; (France and Can.) 7094; (Murray Bay and River Ouelle winter nav.) 7091; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092; (St. John, Halifax and London) 7087; (St. John and W. Indies) 7087, 7176; (Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway) 7091; (wrecking plant) 7094 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 9158 (v); (Royal Military college) 7004 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of arts) 6959; (Can. Temperance Act) 6957; (Dom. and Provincial accounts) 6959 ; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (v); (Naturalization Act) 6957; (Pacific cable grant) 7276; (Paris agency) 6958; (printing) 6957; (secret service) 6958 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (pay of force, &c.) 8657; (Yukon Force) 8662 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956 ; (Fenian Raid) 6956 ; conc., 6961 ; (militiamen 1885) 6957 ; (N.W.M. Police) 6957 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (generally) 7284 (iv); Ottawa (Royal Mint) 607, 612 (i).
Quarantine—General (cattle) on conc., 6914 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, construction, &c.) 2283 (ii); I.C.R. (working expenses) 6907 (iv); Ry. Commission, Board of (maintenance) 1534 (i); Transcontinental (surveys) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Senate (contingencies) 6943 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 7204; (commercial agencies) 7208; (iron and steel bounties) 7216 (iv).
Supreme Court, N.S., Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii), 6837 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Supreme Court Reports, Delay in Printing (Ans.) 1342 (i).
Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of (remarks) 5316 (iii).
Telegraph Lines in Canada and Americans violating Alien Labour Act, on M. (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7645 (iv).
Telephone Committee's Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Grievances, and Tel. Com. Rep. (remarks) on M. (Mr. Maclean) 9535 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ans.) 7018 (iv).
Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T., Advertisements *re* (Ans.) 7098 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Toronto, Centre, Vacancy, Issue of Writ (statement) 3362 (ii).
——— Registration, &c. (remarks) 3251 (ii).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 5425 (iii), 7684 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).
——— Rels. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ans.) 6903 (iv).
See 'Criminal Code.'
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman (remarks) 7916 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Commission, Complete Membership, &c. (remarks) 321 (i).
——— Interim Rep., on Inquiry for (remarks) 731 (i), 2595 (iii).
——— Mr. Reford's Appnmt. (announcement) 492 (i).
——— Rep. *re*, (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4226 (iii).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8637; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grant of Lands (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c. (Ans.) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation and Revision for Algomas, &c. (Ans.) 594 (i).
Walsh, Major John, Superannuation and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks (Ans.) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U.S. Authorities in the South (remarks) 4200 (iii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfred. G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 6966 (iv.)
Wharfs Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 8179 (v).
Wire Fence along N.W.T. Boundary Line (Ans.) 5478 (iii).
——— Letter from Dep. Min. Cory (read) 5689 (iii).
——— Letter from Hon. Mr. R. F. Sutherland (read) 5691 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5580 (iii).
———on Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii).
Wire Fencing, Inspection of (Ans.) 686 (i).
Yonge Street Crossing Bridge, Construction, &c., Tel. *re* to Mayor (Ans.) 586 (i).
Yukon Commissionership, Vacancy *re* (remarks) 5036 (iii).
Yukon Elections, Delay in Ballot Box Opening (remarks) 988 (iii).
Yukon Ter., Ordinances Rep. (presented) 54 (i).
Yukon Elections Return of Member Elect, Telegrams (read) 1066 (i).
——— Returning Officer (remarks) 1152 (i).
——— Ret. Officer, &c., on Cor. with Govt. (remarks) 1259 (i).
Yukon Reforms *re* Condition of Govt (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7073 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3745; in Com. (school clause amt.) 7152 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8348, 8373 (v); (B.N. A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8556, 8612; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) dual language, 8842; (personal explanation) *re* not voting, 8866 (v).
——— Orangemen, Attack on, Ques. of Order, 8365 (v).
Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
By-Elections, Resignations of Members, &c. (remarks) 7423 (iv).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 178) 1°*, 7642 (iv).
Edmonton, Election *re* (remarks) 4201 (iii).
I.C.R. 'Maritime Express,' Running Time (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6831 (iv).
Legal, Mgr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools in N.W.T. (Ques.) 6187 (iv).
Liege Exhibition, and Prov. of Quebec, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
London By-Election, Resignation of Member for S. York (remarks) 6384 (iv).
Newspapers Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners (remarks) 3250 (ii).
Owen, David Thos., Patent Relief (B. 177) 1°*, 7642 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281 (i).

SUPPLY :

Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7534 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell Bridge) 1943 (i).

Lavergne, Mr. L., *Drummond and Arthabaska.*

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8235 (v).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1943 (i).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1283 (i), 3172 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *Prince, P.E.I.*

Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— Subsidy Increases, &c. (Ques.) 108 (i).

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 678 (i).

Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 486 (i).

Canso Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. (Ques.) 1146 (i).

Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 2773 (ii).

Cornwall Canal, Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1223 (i).

Fisheries Protection Service Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Fishermen for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I., Immigration of from Ireland, &c. (Ques.) 586 (i).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ques.) 689 (i).

Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, Canso, Establishment of (Ques.) 1146 (i); 5425 (iii).

House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 253 (i).

Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys, &c. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 4703 (iii).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (iii).

Marconi Station at Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ques.) 383 (i).

Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' (Ques.) 188 (i).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2855 (ii).

Miminegash Breakwater, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Miminegash River Dredging, Commencement of Work, &c. (Ques.) 3834 (ii).

Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2127, 2168 (ii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Ocean and River Service, Amt. of Payments on Pay-roll, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).

Oyster Culture, Depletion in P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).

P.E.I. Mail Service, Delay, &c. (remarks) 1152 (i), 2261 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2677 (ii).

PE.I. Ry., West Cape Branch Survey (Ques.) 589 (i).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Navigation Co. (Ques.) 5316 (iii).

P.E.I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade, &c. (remarks) 1753 (i).

P.E.I. Tel. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Soundings for Pier at Cape Carleton, &c. (M. for cor.) 2778 (ii).

——— Pet. from Travellers *re* Delay, &c. Refund of Expenditure, &c. (Qpes.) 4807 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Cost of, &c. on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret., 2096 (ii).

Summerside Drill Shed (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries (oyster culture) 2911 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7090; (P.E.I. and Newfoundland) 7092 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (examination of masters and mates) 2624; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2677 (ii).
Public Works — Dredging — P.E.I. (new dredge) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1731 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Miminegash) 1735; (Rustico) 1739; (Summerside breakwater) 1739 (i).
Public Works — Telegraphs — Mar. Provs. (Bay St. Lawrence) 7606 (iv).
Railways — G.T.P. (surveys,, construction &c.) 2286 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7495 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 2171 ; (Murray Branch and bridge) 2127 (ii); (Murray Harbour) 7494; (Summerside improvements) 2176 (ii).

Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt. (Ques.) 585, 685 (i).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Solicitor General), *Gaspé, Nicolet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5445 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3304 (ii); in Com., (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8546 ; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8457 (v).

——— in Com. on Schedules (Stony Plain) 8160 (v).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3557 (ii).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 187, 1° m., 8528 (v).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9435 (v).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3207 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6381 (iv).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6342 (iv).
Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2763 (ii).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
Lévis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6669 (iv).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. 152 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6353 (iv).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' Quotations (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
——— 'Yellow Dog,' &c., Translation (read) 8367 (v).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3305 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Defective Boilers in Dredges, Litigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2470 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 934; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1122 (i)..
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Port Hawkesbury) 6838 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Doucet's Landing) 6849 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592; (Laprairie ice piers) 9590; (Maskinonge river) 9590 (v); (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Petite Rivière) 9591 (v); (St. Maurice River dredging) 6852 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Auditor General and Audit Act (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 9623 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6525 (iv).
Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Audit Act (Ques.) 590 (i).
Audit Office and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 1935 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4112, 4136 (iii).
——— (election of members) in Com., 5778 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5930 (iii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8365 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6088 (iv).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).
——— Pets. circulated in Quebec (remarks) 2574 (ii).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers' Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day (remarks) 3580 (ii).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co's B. 22 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 1100 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1813 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo, Par. in Montreal 'Star' (read) 454 (i).
Cardinal Canal, Claims of Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8988 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 654, 672, 1082, 1467 (i).
Cornwall Canal Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1225 (i).
Criminal Code Amt. (B. 23) 2° m., 733 (i).
Dom. Lands Act, Regulations *re* Yukon Ter., on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9784 (v).
Fruit Marks Act. (staple commodities) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5982 (iv).
Geological Survey Museum, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6698 (iv).
Grain Carrying via I.C.R., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1920 (i).
G. T. Ry., Appeal to Judicial Committee, &c. (Ques.) 9080 (v).
G. T. P. Ry., Plans deposited with Dept. *re* Terminals, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 2823, 2833 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8677 (v).
I.C.R., Supplies purchased, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9753; in Com., 9793 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5922 (iii).
Military Camp at S. Simcoe, Establishment of (remarks) 9712 (v).
Murray Harbour and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763; in Com., 8768 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog', Quotations from Quebec Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8365 (v).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5741, 5970 (iv).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 495; in Com. on Res., 575; in Com., 1602; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1802; Neg. (Y. 47; N. 93) 1805 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1528 (i).
——— staff salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1541 (i).
——— Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* (remarks) 6233 (iv).
——— Rep. of Board, Preparation of (remarks) 2007 (ii).
——— Rep., Inquiry for, 2685 (ii), 6136 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c. (M. for reps., &c.) 2067 (ii).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 326, 1202, 1789; on M. for 3° (amt.) 1882; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1872 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).
Statutes Revision, Indexing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlargement) 1220; Galops (enlargement) 1220 ; Grenville (guide piers) 1500; North Channel (dam) 1230; Trent (construction 1420; (surveys) 1484; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1311; (stone protection) 1497; (surveys) 1237 (i).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6522 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 6642; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 (iv).
Miscellaneous (revision of statutes) 8673 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Toronto warehouse) 1589; Ottawa (museum) 760 ; Que. (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1129; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1138 (i); Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 6690, 6698 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (traffic arrangements) 1920 (i); P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2146 (ii); Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1528 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portion of Cor. (remarks) 1317 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 8826 (v).
Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Res., 8675 (v).
Waterways and Transportation Problem, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1311 (i).
Yukon Regulations : *See* 'Dom. Lands Act'.
Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5393 (iii).
——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8617; (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8427; on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8857; (Amt.) 8882; neg. (Y. 6; N. 124) 8882 (v).
Militia Officers gazetted *re* Examinations (Ques.) 8886 (v).
Political Crisis in Quebec, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).
——— Par. from 'Le Journal' (remarks) 753 (i).
——— 'Le Soleil's' Attitude (remarks) 830 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Terrebonne) 7394 (iv).
Trading Stamps, Res. from Boards of Trade *re* Legislation (Ques.) 6903 (iv).
Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditures *re* (Ques.) 1850 (i).
'De Lévis' Str., Hydrographic Surveys, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 914 (i).
Fisheries Protection Steamers, Names, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ques.) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Service, Aids to Navigation, Applications *re* Improvements, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Price, to Contractors, Renewals, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).
——— Memoranda to Dep. Min., &c. (M. for copies*) 2333 (ii).
Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 1153 (i)..
Public Works, Contracts awarded, Lowest Tenders, &c. (M. for ret.*) 916 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Miscellaneous (inspection, &c.) 1513; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1280 (i).
Waterways and Transportation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1280 (i).
Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).
Cables of the Empire, Cor. *re* with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1397 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J.—*Con.*
Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1° m., 318 (i).
Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 2768 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 252 (i).
Immigration, Fraudulent Representations (B. 120) 1° m., 2323 (ii); in Com., 9699 (v).
Judges' Appnmt. and Promotion, &c. (remarks) on M. for Com. on B. 36, 531 (i).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3397 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Ottawa City Voting, 562 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) Appnmt. of B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 531 (i).
SUPPLY :
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 2688 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1733 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii).
Voting at Ottawa Elections (personal explanation) 562 (i).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c. on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6133 (iv).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 9 (i).
Anthracite Coal imported into Canada, Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 9697 (v).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com., on sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8288 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1° m., 728 (i).; in Com., 4236; 3° m., 4412 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. Lamont) on Sen. Amts., 9078 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2605 (ii).
G.T.Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry. Purchase (B. 45) 1° m., 727 (i); in Com., 2765, 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; on M. for 3°, 4229 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
I.C.R. Employees Pensions (remarks) *re*, 9029
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9750 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*
'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2755 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3992 (ii).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8690 (v).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5747 (iii).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. 180 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8687 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation and Experiment *re* Cause, &c. (Ques.) 9079 (v).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (dog-fish experiments) 9174 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 907; (P.E.I. and Mainland) 921 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9167 (v).
Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2602 ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2659 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9567; (Tatamagouche) 9580; (Toney river) 9581 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9509 (v).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re* Delay, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2421 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5240 (iii).
Canadians' Mining Rights in S. Africa (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9530 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr Fisher) in Com., 647, 1085, 1471 (i).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks) in Com. on B. 5 1085 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Cost of Buliding (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6892 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i).
Immigration of Skilled Labour and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7510 (iv).
I.C.R., Pension Scheme for Old Age (Ques.) 2492 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9288 (v).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3204 (ii).
Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Reilef (B. 68) 1°*, 1421 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1760 (i).

Macdonnell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 351, 372 (i).
South Africa and Canadian Mining Rights: *See* 'Canadians Mining,' &c.
Statutes, Revision of, Completion, &c. (remarks) 745 (i).
SUPPLY:
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7542 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating) 6823 (iv); General (armouries) 1657; (clerk of works 1647; Ont. (Toronto barracks) 1589; (Toronto, drill hall) 1582; (Toronto, warehouse) 1583 (i).
Public Works—Dredging—Mar. Provs. (new dredges) 6891 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Pointe au Baril route) 6888; (Port Dover) 7564; (Toronto, breakwater) 7567; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 7565 (iv).
Toronto Drill Hall, in Com. of Sup., 1582, 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse: in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, Fog Signals, Alarms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Expenditure for 1880 to 1904 (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).
——— Straightening Don River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Erection of a new Building (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).

MacLaren, Mr. A. F., *North Perth.*
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8206 (v).
Cornwall Canal Employees, Names, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1221 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agr. Com., 5001 (iii).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182, 1798 (i).
Sheep Disease (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1539 (i).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*
American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5276 (iii).
Autonomy B. 69 School Clause Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5856 (iii).

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used, Total Expenditure, &c. (Qeus.) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7203 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, The, 42 (i).
Alien Labour: *See* 'Naturalization.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 745 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage, &c. (remarks) 4753 (iii).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5481; (subsidy) 5515; on M. for 2°, 5401; (objections) 5424 (iii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5607 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5729, 5749 (iii).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6050 (iv).
——— Crown lands) 8172 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) 7727; Newspaper Rumours, Quotations (read) 7744 (iv).
——— (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 6049 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 5986, 6008 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) in Com., 6102 (iv).
——— (readjustment of representation) in Com., 5754 (iii).
——— (Senate representation) in Com., 5678 (iii).
——— on Schedules, sec. 25 (Athabasca) 8163; (Saskatchewan) 8161; (Stony Plain) 8157 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Province (read) 5637 (iii).
——— Franchise System (remarks) 5476 (iii).
——— (remarks) on Introduction of Min. of Int. *re* Election, 5235 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Res. *re* (remarks) 1594 (i).
——— Unconstitutionality of, &c. (M.) to adjn., 2199 (ii).
See 'Manitoba.'
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 8689 (v).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c. (remarks) 55 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ry. B. 36, 497 (i).
Budget, The., Date of Delivery (remarks) 4920 (iii).
Business of the House, Motions for Supply, &c. (remarks) 1241 (i).
Cabinet ex-Ministers, Annuity B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9738 (v).
Cabinet Vacancy, Minister of Public Works (M.) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
See 'Public Works,' 'Ministers.'
C.A.R. and I.C.R.: *See* 'G.T.R.'
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1287 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Canadian Canals Corporation B. 72 (Mr. Calvert) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 456 (i).
Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawback by U. S. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
C.P.R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 635 (i).
Commercial Agents in Quebec, Tax collected, &c. (remarks) 9811 (v).
Corporations, Trusts, &c. (remarks) in Deb. on Address, 42 (i).
Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).
Express Cos. : *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. Co. of Canada incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6380 (iv).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie, Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6379 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, &c. (remarks) 1808 (i).
Freight Rates, Discrimination, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
See 'Ry. B. 4.' &c.
Glanders among Horses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6693 (iv).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes, &c. (remarks) 227 (i).
G. T. Ry. Arbitration B. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 9279 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 2765, 3649, 3880 (ii).
G. T. Ry. and Can. Atlantic Ry., Purchase of, &c. (remarks) 728 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Interim Report (remarks) 6310 (iv).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission (remarks) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., &c. (remarks) 2009 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9567 (v).
Highway Crossings : *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 239, 251 (i).
Hudson Bay, Sovereignty of Can. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-5609 (iii).
Imperial Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.'s incorp. B. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2771 (ii).
Inland Revenue Act (guarantee bonds) Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8679 (v).
Insurance Cos., Legislation *re* (remarks) in Com., on B. 200, 9689 (v).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Res., 9740 (v).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on B. No. 36, 497 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com. on Res., 279; in Com., 705; on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c. (remarks) 5577 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Demands *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarratti, 3852 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 3983 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets. *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. (B. 184) (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8689 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5706 (iii).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 1891 (i); on M. for 3°, 2325, 2714 (ii), 6346 (iv).
Oats, Rolled, in Com., on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2725 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 9818 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref., to Sel. Com., 1889; in Com., 1283 (i), 2951, 3170 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3394 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk (read) 3170 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5737 (iii), 5964 (iv).
Political Debts, Payment of, &c., Ref. to Speech on Man. Boundaries, 3857 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Railway Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1387 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. and Murray Branch, Expenditure up to 1st Jan., 1905 (Ques.) 106 (i).
Private Bills—Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' (M.) to adjn., 1745 (i).
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) 1027 (i).
Public Works, Acting Minister of, Unconstitutionality of, &c. (remarks) 1936 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Ry. Act, 1903 (highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 299 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Act (express companies) (1903) Amt. (B. 4) 1°*, 9 (i); on M. for Adjnmt. (remarks) 3246 (ii).
——— M. to withdraw, 3743 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109, 1619 (i).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 566; on M. for 2°, 745; on M. for Com., 497; in Com., 1597 (i).
——— (amt.) *re* Express Cos., 1619 (i).
———Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 320 (i), on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 514 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. 76 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 1757 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fisher) 53; in Com., 54; in Com., 328 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9731 (v).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* (remarks) 1856 (i).
Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Can., B. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) in Com., 1755 (i).
Spirits in Bond, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6682 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 9360; surveys) 9354 (v).
Canals—Welland (electric light plant) 9377 (v); (Port Colborne elevator) 1273 (i).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 9306 (v).
Geological Survey (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 7543 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and G.B.) 864; (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 945 (i); (St. John, &c., and W. Indies) 8691 (v).
Northwest Mounted Police (pay of force) 8660 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1027 (i); Ottawa (additions to H. of C.) 9546 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Point Prim Island) 1736 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498; (surveys, plans, &c.) 9493 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 9385 (v); (general vote) 7450, 7469 (iv); (rolling stock) 9501 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 6693 (iv).
Telephone Grievances and Rep. of Telephone Com. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9533 (v).
Telephone Com. Rep. (remarks) 9687 (v).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. for Com. of Sup., 1244 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into, on M. (Sir Wm. Mulock) for Sel. Com., 2683 (ii). *See* 'Port Arthur.'

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3659 (ii).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, on M. for Sup., 746 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8639 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City*
Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper, 8001 (v).
Canadian Cattle, British Embargo (remarks) 455 (i).
C.P.R. Steamers, Coal Loading Methods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
Century Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 49) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2765 (ii).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9434 (v).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 251 (i).
Inter-Imperial Parlt. between G.B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2357 (ii).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s Pet. (presented) 3744 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3172 (ii).
——— Postponement, 1338 (i).
Pet. *re* Autonomy Bill, Ques. of Privilege, 2680 (ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 38 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 2119 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7427 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 983 (i).
Immigration (medical inspection, B.C.) 9230 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 609 (i); Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Langley) 7575 (iv).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal Code.'
Vancouver and Coast Kootenay Ry. Co.'s (B. 131) 1°*, 4081 (iii).
Vancouver Dry Dock, Suppression of Portions of Cor. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8317, 8649 (v).
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 625 (i).
Yukon, Reforms *re* Govt. of Country: (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 7067 (iv).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*

Autonomy Bill, 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4086 (iii).

——— in Com. (Hudson Bay Co. rights) 5949 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5935, 5940 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, Attack *re* 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5909 (iii).

——— (M.) to adjn. Debate, 4078 (ii).

Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5893 (iii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 115) 1°*, 2185 (ii); in Com., 7621, 7677; 3° m., 7853, 7857 (iv).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 3963 (ii).

Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2736 (ii).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2718 (ii).

Parry Sound Buoy Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2732 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act (1898) Amt. (B. 6) 1°*, 58; 2° m., 315; M. to ref. to Special Com., 316 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (surveys) 9358 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoys) 2732 (ii).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Acres of Undisposed Lands in Provisional District, N.W.T. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5495 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3332 (ii); on M. for 3°, amt. (distribution of seats) 8857; neg. (Y. 42; N. 97) 8859 (v).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5604, 5669 (iii).

——— (Crown Lands) 8262 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv); Amt. to ref. to Judges, 7744; moved, 7770, 7819, 7931 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8017 (v).

——— (election of members) 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (H. of C. representation) 5752 (iii).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5944 (iii).

——— (readjustment of representation) 5753 (iii).

——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8494 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8247 (v).

——— in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163; (Cardston) 8149; (Gleichen) 8153; Amt. 8166; (High River) 8155; Medicine Hat) 8149 (v).

Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com., (distribution of seats) 8727 (v).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain, Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2515 (ii).

——— Schedules, Preparation of (remarks) 5477 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists, Printing of (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5863 (iii).

Experimental Farms, Establishment of, in Alberta, N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).

Lesser Slave Lake P.O., Establishment of Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 7018 (iv).

——— (remarks) in Com. on B. 69 8163 (v).

Mange among Horses, Cost of enforcing Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6719 (iv).

Manitoba Boundary Extension, Pets., Memorials, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 2067 (ii).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8773; Amt., 8774 (v).

N.W.T. Voters' Lists, Inquiry for Ret., 2594 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 6170 (iv).

Northwest Mounted Police (Yukon) 8668 (v).

Quarantine (cattle) 2310 (ii), 6719 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantine Cattle (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).

Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Election, 1905, (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*

Water Meters Inspeotion B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9408 (v).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*

Gillies Brothers, Limited, B. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) in Com., 2764 (ii).

Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7810 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Lake Temiscaming) 7559; Que. (Canton Fabre) 7288 (iv).

Temagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1005; in Com., 3135 (ii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief (B. 172) 1°*, 7095 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*

Agriculture and Colonization Com., 6th Rep. (presented) 8097 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5179 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5428 (iii).

Cattle, Canadian, Embargo, &c., 6th Rep. of Agriculture, &c., Com. (presented) 8097 (v).

House of Commons, Improvements in, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3231 (ii).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 15) 1°*, 317 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (House of Commons improvements) 1570 (i).
Quarantine (cattle) 2313 (ii).

McIsaac, Mr. C. F., *Antigonish.*
Harbours and Rivers—N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Public Accounts Com., (M.) 582 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2668 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 851, 1016 (i); (Phinney's Cove) 9563 (v).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 2668 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North and Victoria.*
'Agnes G. Donohue,' Str., Seizure, &c. (remarks) 1507 (i).
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Smallpox Quarantine (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Autonomy (Alberta) Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3713 (ii).
Autonomy Bill in Com., Resignation, &c. (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8480, 8486 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, School Clauses (remarks) in Com. 5898, 5912 (iii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Collision, Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, Quotation and Telegrams (read) M. to adjn., 9773 (v).
Govt. Steamers, Coal Supply (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9575 (v).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9742; in Com., 9793 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew at Halifax (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2617 (ii).
McDermot, Clara Bidwell Relief B. 132 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 6376 (iv).
Montevideo, Imprisonment of British Seamen, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2613 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Sydney Mines) 1046; (Sydney P.O.) 1045 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Boisdale wharf) 9585 (v).
Quarantine (organized districts) 2307 (ii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*
Agriculture Committee, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 4984 (iii).
——— 6th Rep. Cattle Embargo (M.) to conc., 8998 (v).
Bruce County Armouries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Canadian Cattle Embargo in G.B. (M.) to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 8998 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination, &c., on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4984 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 374 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture (experimental farms) 6175 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1658 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 493 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8204 (v).
Curley, Thos., Mitchell, &c., Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (Ques.) 3361 (ii).
Grain carried to Halifax, via I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1918 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Claims of P.E.I., &c. Memorial, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1386 (i).
I.C.R. Dining Cars, Losses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2255 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).
'James W,' Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS 'Durango' (remarks) 4198 (ii).
Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton (read) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Marconi System, Establishment of on Govt. Steamers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2623 (ii).
'Minto,' Govt. Steamer, Coal Loading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 2603 (ii).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).
——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. (M. for copies*) 2334 (ii).
New London Branch Ry., P.E.I. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

Pinette, Customs Officer, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 2330 (ii).

Power, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ques.) 4374 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland Steam Communication, Delay in Mail Service (remarks) 2203, 2261 (ii).

P.E.I., Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Communication, Investigation *re* Pier at Cape Carleton, on M. (Mr. Lefurgey) for Cor., 2808 (ii).

——— Delays, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2648; Cor. (read) 2649; Res. from Delegates (read) 2651 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry. Claims for Damages *re* Murray Harbour Branch (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9489 (v).

Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1532 (i).

Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ques.) 3361 (ii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7. (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2904 ; (protection service) 2909 (ii).

Immigration (agents, G.B.) 7700 (iv); (medical inspection) 9236 (v).

Legislation (laws, printing, &c.) 6948 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Manchester Line) 933; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 927 (i); (P.E.I. and G.B.) 7088; (St. John and W. Indies) 7197 (iv).

Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7247 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2598; (schools of navigation) 2646; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii).

Post Office (mail service) 9612 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 7497 (iv); P.E.I. (Higgin's pier) 1734; (Rustico) 1738 (i); Telegraphs—Dom. (generally) 7636 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1918 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); (steel rails) 2003 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (air brakes) 2178; (Charlottetown station) 2026 (ii); (Georgetown accommodation) 9489 (v); (Morrell bridge span) 2177; (Murray harbour branch) 2041; (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2130; (Vernon River branch line) 2177 (ii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1532 (i).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspectors) 1696 (i).

Timber Sales in Man. and N.W.T. Advertisements *re* (Ques.) 7097 (iv).

Truro Dining Room, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commission (Ques.) 4371 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1040 (i); Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7404; (Mabou bridge) 7408; (Margaree) 7410 ; (Port. Hood) 7414 ; (Scott's bay) 7417 (iv).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 679 (i).

Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 671 (i).

Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry. Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction (M. for copies*) 194 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

——— Site, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).

Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Mar. Can., Number, Location, &c. (M. for ret.) 1769 (i), 2067 (ii).

Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Fruit Growers Ass'on, P.E.I., Govt. Intention (Ques.) 381 (i).

Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. (M. for copies*) 1770 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Distribution to Provinces, &c. (Ques.) 1593 (i).

Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4373 (iii).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, Cor., &c. (M. for copies.*) 1398 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).

Live Stock Record of Can., Nationalization, &c. (Ques.) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).

Morell River Ry. Bridge, P.E.I., Complaints *re* (Ques.) 5035 (iii).

Murray Harbour and Hillsboro Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Completion, &c. (Ques.) 189 (i).

——— Delegation *re* (Ques.) 265 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

North Lake P.O., Removal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, Inquiry for Ret., 4810 (iii).

P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of SS. 'Stanley' (Ques.) 687 (i).

——— Mail Service, Delays, &c. (remarks) 280 (i).

——— Terms of Union, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Train Service (remarks) 697 (i).
——— Tunnel Surveys, Proposal to Delegation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c., Tel., (read) 831 (i).
——— Fisheries, Supervision, &c. (Ques.) 1762 (i).
——— Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Branch Lines, Construction and Surveys, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
P.E.I. Ry. Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* (Ques.) 266 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Tidings of SS. 'Stanley' (remarks) 1338, 1595 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c., *re* (M. for copies*) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* (Ques.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Inspector's Rep. of Str. 'Stanley,' &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
Railways and Canals, Can., Subsidies, Construction, Expenditure, &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 916 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1397 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5026 (iii).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1593 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. (Ques.) 5035 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 354 (i).
Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1062 (i).
Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry., Total Cost, Claims for Damages, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (Act violations) 1704 (i).
House of Commons (stationery) 6595 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 977; (Magdalen Islands) 907; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 929 (i), 7088 (iv); (P.E.I. and Mainland) 920; (P.E.I. and Nfld.) 940 (i), 7093; (St. John and W. Indies) 7194 (iv).
Militia (depots) 9113 (v).
Ocean and River Service (ice breaking steamers) 9618 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Inverness) 1042 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Miminegash) 1735 (i); (Mount Stewart) 9585 (v); (New London) 1735; (Point Prim Island) 1736; (repairs, &c.) 1737; (Wood Island) 1743 (i).
Public Works—Telegraphs—B.C. (Kamloops) 7610 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 1913 (i); (general vote) 7495 (iv); P.E.I. Cardigan branch) 9482 (v); (Charlottetown accommodation) 2025 (ii); (Charlottetown track extension) 6434 (iv); (Hillsborough bridge) 2038; (Murray branch) 2038 (ii).
Sydney, I.C.R., Station, Collections for Freight, &c. (M. for ret.) 1767 (i).
Wheatley River, P.E.I. Postmaster, Dismissal of James Power, Cor. (M. for copies*) 9697 (v).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) in Com., 4700 (iii); on Sen. Amts. 6609 (iv).
Mutual Reserve Ins. Co., Payment of Claims, &c. (Ques.) 2332 (ii).
Officials dismissed for Partisanship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6867 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1182 (i).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2849 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4292 (iii).
——— in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8624 (v).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8364 (v).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8991 (v).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Dredging Contracts, Mr. McKay's Interests *re* (remarks) 5599 (iii).
Farmers' Bank of Canada (B. 124) 1°*, 2681 (ii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Killam, Judge, Appmt. as Chairman of Ry. Commission (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 561 (i).
Man. Boundaries Extension, 'Scurvy Politician' Quotation *re*, 3863 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9475 (v).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, 'Yellow Dog' quoted in Newspapers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8364 (v).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).
Ry. Commissioner, Apptmt. of Chairman B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 561 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5029 (iii).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 349 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6821; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7617 (iv).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1383 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Acetylene Gas Explosion : *See* 'Scout.'
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 739 (i), 2414 (ii).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. (Ques.) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3064 (ii); in Com., 8176 (v).
——— on M. for 3° (Amt.) Dual Language, 8839 (v), Neg. (Y. 7; N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— in Com., (Alberta boundaries) 5602 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Acts) 8526 ; Amt., Dual Language) 8530, 8613 (v).
——— (election of members) 5777 (iii).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 8241 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5756 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8425, 8441 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8505 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., sec. 2 (B.N.A. Act) Amt. 8702 (v).
Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. *re* (M. for copies) 599 (i).
——— French and English Language, Notice of Motion, 7582 (iv).
See 'Provincial,' 'Separate Schools.'
Blair, Hon. A. G., Letter *re* Resignation (M. for copy*) 601 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4243 (iii).
'Canada,' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees and Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 991, 1003; in Com., 629, 1091 (i).
——— Order (Ques. of) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation, and Apptmt. to Senate (Ques.) 1344 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2110 (ii).
Coal Contracts for Penitentiaries, Montreal Firms, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Cote St. Paul Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham (Ques.) 3360 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. for 1°, 986 (i); in Com., 3208 (ii).
Fish imported into New York, Prohibition *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6191 (iv).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt. (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Legislation (remarks) on M. to take in Wednesdays, 821 (i).
G.T. Pacific Questions, Answers by Govt. (remarks) 1595 (i).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter (read) 7813 (iv).
Hudson Bay Expedition, Payments of Salaries: (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ice Breaker : *See* 'Montcalm.'
Immigration and Salvation Army, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 7684 (iv).
Immigration Office, G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Immigration, SS. Subsidies, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7699 (iv).
——— Ten Years' Contract, &c., Inquiry for, 8387 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Immigrants, Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 7811 (iv).
Isle Bizard Wharf Abutments, Expenditure *re* (M. for ret.*) 2067 (ii).
Jacques Cartier Surveys, Cost, Reps. &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Joliette Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
Kingston, Lighthouse Depot, Establishment of (Ques.) 914 (i).
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Use of Water Power (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
Lachine Canal Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Levis, Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6670 (iv).
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* (remarks), 1091 (i).
Meteorological Service, Names on Pay-roll, &c. (M. for ret.*) 917 (i).
Military Hospital, St. Johns, Que., Contract *re* Repairs, &c. (Ques.) 5687 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Mint, Royal of Canada, Establishment of, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for, Cor. (remarks) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
'Montcalm,' used by Dept. for St. Lawrence Ship Channel (remarks) in Sup., 2450 (ii).
Montreal and other Harbours, Dues and Charges, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Permanent Sheds, Cor. between Govt., &c. (M. for copies) 153 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition and Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1122 (i).
Montreal P. O., St. Catherine St. Branch P.O., Rents paid and Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. (M. for ret.) 402 (i).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1346 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* Immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for, &c., 7906 (iv).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 8887 (v).
See 'Immigrants.'
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 464 (i).
Northwest Territories B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 8769 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5740 (iii), 5967 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 470 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ques.) 1148 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Employees, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
Provincial Autonomy *re* N.W. Ters., Cor. between Govt. of N.W.T., &c (M. for copies) 599 (i).
See 'Autonomy:'
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, &c. (remarks) 403 (i).
Public Buildings in Villages, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. B. 37 (Mr. Prefontaine) in Com., 1243 (i).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Marine Dept., in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Political Crisis, Explanation asked for, 822 (i).
Railway Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1606 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Railway Commission, Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 593 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c. (M. for ret.) 2065 (ii).
Royal Mint: *See* 'Mint.'
St. Francois Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 1343 (i).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 601 (1).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, &c. (Ques.) 592 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2450 (ii).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 2777 (ii).
Salmon, Capt., Resignation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 395 (i).
'Scout' Str., Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts on Commission (remarks) 4841 (iii).
Separate Schools, Circulars issued by Jacques Cartier Club (personal explanation) 2410 (ii).
Sorel Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Amount expended in supplies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1399 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Statistics, Collection, &c., Information, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).
Submarine Signal Co., Boston, Contracts with, &c., Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 917 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 1827; (exhibitions) 1833; (Year-book) 1474 (i).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c., salaries) 7685 (iv).
Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 128 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and France) 7094; (Canada and New Zealand 7094 (iv); (Can. and S. Africa) 979; (Paspebiac and Gaspé) 947; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 950; (wrecking plant) 963 (i).
Ocean and River Service (schools of navigation) 2641 (ii).
Penitentiaries (coal contracts) 478; (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—General (clerk of works) 1646 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Regina P. O.) 1639 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (museum) 761 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 1101; (Dom., renewals, &c.) 1107; (Grosse Isle) 1108; (Longueuil) 1113; (Magog) 1115; (Montreal, barracks) 1118; (Montreal, Inland Rev.) 1119; (Montreal P. O., improvements) 1127; (Quebec, trachoma hospital) 1138 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grande Piles) 7327 (iv); (harbour improvements) 771 (i); (Portneuf wharf) 7314; (Repentigny wharf) 7314 (iv); (St. Lawrence Channel) 2450 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1398 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, *re* Alien Labour Act (M.) to adjn., 7642 (iv). *See* 'G.N.W.'
Trachoma Hospitals, Generally, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
Trading Stamps Legislation, &c. (Ques.) 7020 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5134 (iii).
Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P.'
Transportation Problem and Wharf Building, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c.; Value of Imports, (M. for stmnt.*) 279 (i).
Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal (M. for copies*) 457 (i).
Veterans, 1866 and 1870, Grant of Land (remarks) 6047 (iv).
Wrecking Plant 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 963 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5534 (iii).
Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette *re* (letter read) 989 (i).
——— (remarks) 1337 (i).
'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 149 (i).
See 'Montcalm.'
Chateau-Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works (M. for stmnt.*) 109 (i).
——— Obstruction, Removal of (remarks) 1154 (i).
Disraeli Wharf, Wolfe Co., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 916 (i).
Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2410 (ii).
I.C.R., Time Table, Connections at Montreal (remarks) 6831 (iv).
Man. Boundaries, Mgr. Sbaretti's Explanation, on M. to adyn., 4073 (iii).
'Montcalm,' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 150 (i).
See 'Champlain.'
Quebec Citadel Wall, Repairs to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* (Ques.) 6653 (iv).
Ste. Marguerite Pastmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ques.) 6477 (iv).

Morin, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
St. Moise Station, Population *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1979 (i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (rents) 6822 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Lévis) 1112, (Montmagny) 1117 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1729 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Beauce wharf) 9591 (v); (Château Richer) 7290 (iv); (Disraeli wharf) 9593 (v); (Doucet's landing) 7300 (iv); (Grande Riviere de Beaupré) 9592 (v); (Harbour commissions) 6726; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6460; (L'Ile d'Alma) 7307 (iv); (Maskinongé river) 9590 (v); (Mille Vaches) 7310; (Montmagny wharf) 7311; (Montmorency wharf) 6852 (iv); (Peribonka river) 9591; (St. Alphonse wharf) 9591 (v); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6458 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (St. Cyrille, diversion of line) 1969 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir Wm., K.C.M.G. (Postmaster General), *North York, Ont.*
Alien Labour, Employment of at Sault Ste. Marie on Govt. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1416 (i).
Atlantic Fast SS. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 893 (i).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3400 (ii); (C.P.R. lands) in Com., 6081 (iv).
See 'Manitoba.'
Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette (remarks) 1338 (i).
Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters, Cor. read, in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
Brantford Post Office Improvements, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada and Mexico SS. Communication, &c. (remarks) 67 (i).
See 'Mexico.'
Château Richer Public Works, Dates of Payment (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2042 (ii).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4266 (iii).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Elevators on Welland Canal, at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 1401 (i).
Facer Steel Car Co.'s B. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) in Com., 1285 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Name of Contractor, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6607 (iv).
Fitz-Simons Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of, *re* Circulars of Dental Institute (remarks) 1807 (i).
——— Use of Stamps, &c. (remarks) 5135 (iii), 5963 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ans.) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2493 (ii).
Grain Survey Boards, Toronto and Montreal, Stmts., Names, &c. (Ans.) 910 (i).
G.T. Pacific Commission, Staff and Salaries (Ans.) 688 (i).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
House of Commons P.O., Delay in Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Kent, Miss A., Postmistress at Kent, N.S., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster, Sureties, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5133 (iii).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 705 (i).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Payment for Sick Leave (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 176 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Partisan Conduct *re* Election (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to (Ans.) 4373 (iii).
Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, (Ans.) 188 (i).
Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 205, 209 (i).
Mail carried free by Rys, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 186 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line *re* River St. John (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum, &c. (personal explanation) 3846 (ii).
——— 'Malicious Fabrication' *re* Charges, 4035 (ii).
Manitoba Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown (remarks) 1406 (i).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4372 (iii).
Mexico and Canada, Exports of Canadian Goods, &c. (remarks) 897 (i).
See 'Canada and Mexico.'
Mileage *re* Mail Carriage, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Ministers, Absence of (remarks) 1285 (i).
Money carried Through Mail, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 4809 (iii).
Montreal Postal Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Complaints *re* Registered Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).
——— Illegal Stamping of Letters (cor. read) in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
——— Improvements, New Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— Pneumatic System Installation, in Com. of Sup., 1134 (i).
——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 202 (i).
——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).
Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 20 (Mr. Scott) in Com., 2715 (ii).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1709 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fence, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
——— Papers *re* Contract, on Inquiry for Ret., 5962 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2055; on M. for 3°, 2714 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 2720 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1284 (i), 2954, 3178 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Judge Winchester's Rep. (presented) 6232 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube System, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Telephone System and Board of Ry. Commissioners, on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies of Cor., 1389 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Postage on Newspapers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps, Bank Notes, &c., Contracts, *re* (remarks) in Com., of Sup., 204 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District, on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 600 (i).
Postal Rates Increases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).
Postmasters acting as Del. Ret. Officers (remarks) in Com. of Spu., 6241 (iv).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &s., (Ans.) 4374 (iii).
P.E.I., Additional Subsidy in 1901, on Inquiry for Ret., 4811 (iii).
P.E.I. and Mainland, Delay of Mail (explanation) 2261 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger (read) 1153 (i).
——— (remarks) 2204 (ii).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland, (remarks) 832 (i).
——— Contract with Steam Nav. Co. (Ans.) 5316.
——— Winter Mail Service, in Com. of Sup., 2662 (ii).
Public Works Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister (remarks) 5961 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3247 (ii).
——— (remarks) 109 (i).
Reports and Rets., on Inquiry for, 1242 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (remarks) 835, 844 (i).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Royal Mint, Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 618 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery. Cost of Establishment, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Rep., 2079 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
St. James Division Branch Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. John and St. Martin's, N.B., Mail Contract (Ans.) 2776 (ii).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Sarnia Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., on M. (Mr. Barr) for Cor., 597 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
Sherbrooke, Postal Rate and Delivery (Ans.) 379 (i).
Stanhope, P.E.I., Dismissal of Postmaster Lawson (Ans.) 1062 (i).

Mulock, Hon. Sir William, K.C.M.G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1272, 1300 (i).
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 100 (i); Post Office—(contingencies) 6240 (iv); (salaries) 95 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and Mexico) 895 (i).
Ocean and River Service, (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2662 (ii).
Post Office (compassionate allowance *re* Patrick Callery) 6628 (iv); (detective service) 209; (inspectors' salaries) 144; (inspector W. A. Cairns salary) 6629 (iv); (letter carriers) 173; (mail service) 5629 (iv); (provisional allowance) 166; (ry. mail clerks) 139; (salaries) 165; Yukon (mail service) 203; (salaries) 214 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 849; (Canso) 1029; (Shelburne) 1044 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Sandwich) 1579; (Toronto postal station) 1592; (Toronto warehouse) 1584 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Royal Mint) 618 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1126; (Montreal P.O., improvements) 1127; (Montreal P.O., pneumatic system) 1134.
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River wharf) 1730; (Harbour improvements) 774 (i).
Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup., 1301 (i).
Telephone Systems, Investigation into: (M.) for Sel. Com., 2681, 2841 (ii).
——— (M.) to add Names, 4186 (iii).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties (Ans.) 6106 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Boyce) for Cor., 3202 (ii).
——— Further Papers *re* Irregularities (presented) 6232, 6646 (iv).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, in Com. of Sup., 1584 (i).
Toronto Postal Service, Pneumatic Tubes (remarks) 5807 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1272, 1300 (i).
Trent Canal Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1471 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1385 (i).
Uniforms for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contract (Ans.) 2191 (ii).
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
——— Personal Duties (remarks) 5807 (iii).
Welland Canal, Leases for Water Power, on M. (Mr. German) for Ret., 2098 (ii).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3121, 3136 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2598 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9758 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 7261 (iv).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5969 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 327 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 1761 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 713 (i).
Yukon Representation, Ret. of Member-Elect Delay (remarks) 453 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Athabasca Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 2185 ; in Com., 3135 (ii).
Atlas, furnished by Interior Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
Auditor General's Resignation, Acceptance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6520 (iv).
Autonomy (Alberta) B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5485 ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3152 (ii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5612 (iii).
——— (Compensation *re* Lands) 5817 (iii).
——— (Crown Lands), 8262 (v).
——— (distribution of seats), 7728 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden), 8017 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. McCarthy) *re* distribution of seats, 7771, 7818, 7938 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown), 5992 (iv).
——— (school clause amts.), 5865 (iii).
——— (seat of govt.), 8244 (v).
——— (subsidy to provs.), 6088 (iv).
Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabasca) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8149 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8154, 8166 ; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plains) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70 in Com., sec. 12 (distribution of seats) 8712 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on "Orangeism" (remarks) in Com., 5874 (iii).
——— Census *re* Rural and Town Population, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8092 (v).
Bell, Dr., Appnmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9304 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 378 ; in Com., 1100 (i).
Congdon, Mr., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Reglations *re* Yukon Ter., (M.) to approve, 9784 (v).
Dom. Lands Official Salaries, List read in Com. of Sup., 9290 (v).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of (Ans.) 7812 (iv).
D. R. Fraser Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 2185 (ii).
Douhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of, &c. (remark) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters' Lists (remarks) 5865 (iii).
"Emigration of State Children ; Reply to Ques. (read) 5576 (iii).
Geological Survey Director, Appnmt. of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant (remarks) 6480 (iv).
——— Jurisdiction of, Memorandum (read) 6478 (iv).
Grazing Leases, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 8530 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications from N. Ouellet, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip to Non-residents (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6500 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6564 (iv).
——— (reply) to Hon. Mr. Foster, 7667 (iv).
——— Further Issue of Patents (remarks) 8003 (v).
——— Further Instructions laid on Table, 9075 (v).
——— Further Papers laid on Table, 9179 (v).
——— Inquiry for Copy of Instructions (Mr. Foster) 8181 (v).
——— Memo. from Mr. Coté (read) 6403 (iv).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 7423 (iv).
See 'Nixon.'
Homestead Entries, Bogus Applications (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9270 (v).
——— Sales to Settlers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9269 (v).
Homestead Inspectors and Govt. Officials acting as Political Organizers in N.W.T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9256 (v).
——— Policy *re* Politicians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
Immigration Agents, Tabulated Statement (read) 9308 (v).
Immigration, B.C., Medical Inspection, O.C., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigration, Bonuses paid to Transportation and Booking Cos. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
——— Bonuses to Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Offices in G.B., Memorandum from Toronto Trade and Labour Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9312 (v).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (remarks) in Com .of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants entered at Vancouver and Victoria, Statement (read) in Com. of Sup., 9332 (v).
Immigrant Farmers, Bonuses paid by Govt. (Ans.) 7811 (iv).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9324 (v).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Indian Reserve Sales, on M. (Mr. Hughes) 6564 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to *re* Berens Agency (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Land Titles Act (1894) Amt. (B. 162) 1° m., 6104 (iv); in Com., 9082 (v).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9251 (v).
Lesser Slave Lake Post Office (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8164 (v).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands (Ans.) 6476 (iv).
Medical Inspection *re* Indians, Payments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Middle Forks Falls, Location of, Conditions of Sale, &c., (Ans.) 9079 (v).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Rep. of Inspection (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T., (explanation) 6110 (iv).
——— Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8107 (v).
——— Investigation at Macleod (remarks) 9075, 9789 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Salary, 9316, 9770 (v).
See 'Half-Breed,' &c.
North Atlantic Trading Co., and Contract *re* immigration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv), 9320 (v).
——— prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9440 (v).
——— Contract with, *re* Immigrants (remarks) 7907 (iv), 8182 (v).
See 'Immigration.'
N.W.T., Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9717 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
N.W.T., Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ans.) 5478 (iii)
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. (B. 161) 1° m., 6104 (iv); 2° m. and in Com., 8775 (v).
Porter, S., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Roads and Road Allowances in Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 195) 1° m., 9075; in Com., 9525; on Sen. Amts., 9819 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
St. Lawrence Islands, Cor. *re* Disposal of, &c. (Ans.) 6477 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep. (Ans.) 6188 (iv).
Saskatchewan Bill, Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
See 'Autonomy.'
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents *re* Homestead entries (Ans.) 8267, 8655 (v).
Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Patent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Stoney Indians Depleting Game, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6549 (iv).

SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Interior (mines branch) 6264 (iv); (salary increases) 9070 (v).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (Banff Park waterworks) 9306 (v); (contingencies) 6406 (iv), 9289 (v); (homestead inspectors) 6407 (iv), 9253; (land agents) 9251; (maps, &c.) 9308; (Mines branch, smelting ore) 9303; (national boundary fence) 8672; (outside salaries) 9251 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425; (roads and bridges) 6423 (iv); (salaries, outside service) 9290 (v); (surveys, maps, &c.) 6406 (iv); (surveys) 8671, 9306; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Geological Survey (assay apparatus) 8671; (maps, &c.) 8670; (salaries) 9249; (surveys) B.C.) 8669; (surveys, &c.) 8669 (v).
Immigration (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385 (iv); (agents in Can. and G.B.) 9308; (tabulated statement (read) 9308 (v); (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685 (iv) 9226; (detention hospital, B.C.) 9227 (v); (interpreters) 7701 (iv); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9331; (O.C., read) 9330; (seed grain) 9307 (v).
Indians—B.C.(Dom. exhibition at New Westminster) 9339 (v); (industrial schools) 6556 (iv) 9339 (v); (medical attendance) 6555 (iv); (miscellaneous) 9339; (Pemberton Band) 9339 (v); (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv).
Indians—General (Dr. Bryce, salary) 6558; (printing) 6558 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538 (iv); (implements) 9336 (v); (live stock) 6539; statement (read) 6543; (provisions, &c.) 6550 (iv), 9338 (v); (seed grain) 6539; (surveys) 6552 (iv).

Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6517 (iv).

Indians—N.B. (medical attendance) 6516; seed grain) 6516; (salaries) 6515 (iv); (supt., salary) 9336 (v).

Indians—N.S. (general vote) 6514 (iv).

Indians—N.W.T. (inspectors) 6548 (iv).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336; (park improvements) 9335; (Treaty No. 9) 9336 (v).

Indians—P.E.I. (medical attendance) 6538 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (assay office, B.C.) 7721; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720; (litigation expenses) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721; (Yoho park) 7719 (iv).

N.W. Ter. Govt. (Torrens system) 9249 (v).

Scientific Institutions (astronomical observatory) 9248 (v).

Yukon Ter. Govt. (additional allowance to Maj. Wood) 9250 (v); (local council grant) 7718 (iv), 9250 (v); (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).

Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ans.) 9281 (v).

Timber Regulations *re* Cutting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).

Toronto Observatory, Removal to Ottawa (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt. (Ans.) 8267 (v).

Yukon Regulations: *See* 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Yukon Ter. Orders in Council (prop. res.) 9724 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Acetylene Gas Cos., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

Apples, Packing for Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 743 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4404 (iii).

——— in Com., (election of members), 5766 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister on M. for Sup., 2513 (ii).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, on M. (Mr. Porter) to Com. of Sup., 9218 (v).

Carpets purchased by Govt. for Parlt. Buildings, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8266 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 633 (i).

Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2109 (ii).

Drummond Co. Ry., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 1941 (i).

Elevator at Port Colborne, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Estimates, Obstruction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

Govt. Officials and Political Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9272 (v).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3650 (ii).

G. T. Pacific Surveys, Reps. in Ry. Dept., (remarks) 2021 (ii).

Immigration of Children (remarks) in Com. of of Sup., 9324 (v).

Immigration Office in G.B., Complaints of Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum (read) 9309 (v).

I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1953 (i).

Japan Trade Relations with Canada, on Stmnt. (Mr. Fisher) 7913 (iv).

Killam, Judge, Appnmt. as Chairman of Commissioners (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 709 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4033 (ii).

Moncton Shops, I.C.R., Capacity, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, Termination of (prop. res.) 9437; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 76) 9480 (v).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9320 (v).

——— Notice of Motion, in Com. of Sup., 9329 (v).

N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5712 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5584 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 462 (i).

Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).

Pilotage Act (Quebec) Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 7444 (iv).

Plains of Abraham, Que., Erection of Tank on Martello Towers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Port Colborne, Elevator on Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com. on Res., 562 (i).

Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1168 (i).

South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9345 (v).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9360; (surveys) 9356; (surveys of dams) 9377 (v); Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1271, 1309 (i).

Osler, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Dom. Lands (agents' salaries) 9253; (homestead inspectors) 9253 (v).

House of Commons (messengers) 248 (i).

Immigration (agents in G.B. and Can.) 7699 (iv), 9309 (v); (medical inspection, B.C.) 9229; (seed grain) 9307 (v).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (implements) 9337 (v).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 2870 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974; (Quebec and Natashquan) 968; (St. John and Minas Basin) 971 (i).

Militia (pay and allowance) 431 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (fuel) 6822; (rents) 6818 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (immigration building) 1050; (St. John quarantine) 1053 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 6816; (treasury vaults) 6825 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Country Harbour) 7398; (Cow Bay) 7399; (Culloden) 7401; (Inverness Mines) 7403 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barrie pier) 9595 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (salaries, &c.) 2293; (surveys, construction, &c.) 2281 (ii); (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490; (terminals, &c.) 9499 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (Campbellton) 1969; (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i); (general vote) 7475 (iv); (Halifax terminals) 2034 (ii); (Mitchell bridge) 1941; (Moncton accommodation) 1947; (Newcastle improvements) 1967; (rolling stock) 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9514 (v); (steel rails, fastenings, &c.) 1988; (Sydney Mines extension) 1987 (i).

Railways—P.E.I. (Cardigan branch) 9484 (v).

Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).

Toronto, Centre, Issue of Writ, Registration *re* (remarks) 3251 (ii).

Toronto Island Fog Horns, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9286 (v).

Toronto Trade and Labour Council, Memorandum *re* Immigration Office in G.B. (read) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).

Transportation Problem *re* Waterways, in Com. of Sup., 1277, 1309 (i).

Wire Fencing: *See* 'N.W.T.'

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. to M. for 2°, 4798 (iii).

Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French, &c. (Ques.) 6826 (iv).

Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1760 (i).

I.C.R. Time Tables, Printing in English and French (Ques.) 6827 (iv).

St. Angel, Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1759 (i).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s. Speech (seconded) 17 (i).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4886 (iii).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s (B. 75) 1° m., 1671 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8231 (v).

Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 317 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*

Agricultural Imports to U.S. 1903-4 (Ans.) 909 (i).

Allans SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3045 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8081 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, School Clause Amts, (remarks) in Com., 5870 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 6836 (iv).

See 'Manitoba.'

Binder Twine, Manufacture in Can. for Home Consumption (Ans.) 1759 (i).

Budget, on The, 8934 (v).

Canso, Establishment of Bait Freezers, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).

Cattle Embargo, &c. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 902 (i).

Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9765 (v).

Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).

Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement, &c. (presented) 54 (i).

Coatsworth, Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Customs Collections on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Customs Collector, Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of, &c. (Ans.) 271 (i).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9764 (v).

Discrimination *re* Freight Rates, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 889 (i).

Dumping Clause, Amts. to (remarks) in Com. on B. 190, 9767 (v).

——— Customs, Instructions *re*, on M. (Mr. Kemp) for Copies, 695 (i).

Dredges imported, Entries at Customs, &c. (remarks) *re* Ques. of Mr. Bennett, M.P., 5596 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Edmonton Election, Opposition to Min. of Int. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5884 (iii).
Fisher, P. G., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade, in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Hamilton Cove P.O., Mail Service and Revenue (Ans.) 7422 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of (Ans.) 9697 (v).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons (Ans.) 689, 1065 (i).
Herring Industry, &c. at Canso, &c. (Ans.) 1147 (i).
Imports and Exports, Total Amount for Home Consumption, 1904 (Ans.) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c. (Ans.) 267 (i).
McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries, Mr. Borden's Visit to Bishop Langevin in Winnipeg, &c., 4020 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4018 (ii).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer, Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 2330 (ii).
Oats, Rolled, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9764 (v).
Preferential Tariff, Amounts, Volue of Imports, &c. (Ans.) 152 (i).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c. (Ans.) 1149 (i).
Pub. Accounts (presented) 50 (i).
'Reptile Press,' &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., on M. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) for Ret., 601 (i).
Rolled Oats : *See* 'Oats.'
Rouse, David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 452 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of (Ans.) 1150 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Request *re* (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse for Soft Coal, Establishment of (Ans.) 5688 (iii).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvement (Ans.) 3361 (ii).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. (Ans.) 264 (i).

Paterson, Hon. William—*Con.*
S. Africa and Can SS. Subsidy, Contract *re* in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Supply (M.) for Com., 50 (i)
SUPPLY :
Chinese Immigration (salaries, &c.) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 77, 90; Customs (contingencies) 405; (salaries) 78 (i), 9069 (v); Finance (salaries) 78; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (salaries) 70; Sec. of State (salaries) 74; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 96 (i).
Customs (commutation *re* navy and army) 6724 (iv); (contingent expenses) 256 (i); (Foote, J., gratuity, &c.) 6434 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 405 (i); (remission of duty *re* army and navy goods) 6812 (iv); (revenue cruisers) 409 (i); (Shadwell, Mrs. J. B., gratuity) 6435; (Turner, Mrs. J., gratuity, &c.) 6435 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and G.B.) 967 ; (Baddeck and East Bay) 934 ; (Canada and G.B.) 864; (Canada and Mexico) 895; Canada & South Africa) 971; (Grand Manan and Mainland) 922; (Halifax and Canso) 937; (Halifax and Liverpool) 902; (Halifax and Nfld.) 906; (Magdalen Islands) 906; (Manchester Line) 932; (Montreal, Quebec and G. B.) 932; (Murray Bay and Riv. Ouelle) 938; (Paspébiac and Gaspé) 944; (Petit de Grat) 966; (Pictou and Cheticamp) 935; (Pictou and Montague Bridge) 926; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 934; (P.E.I. and G. B.) 927 ; (P. E. I. and Mainland) 920 ; (P. E. I. and Newfoundland.) 940 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 935; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 936; (Quebec and Gaspé) 926; (Quebec and Natashquan) 967; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 948; (St. John, N.B. and Belfast) 902; (St. John and Digby) 904, 966; (St. John, N.B., and Glasgow) 902; (St. John and Halifax) 923; (St. John, Halifax and London) 904; (St. John and Minas Basin) 926, 971; (St. John and Westport) 966; (St. Stephen and Black Bay) 936; (Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence) 937; (Victoria and San Francisco) 906; (Victoria and Vancouver) 938; (wrecking plant) 957 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 848 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Bridgeburg) 1550 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 1575 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (semaphores) 1986 (i).
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Dismissal as Preventive Officer (Ans.) 1763 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 321 (i).
Trade and Navigation Rep. (presented) 50 (i).
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector at Collingwood, Superannuation, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 50 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, Ownership of Land, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona', in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Yukon Customs, Living Allowances (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3739 (ii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7735; (iv); on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8072 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7864, 7970 (iv).

Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

——— Establisment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).

Carillon Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).

Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2063 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).

Grenville Canal, Appnmt, of Supt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Grenville Canal Wharf, Price of Lumber (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i).

Hull Wharf, Total Cost, (Ques.) 2064 (ii).

Immigrants, Austrian, Stranded at Ottawa, (remarks) 4845 (iii).

Lumber purchased by Govt., Prices paid, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Militia Orders *re* Civil Servants (remarks) 1260 (i).

Ottawa Buildings and Civic Taxation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).

Ottawa Improvement Commission, Number of Employees (Ques.) 382 (i).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).

Ry. Act (1903)—(highway crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 281, 308 (i).

Railway Commission Board, Names of Employes, &c. (M. for ret.*) 403 (i).

Robert & Co., Lumber purchased from, Prices (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).

Saw Logs, Export Duty (remarks) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Grenville (guide piers) 1499; (inspection) 1509 (i).

Fisheries (protection service) 2910 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 2611 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rentals &c.) 1663; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Apple River) 1727 (i); Que. (East Templeton) 7300; (Montmorency wharf) 6856 (iv).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of (prop. res.) 1351, 1383 (i).

——— (M.) for special Com., 8636 (v).

——— Rep. (presented) 9392 (v).

——— (M.) to conc. 9522 (v).

Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2611 (ii).

Wharfs, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).

Piche, Mr. C., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*

Central Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Montreal Bridge Terminal Co.'s (B. 138) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans (Ques.) 1345 (i).

——— Grain Conveyors, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, Plans *re*, Preparation of (Ques.) 2186 (ii).

Montreal Postal Facilities, East End Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1133 (i).

Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s Change of Name (B. 81) 1°*, 1671 (i).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal P.O., Pneumatic system) 1133 (i).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Victoria beach) 7418 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*

Autonomy Bill No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4726 (iii); in Com., sec. 16 (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8474 (v).

Ballot Box Frauds in West Hastings Dom. Elections, on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary appeals) Amt. (B. 66) 1°* 1336 (i); 2° m., 4260; in Com., 4260; Amt. in Com., 5137 (iii); 3° m., 9699 (v).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9425 (v).

Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c. (Ques.) 1149 (i).

Oxford Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie (remarks) in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 8474 (v).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Maisonneuve.*

"Acadia," Str., Disposal of Fittings, &c. (Ans.) 1849 (i).

Acetylene Gas Lights, Number, Annual, Saving &c. (Ans.) 1593 (i).

See 'Carbide,' 'Scout.'

Advances by O.C., Total Amount (Ans.) 267 (i).

'Agnes G. Donohue' Schr. Seizure of (remarks) 1508 (i).

Aids to Navigation, Res. from Boards of Trade, Programme (read) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).

American Fishermen on N.S. Coasts, Protection *re* (remarks) 7908 (iv).

Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1850 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 270 (i).
Beaujeu Bank Pier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3202 (ii).
Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, &c., Denials, &c., 544 (i).
British American Fish Corporation, Lease to *re* N. Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Bronte Light, Installation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii), 9176 (v).
Brother's Light, Salary of Keeper (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
'Canada-Cape Breton,' Rep. *re* Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
Carillon Dam Fishway, Establishment of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5689 (iii).
'Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Ice Breaker,' 'Montcalm.'
Cold Storage Bait Freezers, Location, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1770 (i).
——— Amount expended (Ans.) 1505 (i).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments (Ans.) 5425 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (ry. debts) Amt. B. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3210 (ii).
Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Fishery Overseers, Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 5978 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Enforcement of the Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6633 (iv).
——— Steamers, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i).
——— Service, Weekly, &c., Pay-roll, Amt. of Payments (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Fishing Regulations in Ont., Conflict with Dom. (remarks) 4752 (iii).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Fish imported into New York, Legislation *re* Prohibition of, on M. (Mr. Demers) to Com. of Sup., 6190 (iv).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship (Ans.) 1343 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
——— Estimate of Expenditure (read) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Govt. Steamers, Purchases of Supplies, Statement (read) 2619 (ii).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt. (Ans.) 8886 (y).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces (Ans.) 1593 (i).
Halifax Lightship (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Harbour controlled by Commissioners, Names &c., (Ans.) 1063 (i).
Herring and Lobster Industry, Investigation, &c., Rep. *re* (Ans.) 4371, 5425 (iii).
Hodgins, Jonathon, Resignation from Harbour Commission, Montreal (Ans.) 151 (i).
Hospital Dues *re* Sick Mariners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Icebreaker 'Montcalm', Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
See 'Montcalm.'
Lake Manitoba Closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. to Lightship Service (Ans.) 1762 (i).
Lepreaux Point Lightkeeper, Dismissal, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 6475 (iv).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 4921 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Depot at Prescott, Contract *re* Erection (Ans.) 1340 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2710 (ii).
Lobster Fishing, N.B., Open Season in 1903-4-5 (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal *re* Ship 'Neptune' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
Lumber purchased by Govt., Quantity and Prices, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
'Lurcher,' Lightship, Accident to, Statement (read) 2851 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
See 'Salmon.'
'Maisonneuve' Str., Expenditure *re* by Govt. (Ans.) 1850 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, &c., Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Marconi Stations, List of Stations (read) 2869 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
——— System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto,' &c. (Ans.) 188 (i).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Marconi Station, Table Head, Delay in Operating (Ans.) 383 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).
Marine Insurance, Decrease in Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).
Marine Supplies, Purchase of, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2594 (ii), 4753 (iii).
Markey, F. H., Fishing Rights in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Meteorological Survey, Toronto, Removal to Ottawa (statement) 9812 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock, Tenants, Rent, &c., (Ans.) 5482 (iii).
Midland Dock, on Protest (Mr. Bennett) *re* Govtl. Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9559 (v).
Midland Harbour Range Lights (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2734 (ii).
——— Statement (read) 2852 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Accident to (statement) 4752 (iii).
——— rep. of Capt. Koenig (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 150 (i).
See 'Champlain.'
Montevideo, Seamen in, Imprisonment, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 192) 1° m., 9028; in Com., 9288 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Commissioners (Ans.) 150 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyers, Engineers' Plans, &c. (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Sheds, Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept. *re*, on M. (Mr. Ames) 693 (i).
——— Sheds, Plans and Specifications *re* (Ans.) 2187 (ii).
——— Raising of Sunken Elevator (Ans.) 151 (i).
Montreal Inland Revenue Building, Addition, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1123 (i).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ocean and River Service Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
——— Total Expenditure on Pay-roll (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Oshawa Harbour Revenue (Ans.) 1504 (i).
Parry Sound Buoy Contract, Statement (read) 2856 (ii).
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2726 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 171) 1° m., 7018; 2° and in Com., 7440 (iv).
Pilotage Commission, Sydney Harbour, Benefit Fund for Pilots, &c. (remarks) 9037 (v).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision *re* (Ans.) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Ice Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2673 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips made (read), 2675
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Inspection of 'Stanley' (Ans.) 687 (i).
——— (remarks) 1338 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland (remarks) 1595 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Service, Delegation *re* Tunnel, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners Act Amt. (B. 37) 2° m., 1242; in Com., 1243 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals (read) 2886 (ii).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 1242 (i), 2263 (ii).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 152 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel Improvements, Aids to Navigation, 2859 (ii).
——— Allan SS. Co., Res. *re* (read) 2860 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade (read) 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Ship Channel, Rep. of Capt. Koenig, *re* 'Montcalm' (read) 2451 (ii).
——— Suction Dredge, Description *re* (read) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
See 'Sorel.'
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ans.) 270 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. of Mr. Douglas Stevens in Answer to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).
——— Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident (laid on table) 2878 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 388 (i).
See 'Lurcher,' 'Stevens.'
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
Sault Ste. Marie Dry Dock Construction, Total Amount expended (Ans.) 5427 (iii).
'Scout' Str., Claims *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 4750 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 7424 (iv), 9030 (v).
——— Victoria Board of Trade, Res. (read) 7432 (iv).
Seamen's Act Amt. (B. 38) 2° m., and in Com., 2114-5 (ii); wthdrn., 4749 (iii).
Seamen's Act B. 38, Memo from Victoria Board of Trade (read) 2117 (ii).
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt. (Ans.) 3834 (ii).
Small-pox, on Ships, Prevention, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 9587 ; on Sen. Amts., 9815 (v).
Steam Communication with P.E.I., Delay in Mails, &c. (telegram read) 1753 (i).
Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 151 (i).
Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* Lurcher Accident, in Com. of Sup., 2878 (ii).
Submarine Signalling Bell, Shore Stations, Reps. of U.S., &c. (read) 2871 (ii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Reid (read) 2886 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).
Fisheries (bait freezers, Mar. Provs.) 9620 (v) ; (bounty distribution) 6636 (iv); (dogfish experiments) 9173 (v) ; (fish-breeding stations) 6636 (iv) ; (fish curing) 9173 ; (Fishery Commission) 9172 (v) ; (hatcheries) 2904 (ii) ; (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv) ; (inspectors' salaries) 2878, 2890 ; (oyster culture) 2912 (ii) ; (protection cruiser 'Petrel') 6630 (iv) ; (protection service) 2907 (ii) ; (Venning, R. N., honorarium) 6630 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 2705 ; (aids to navigation) 2759, 2850, 2859 (ii) ; ('Arctic' patrol boat) 9177 (v) ; (buoys) 2730 ; (engineers' salaries) 2760 (ii) ; (ice boats) 9177 (v) ; (keeper's salaries) 2697 (ii) ; (lighthouse repairs) 6636 (iv), 9035 ; (light-keepers salaries) 9175 (v) ; (maintenance, lightship) 2706 ; (Marconi stations) 2869 (ii) ; (Parry Sound buoy) 9175 (v) ; (pilotage) 2760 (ii) ; (Port Arthur, &c., fog alarms) 6645 ; ('Scout,' repairs) 6643 (iv) ; (signal service) 2760 ; (submarine signals) 2871 (ii) ; (N. W. M. Police patrol boat) 9178 ; (wrecking plant, Mar. Provs.) 9177 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Mexico) on conc., 6910 (iv).
Marine (hospitals) 9172 ; (naval militia) 9178 (v) ; (St. John, N.B.) 6628 (iv) ; (sick seamen) 2686, 2688 (ii).
Ocean and River Service ('Aberdeen' boilers) 6464; (Arctic expedition) 6468 (iv); (examination of masters and mates) 2623 ; (Govt. steamers) 2595 (ii) ; (Harrison, Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv) ; (hydrographic surveys) 2679 (ii), 6623; (ice breaking steamers) 6464 (iv), 9034, 9617 (v) ; (life-saving rewards) 2624 (ii); (Mr. Lowe's honorarium) 6473; (maintenance *re* steamers) 6463 (iv) ; (meteorological service) 2679 ; (obstruction, removal) 2647 (ii) ; ('Quadra' repairs) 9171 (v) ; (schools of navigation) 2639 ; (tidal surveys) 2648 (ii) ; (winter mail service) 6467 (iv) ; (winter mail service, P.E.I.) 2648 (ii) ; (wrecks investigation) 6466 (iv).
Public Works Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1118 ; (Montreal Inland Rev.) 1123; (Montreal military buildings) 1126

Prefontaine, Hon. Raymond—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Dredges (new plant) 9171 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (compensation to Jos. Paul) 6463 (iv); (Lake St. Peter piers) 6453 (iv), 9171 (v) ; (St. Lawrence channel) 2448 (ii); (St. Lawrence ship channel (suction dredge) 6436 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 9172; (purchase of steamer) 9172 (v).
Steamboat Inspection (gratuities) 6628 (iv) ; (salaries) 2695 (ii).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* (remarks) 9283 (v).
Transportation Commission, Progress *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Verdun, Protection *re* Floods, on M. (Mr. Monk for Cor., 459 (i).
Vessels, Registered, List of : Rep. (presented) 6907 (iv).
Wireless Telegraph Regulation (B. 186) 1° m., 8177; in Com., 9031 (v).
Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4273 (iii).
——— in Com. (readjustment of representation) 5762 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7172 (iv).
Ballots, Dom Elections, Printing, &c. for Carleton, Glengarry, &c. (Ques.) 587 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 641 (i).
Cornwall Armoury (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1554, 1659 (i).
Cornwall Basin, Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
——— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising (Ques.) 686 (i).
——— Employees during Election Campaign (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).
——— Employees for October and Nov., 1904 (Ques.) 107 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9759 (v).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) in Com., 5736 (iii). 5963 (iv) 5971.
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contract *re* Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1410 (i).
——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices paid, &c. (Ques.) 589 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 1230, Sault Ste. Marie (ocnstruction) 1410; (Welland (obstruction, &c.) 1231; (Port Colborne, deepening) 1232; (Port Colborne, entrance) 1230; Welland (surveys) 1234 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Chatham armoury) 1552; (Cobourg armoury) 1558 (i).
Welland Canal Deepening, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).

Proulx, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) in Com. (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8515 (v).
Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4271 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5301 (iii).
Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissals, &c. (Ques.) 8384 (v).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1923 (i).
Cardinal Canal Swing Bridge and Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
Maps, Sale by Govt., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1476 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel, Capt. Leslie's Wrecking Plant, Bonus to, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
St. Louis Exhibition, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 1832 (i).
Canals—Cornwall (lock repairs) 1494; Galops (leakage) 1492; Welland (stone protection) 1497; Williamsburg (steam plant) 1494 (i).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).
Quarantine (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (public health organized districts) 1843 ; (Public Works, Health Act) 1845; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).

Riley, Mr. G., *Victoria City, B.C.*
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9041 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm., *Halifax.*
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguay Govt., Telegram (read) 6137 (iv).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9781 (v).
Halifax Lightships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9573 (v).
'Lady Laurier,' Number of Crew, Names (read) 2665 (ii).
Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for 2°, 9186 (v).
Montevideo, British Seamen, Imprisonment (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6226 (iv).
See 'Stewart.'
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9476 (v).

Roche, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7190 (iv).
Stewart, Mr. J. S., Charges against (remarks) 9614 (v).
See 'Musquodoboit.'
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightship maintenance) 2708 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7190 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Phinney's Cove) 9573 ; (Porter's Lake) 9583 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax terminals) 2036 (ii).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*
Acreage in Provisional Districts of Alberta, Sask., &c., Disposed of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 601 (i).
Alberta District, Postal Business, &c. (M. for ret.) 599 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5563 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3672 (ii).
——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5624 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8038, 8083 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (distribution of seats) 8860 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2524 (ii).
——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast (remarks) 5575 (iii).
British America Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing in Western Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Cattle Quarantine, Man., System *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2316 (ii).
Fish-breeding Establishments in Lake Winnipeg (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).
Fishing Rights in Nelson River, &c., Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Glanders among Horses, Jurisdiction *re* Compensation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6705 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Route proposed West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
Homestead Inspectors acting as Liberal Organizers (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 9254 (v).
See 'Nixon.'
Immigration, Govt. Policy *re* bonusing Steamships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
Indian Agents acting as Magistrates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Lake Manitoba closed to Fishing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).
Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Leach, R. E. A., Dom. Lands Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9252 (v).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Leach, Mr. (Ques.) 1065 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to (Ques.) 4373, 4457 (iii).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* (M. for copies) 1768 (i).
——— Res. passed by Man. Legislature (remarks) 4082 (ii).
Manitoba Lake, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6751 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease *re* Fishing Rights in N.W. Lakes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy (M. for copy*) 97 (i).
Milk River Ranche Co., Quarantine *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Minnedosa Drill Hall, Representations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Moose Lake, License to Fish (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Nixon, Mr., Dom. Lands Agent, Charges against, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8122 (v).
See 'Homestead.'
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonus *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5783 (iii).
Northwest Ters., Surveys, Number of Miles, Total Cost, &c. (M. for ret.) 1396 (i).
Postal Business, Alberta District (M. for ret.) 599 (i).
Ret. Officers, Deputy, Payments *re*, Letter from Mr. E. Walker (read) 6560 (iv).
Revenue collected, Customs and Inland Rev., in N.W. Ters., &c. (M. for ret.) 600 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Boundaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Russian Priests canvassing for Conservatives in Dom. Elections (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9264 (v).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of: *See* 'Autonomy.'
SUPPLY:
Customs (collectors' salaries) 407 (i).
Dom. Lands (land agents) 9252; (tree culture) 9298 (v).
Fisheries (fish-breeding stations) 6635 (iv); (hatcheries) 2905 (ii); (inspectors' disbursements) 6630 (iv); (inspectors' salaries) 2896 (ii).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9318 (v).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 6538; (live stock) 6539 (iv).
Indians—Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6518 (iv).
Justice—Man. (judges' salaries, &c.) 123; Yukon (living allowances) 129 (i).
Legislation—Franchise Act (voters' lists) 6898 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Fernie) 1641 (i).
Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 1634; (Dom. renewals) 1634; (Winnipeg, immigration) 1635; (Winnipeg, militia) 1635; (Winnipeg P.O.) 1636; (Virden drill hall) 1634 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Edmonton jail) 1638; (Moosejaw) 1638; (Regina P.O.) 1640 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7569 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N.W.T. (Qu'Appelle and Edmonton) 6893; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 2312 (ii); (contagious diseases, Man.) 1843; (Winnipeg, &c., Hospitals) 1846 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1368 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man. Constituencies, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 60 (i).
——— Printing and Proof-reading, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6898 (iv).
See 'Marquette.'
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c. (M. for copies*) 1398 (i).
Young, Thos., and McNab, G. C., Homestead Inspectors, Canvassing for Liberal Candidate (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).
See 'Homestead.'
Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Autonomy Bill, Separate Schools Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4068 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2050 (ii).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C., Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9296 (v).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 1777 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Navigation Co.'s (B. 139) Pet. (presented) 3743 (ii); 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4700 (iii); in Com., 8315, 8637; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v).
Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2° 4622 (iii).
Autonomy Bill, Mr. Haultain's Letter to Prime Minister, on M. for Sup., 2548 (ii).
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 483 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal &c. (Ques.) 2327 (ii).
Man. Public Buildings, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6771 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 346 (i).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 857 (i) ; Roads and Bridges—N.W.T. (colonization roads) 7597, 7598 (iv).

Timber Licenses on Indian Lands, Govt. Procedure (Ques.) 9280 (v).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1373 (i).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*

Great Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 71) in Com., 4258 (iii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 680 (i), 2435 (ii).

Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1241 (i).

Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Com., 9015 (v).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5007 (iii).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 1179 (i).

Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1366 (i).

Scott, Mr. W., *West Assiniboia.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5502 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3591 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries), 5627 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8598 (v).

——— (C.P.R. lands) 6058 (iv).

——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8073 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7772, 7891, 7924 (iv).

——— (election of members), 5777 (iii).

——— (lands vested in Crown), 6010 (iv).

——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8509.

——— (seat of govt.) 8245 (v).

——— (subsidy to provs.) 6099 (iv).

——— on M. for 3°, Amt. (C.P.R. taxes) 8777; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* schools, 8809 (v).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, in Com. (distribution of seats) 8711 8725 ; in Com. on schedule (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757; on M. for 3°, 8866 ; (Amt.) 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11 ; N. 126) 8881 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com., 5890 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Net Revenue of Public Lands in N.W.T. (read) 5505 (iii).

Edmonton Election, Voters' Lists *re* (remarks) in Com. on Bill 69, 5853 (iii).

Scott, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 317 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii).

Northwest Territories Elections, Interference of Govt. Employees (remarks) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* B. 156, 8772 (v).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8769 (v).

Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 625 (i).

Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 2184 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Autonomy Bill, B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3092 (ii).

Resignation, Personal Explanation, 1851 (i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 2447 (ii).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5121 (iii).

Binder Twine, Home Consumption, Manufacture in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1759 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (summary convictions) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Porter) in Com., 4262 (iii).

Fog Horn Nuisance at Toronto Island (remarks) 9287 (v).

Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 912 (i).

'Lurcher' Lightship, Accidents to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2754 (ii).

Presbyterian College Board (B. 123) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Public Buildings, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1033 (i).

Safety of Ships (B. 21) 1° m., 319 ; in Com., 731 (i).

Small-pox Epidemic in N.S. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2690 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (hatcheries) 2907 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeeper salaries) 2698 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 974 ; (Port Mulgrave and Canso) 936 (i).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 2688 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Canso) 1033 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Half Island cove) 9584 ; (Tatamagouche) 9579 (v).

Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 9513 (v).

Steamboat Inspection (fees *re*) 2696 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*

Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt (Ques.) 188 (i).

G.T. Pacific Ry., Surveys, B.C., Information *re* (Ques.) 3009 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W.—*Con.*
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. (Ques.) 585 (i).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judge Anglin's Decision (Ques.) 8147 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, and Labour Dept., Complaints *re* Graeme Hunter (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
B.C. Immigration Legislation, Disallowance *re* (Ques.) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Celeste Joly, Patent Relief (B. 107) 1°*, 2184 (ii).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 2005 (ii).
Hunter, Graeme, Complaints *re* Immigration Frauds (Ques.) 2188 (ii).
Labour Union Labels (B. 10) prop. Res., 272 (i); in Com. on Res., 272; in Com., 701, 918, 1770, 1774; 3° m., 1779 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland) *North Essex.*
Address from Gov. Gen. (read) 6 (i).
——— Reply to from His Ex. (read) 1340 (i).
Assent to Bills, Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
See 'Bills.'
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on Amt. (Mr. Léonard) to M. for 3° (ruling) 8857 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2570 (ii).
——— Members' remarks checked, 2277 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5430 (iii).
——— Presenting Pets. (remarks) 2319 (ii); (ruling) 2320 (ii).
——— on Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton (remarks) 1864 (i).
See 'Man. Boundaries,' 'Order, Ques. of,' 'Petitions.'
Bills, Assent to, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 6991 (iv).
——— Mess. from His Ex., 6084 (iv).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, Conspiracy, &c., Ques. of Order, *re* Denials from Minister's (ruling) 546 (i).
Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election, 583 (i).
Campaign Literature and Franking by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1810 (i).
Carleton Electoral District, Vacancy, &c. (issue of warrant) 98 (i).
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate (presented) 9 (i).
Debates, French Edition, Delay in Issuing, &c. (remarks) 240 (i).
Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 5131 (iii).
Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Edmonton Electoral District, Vacancy (notification) 4200 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, 4200 (iii).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6378 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4228 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Surveys, Rep. *re* &c., Members remarks checked, 2021 (ii).
G. B. and Her Colonies, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 2401 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 (ii).
House of Commons, Desks for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).
——— Purchases, Audit of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
——— Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 238 (i).
——— Supplies, Furniture, Purchase of, Res. from Internal Economy Com. (read) 6614 (iv).
Lévis Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 7175 (iv).
Lévis Vacancy, Issue of Writ (notification) 6474 (iv).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 8 (i).
London Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 8001 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6473 (iv).
Man. Boundaries, Ques. of Order, Naming Member, 3858 (ii).
——— Question of Order, 'Political Debts, Payment of,' &c., 3857 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* 'Scurvy Politicians,' 3863 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, Suppl. (presented) 6165 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (Opening of Parliament) 4 (i).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Man. Boundaries, Ruling *re* Naming Members, on Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 13 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., Members remarks checked, 3190 (ii).
Oxford, N., Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 8177 (v).
——— Issue of Writ (notification) 6046 (iv).
Petition presented *re* Autonomy Bill: (Ruling *re* Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
Petitions, Presenting of, Endorsement *re* (remarks) 2490 (ii).
Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time for Receiving (remarks) 318 (i).

Speaker, Mr.—*Con.*
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen. Sec. (read) 9815 (v).
Quebec Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 110 (i).
Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2° (remarks) *re* Translation, 282 (i).
Ry. Commissioners B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 558 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Debate, on prop. Res. (ruling) 320 (i).
Returning Officers, Instruction *re* Form of Oath, on Ques. of Order (Mr. S. Hughes) 7361 (iv).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 2297 (ii).
Rooms for Members, Re-arrangement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 250 (i).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) ruled out of order, 1868 (i).
Senate and House of Commons, Conferences *re* Amts. to Bills, Mess. (read) 9028 (v).
Speaker, Election of (remarks) 3 (i).
Speech from the Throne (read) 6 (i).
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) 240 (i).
SUPPLY:
House of Commons (additional messenger) 6614; (committee expenses) 6594; (expenditure) 6592 (iv); (contingencies) 239, 250 (i); (leather trunks) 6606 (iv); (messengers) 240 (i); (pages) 6613 (iv); (salaries) 238 (i); (Sergeant-at-arms, salaries) 240 (i), 6610 (iv); (sessional clerks) 239 (i), 6595 (iv); (sessional messengers) 6612; (stationery) 6594 (iv).
Telephone Grievances, &c., on M. (Mr. Maclean) Ques. of Order, 9534 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 4370 (iii).
——— Vacancy (notification) 2841 (ii).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, on Ques. of Order (rulings) 8828, 8829 (v).
Vibert, Philip Relief B. 172 (Mr. Hall) on M. for 2°, (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Wright Electoral Division, Certificate of Election (notification) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy (remarks) 98 (i).
Yukon Ter. Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notification) 2322 (ii).

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
Autonomy B. 69, Members' remarks checked, 5654, 5660 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) *re* Misstatement of Facts by Mr. Belcourt (ruling) 3520 (ii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie, 8475; (ruling) 8476 (v).
——— School Clauses, Irrelevancy of Debate, 5832 (iii).
Cabinet, Ex-Ministers Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., Amt. (read) 9796 (v).
Carleton County, Electoral District, Certificate (notification) 583 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) Ruling reserved, 632 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Tel. of Can. incorp. B. 144 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 6608 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45, Ques. of Order (ruling) 4221 (iii).
Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates (read) 8718, 9392 (v).
Nicolet Electoral District, Certificate *re* Pet. (notification) 9081 (v).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2052 (ii).
Orangemen, Attack *re*, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Lavergne) 8365 (v).
Port Arthur, &c., Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Irrelevancy of Debate (ruling) 4666 (iii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).
Ry. Commission (chairman) B. 36 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. (ruling) 1632 (i).
Seeds, Sale B. 7, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 361 (i).
South Shore Ry. Co. and Quebec Southern Ry. B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., Amt. (Mr. Borden) read, 9587 (v).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3656 (ii).
Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) Amt. (read) 4259 (iii).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2° (remarks) 4701 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Acetylene Gas Co.'s Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Alien Labour Investigation *re* G.T.P., Inquiry for Rep., 821 (i).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 676, 738 (i), 2413 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5436 (iii).
Autonomy for N. W. Ters. B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on M. for 1°, 1430 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3010 (ii).
Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to sec. 16 (schools) 8811; on Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. land taxes 8789 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5654 (iii).
——— (B.N.A. Act) 5730 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language) 8547, 8594 (v).
——— (C.P.R. lands) 6072 (iv).
——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8027 (v); on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7981 (iv).
——— (H. of C. representation) 5751 (iii).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 5918 (iii), 5995 (iv).
——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5928 (iii). 6101 (iv), 8243 (v).
——— (readjustment of representation) 5757 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8473; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8295; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341; (Mr. Lamont) 8493 (v).
——— (Senate representation) 5681 (iii).
——— (subsidy to provs.) 6086 (iv).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on M. for 3°, Amt. (schools) 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bill, Approval of Cabinet, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— *re* Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5873 (iii).
——— Cor. ref. to by Prime Minister, Inquiry for, 2593 (ii).
——— on Mr. Haultain's Letter, Ques. of Order *re*, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Official Report of Division (remarks) 5429 (iii).
——— Pets. presented *re* (personal explanation) 2320 (ii).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1788 (i).
——— Printing before 3rd Reading (remarks) 8762 (v).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5836 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Amts, *re* Explanation (remarks) 5822 (iii).
——— "Yellow Dog," Quotation from Halifax 'Chronicle,' in Com., 5873, 5879, 5901 (iii).
See 'Lt.-Govs,' 'McKenzie, D.D.,' 'Pets.,' 'Separate,' 'N.W.T. B. 160,' 'Yellow Dog.'
Ballots, Blank, Dom. Elections, Procedure *re* Printing, &c. (Ques.) 911 (i).
——— Method of Issuing Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa (Ques.) 1342 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 181 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 7642 (iv).
Bank Notes, Printing and Circulation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6263 (iv).
Bills from the Senate, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to place on Order Paper, (remarks) 8001 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Binder Twine Industry at Kingston (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).
Blair, Mr., Resignation, &c., Ques. of Order, 553 (i).
B. C. Customs Collector, Appmnt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes (Ques.) 382 (i).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 1152, 1242 (i).
Cabinet, ex-Ministers', Annuities B. 203 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9792 (v).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers, on Orders of the Day, 3572 (ii).
Cabinet Vacancies, N. W. Ters. Representation (remarks) 3252 (ii).
Cadet Corps of Montreal (remarks) 7815 (iv).
Campaign Literature, franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1820 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4413 (iii).
Canada Eastern Ry., Total Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup.., 1925 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.s B. 29 (Mr. German) in Com., 1286 (i).
Canadian Cattle Ehbargo in G. B., on M. to conc. in 6th Rep., 9004, 9017 (v).
Canadian Fast Mail Service, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to adjn., 9780 (v).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 993 (i); in Com., 638, 1069 (i).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2127 (ii).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Service (M. for ret.*) 2333 (ii).
Civil Service Appnmts., Permanent and Temporary, &c. since July 1st, 1896 (Ques) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5808 (iii), 6232, (iv), 8002, (v).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2111 (ii).
Customs Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of (Ques.) 270 (i).
Cold Storage, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8202, 8238 (v).
Congdon, Mr., Legal Adviser to Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Consumption : *See* 'Tuberculosis.'
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Debates, Official, 4th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) 4984 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep., 9802 (v).
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 106 (Mr. Black) in Com. 4977 (iii).
Dom. Lands Act, Yukon Regulations on M. (Mr. Oliver) to approve, 9786 (v).
Express Cos. : *See* 'Ry. B. 4.'
Freight Rates : *See* 'Ry. Rates.'

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Gold Medal Furniture Co.'s Patent Relief B. 102 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3399 (ii).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3891 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys, Reps. *re* (remarks) 229 (i).
Grazing Leases, &c., Inquiry for Rets., 8529 (v).
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parlt., on prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2405 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order, 2401 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers *re*, 9029 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, N.S., Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9570 (v).
Hersey, A. H., Relief B. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) in Com., 7682 (iv).
House of Commons Employees, Inquiry for Ret., 5209 (iii).
House of Commons P.O., Complaints *re* Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 199 (i).
Immigration : *See* 'North Atlantic.'
I. C. R. Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6124 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. 9793 (v).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co. Pet., on M. (Mr. Galliher) 3744 (ii).
Killam, Judge, Appnmt, as Chairman of Ry. Commission, on M. for Com. on Ry. B. No. 36, 509 (i).
Labour Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., on Res., 277 ; in Com., 703 (i).
Letter Carriers Uniforms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 212 (i).
Lt. Governors of Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 193 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9033 (v).
Live Stock Record Ass'ns. incorp. B. 148 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 5078 (iii).
L'Union St. Joseph of Ottawa, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) to present Pet., 2491 (ii).
McKenzie, D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8479 (v).
Mail Bags, Contracts *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 213 (i).
Mail Carriers, System of Payments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Information *re* System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 924 (i).
Mallein Test for Cattle (remarks) in Com, of Sup., 2317 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum of Mgr. Sbarretti *re* Separate Schoo s, 3873 (ii).
——— on M. to adjn., 4005 (ii).
Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military Camps, Indemnity *re* Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9158 (v).
Militia Estimates, on General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9145 (v).
Montreal Post Office, Illegal Stamping of Letters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 197 (i).
Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. 34 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1707 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract *re* Immigrants, on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9469, 9471 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police Act Amt. B. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com., 459 (i).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5583 (iii).
——— on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5696 (iii).
N.W.T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, &c. (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. 161 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 6104 (iv).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2323 (ii).
Northwest Territories (Rupert's Land) B. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 8763, 8766 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3135 (ii).
Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5748 (iii), 5966 (iv).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 ; in Com., 1284 (i), 2532, 3176, 3194 ; on Amt. (Mr. Stewart) to M. for 3°, 3396 (ii).
Owen Sound P.O., Site chosen by P.M.G. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Oxford, N., Electoral Vacancy (notification) 5961 (iv).
Parliament Grounds Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5794 (iii).
Pets. *re* Autonomy Bill, Signature *re* (remarks) 2261, 2322 (ii).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4463, 4659 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 808 (i).
Port Colborne Elevator, in Com. of Sup., 1321 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 318, 448 (i), 2491 (iii).
'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Reply to Mr. Lemieux *re* Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3306 (ii).
Provident Savings Association incorp. B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5975 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1028 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Examination of Ships, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
Quebec Political Crisis (remarks) 830 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers (remarks) 1068 (i).
Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1674 (i).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for Adjnmt., 3248 (ii).
Railway Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for Com., 509 ; in Com., 1601 ; on M. for 3°, 1804 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1623 (i).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman, on prop. Res. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Ques. of Order, 320 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, Maintenance (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1536 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 5004 (iii).
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 103 (Mr. Tobin) on M. for 2°, 2296 (ii).
Roads and Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 195 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9526 (v).
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations, &c. (Ques.) 269 (i).
Saskatchewan, Prov. of : *See* 'Autonomy B. 70.'
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 322, 361, 1162, 1201, 1797 ; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1878 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, 361 (i).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodges (remarks) 2405 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assiniboia, Ques. of Priv., 2412 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1860 (i).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
South Shore Ry. Co.'s B. 149 (Mr. Geoffrion) on M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9073 (v).
Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing Bureau, &c. (remarks) 7723 (iv).
Sunday Observance, Govt. Legislation *re* (Ques.) 8656 (v).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (aids to societies) 1829 ; (Can. exhibits, Imperial Institute) 1838 (i); (exhibitions) 6270; (experimental farms) 6176 (iv); (public health organized districts) 1843 (i).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 1334; Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1321 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6263 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 6249 (iv).
Dominion Police (salaries) 138 (i).
Indians—Ont. (medical attendance) 225; (St. Regis lock-up) 237; (surveys, &c.) 236 (i).
Justice—Yukon (sheriff's allowances) 132 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (G. B. and Can.) 868; (P.E.I. and G.B) 932; (St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac) 951; (wrecking plant) 959 (i).
Militia (permanent force) 9113 (v).
Miscellaneous (Alaska surveys) 7720; (maps, &c., N.W.T.) 7721 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6469 ; (expenditures, &c.) 6466; (Mr. Low's honorarium) 6473 (iv).
Post Office (letter carriers) 174; (mail carriers uniforms) 212 ; (provisional allowance) 168 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 9549 (v) ; N.S. (Canso) 1028 (i) ; Ont. (Owen Sound) 9547; Ottawa (additions, &c., H. of C.) 9545 (v) ; (Museum) 755; Que. (Montreal military buildings) 1125 ; (Sherbrooke, drill hall) 1141 ; (trachoma hospitals) 1139 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S (Phinney's Cove) 9559; (Porter's Lake) 9584 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 808; (Port Colborne) 815 (i).
Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay surveys) 9547 (v).
Quarantine (cattle) 2309 (ii); (Grosse Isle steamer) 1839; (Tracadie Lazaretto) 1845; (William's Head) 1841 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (construction) 9498 (v); (surveys, construction, &c.) 2298 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 1933; (expenditure, &c.) 1925 (i).
Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 1536 (i).
Yukon Govt. (local govt grant) 7718; (salaries, &c.) 7716; (school grant) 7719 (iv).
Telephone and Telegraph Systems, Govt. Control (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).
Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1251 (i).
Thermographs *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 3653 (ii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1686 (i).
Transportation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Bertram (remarks) 1288 (i).
Treadgold Concession, Rep. of Judge Britton (remarks) 821 (i).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1363 (i).
——— Joint Com., Rep., on M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9523 (v).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) in Com., 277, 703 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) on M. for 2°, 4701 (iii) ; in Com., 8315 ; on M. for 3°, 8818 (v).
——— Pet., on M. (Mr. D. Ross) 3743 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 8696 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9545 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary.'
Wrecking Plant, and 'Lord Strathcona' in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
"Yellow Dog" applied to Orangemen, Quotations, &c. (read) in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
Yukon : *See* 'Congdon.'

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4312 (iii).
See 'Man.,' &c.
Bernier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claude, Man., Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* (M. for copy*) 1397 (i).
Fairford River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7570 (iv).
Glanders among Horses, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6695 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Application from N. Ouellette, &c., Purchase of, &c. (Ques.) 9078 (v).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, M'gr Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools (remarks) 3851 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Rogers sent to Prime Minister (remarks) *re* Mr. Paterson's Charges, 4022 (ii).
Man Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6740, 6793 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 87 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1176 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture (live stock records) 6688 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg immigration) 1635 (i) ; Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7570 (iv).
Quarantine (cattle) 6695 (iv).
Veterinary Surgeons in Man., Number (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6704 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c. (M. for copy*) 697 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Central Counties Ry Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).

Stewart, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2532, 2950, 2961, 3177, 3182 ; Letter from Sec. Treas, D. R. Street (read) 3183 ; (amt.) 3201 ; on M. for 3° (amt.) 3393 (ii) ; Neg. (Y. 56 ; N. 80) 3398 (ii).
Owen, Thomas David, Patent Relief (B. 177) in Com., 8652 (v).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*
Admiralty Court Registrars, &c. Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5380 (iii).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. R. L Borden) to sec. 16, Schools, 8814 (v).
——— in Com. (laws, courts, &c.) 5814, 5935 (iii).
——— (school clause amt.) 7129 (iv).
——— School Clauses Amts. (remarks) in Com., 5832 (iii).
Blair, Mr. Resignation of, Conspiracy &c., Denial *re* Election Speaking, 557 (i).
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers (remarks) on Orders of the Day, 3578 (ii).
Collingwood Govt. Dock, Conroy Bros. Cheque (remarks) 6583 (iv).
Criminal Code (summary appeals) Amt. B. 45 (Mr. Porter) on Amt. (Mr. Bureau) *re* Race Courses, 5138 (iii).
Debates and Internal Economy Committees (remarks) 9804 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6844 (iv).
Fisheries Industry, Commission *re* Investigation, Recommendation, &c., on M. (Mr. Ganong) 6341 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 3884 (ii), 4203 (iii).
Halifax and Esquimalt Garrison (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9114 (v).
I.C.R., Freight Arrangements and Traffic, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2222 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6127 (iv).
——— Time Table, Changes and Delays (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
Judges of the Provincial Courts (salaries) B. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9740 ; in Com., 9793 ; on Amt., 9798 (v).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6662 (iv).
McKenzie, Mr. D. D., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill, on Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8478 (v).
Martineau Defalcations, Collection of Guarantee Bonds (remarks) 114 (i).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. 28 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 2057 (ii).

Stockton, Mr .A. A.—*Con.*
N.W.T. Govt. Officials, Interference in Elections (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9729 (v).
Opposition Leader, Indemnity to : *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'
Ry Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 563 (i).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master at Moncton (Ques.) 2329 (ii).
St. John Harbour Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
Seamen's Act (shipping masters) Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com., 9031 (v).
Senate and House of Commons Indemnity B. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 9728 (v).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Acadian historical data) 1830 ; (Archives) 1825 (i).
Immigration (agents' salaries) 9317 (v).
Indians—N.B. (supt's. salary) 9336 ; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 9336 (v).
Justice—Exchequer Court (salaries) 125 ; Yukon (living allowances) 127 (i).
Militia (Canadian garrisons) 9114 (v).
Penitentiaries (parole system) 470 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Dipper harbour) 9588 ; (St. John harbour) 9589 ; (St. John tidal waters) 9590 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (harbour improvements) 775 (i) ; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6844 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2222 (ii).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 99 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4683 (iii).
Trading Stamps, Legislation *re* Suppression (Ques.) 5426 (iii).
Transportation Commission and St. John Harbour, Reps. to Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 9698 (v).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) on M. for 3°, 9048 (v).

Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2425 (ii).
Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 5140 (iii).
Franking Privileges, Abuse of, *re* Jacques Cartier Club (remarks) 9798 (v).
I.C.R., 'Maritime Express,' &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6832 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1336 (i).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B. 191) 1°*, 9072 (v).
Man. Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation, on M. to adjn., 4070 (ii).
Military School at Quebec, Improvement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Bonuses *re* Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9322

Talbot, Mr. O. E.—*Con.*
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3196 (ii).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7348, 7369 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Militia (permanent force) 9127, 9162 (v).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).

Talbot, Mr. P., *Strathcona.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4176 (iii).
——— in Com. (distribution of seats) 7734 (iv) ; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8040 (v) ; on Amt. (Mr. S. McCarthy) 7830, 7877 (iv).
——— (lands vested in Crown) 6040 (iv).
——— (subsidy to provs.) in Com., 6089 (iv).
——— in Com. on Schedules (Gleichen) 8154 (v).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 74) 1°*, 1671 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (provisions, &c.) 6551 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. G., *Leeds.*
Acetylene Gas System, Saving in Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Scout.'
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure (remarks) 990 (iv).
Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 2426 ; in Com., 2849 (ii).
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space and American Shippers (remarks) 5428 (iii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4896 (iii).
——— (schools) on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8362 (v).
——— on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8787 (v).
Autonomy B. 69, Attack on 'Orangeism' (remarks) in Com., 5897 (iii).
——— School Clauses, Min. of Justice quoted, in Com., 5898 (iii).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) on Amt. (Mr. Scott) to M. for 3°, 8879 (v).
See 'Edmonton.'
Binder Twine Bounties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privilege, &c. (remarks) 1815 (i).
Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 45, 4235 (iii).
Cement, in Com. on Ways and Means, 8986 (v).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 990 ; in Com., 666 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) 660 (i).
Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Criminal Code (trading stamps) Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4551 (iii).
——— on M. to conc. in 7th Rep of Com., 9809 (v).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6846 (iv).
Edmonton Election, Date of Contest, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 5891 (iii).
Electoral Atlas, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Estimates, Criticism of and Obstruction, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9273 (v).
Estimates of the Interior Dept., Obstruction by Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9265 (v).
Freight Rates : *See* 'I.C.R.,' 'Ry. Com.,' 'Tariff.'
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 736 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Fitz-Simons, Jane Marie Relief B. 130 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 6377 (iv).
Gananoque Armoury Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant) on M. for Sup., 6486 (iv).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) on M. for 3°, 4235 (iii).
House of Commons, Rooms for Members (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 254 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Duties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
I.C.R., Advertising Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2244 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1961 (i).
——— Freight Rates and Traffic Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2242 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton, Reply to Min. of Railways, 6585 (iv).
——— Freight Rates, Increases, &c., on Explanation of Min. of Rys., 6120 (iv).
——— and G.T.R. Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangement, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— Supplies, Purchase of Oil, &c (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2249 (ii).
Interior Dept., Dep. Minister, Resignation, Appnmt., &c. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley, Dep. Ret. Officer *re* Election, Partisan Conduct *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv.)
Logberg Printing Co., Payments to, (remarks) *re* Question, 4374 (iii),
Manufacturers' Association, Commercial Literature as Campaign Literature, Franked by M.P.'s (remarks) 1815 (i).
Metric System, Letter from Gananoque Teacher (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Military Accountant of Militia Council (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application for Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto (Ques.) 6383 (iv).
Murray Harbour Branch Ry. and Hillsborough Bridge, in Com. of Sup., 2159 (ii).
N.W.T. Boundary Line, Contract *re* Wire Fencing, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5704 (iii).
Orangemen, Attack *re* 'Yellow Dog' in Quebec Papers (remarks) in Com. on B. 69, 8362 (v).
Ottawa Public Buildings, Rentals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5802 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Time for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6876 (iv).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Postmaster acting as Dep. Returning Officer, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Provl. Govt. in N.W.T. : *See* 'Autonomy.'
Public Works Employees, Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6861 (iv).
Railway Commission, Freight and Passenger Rates, Advancement (remarks)* in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Com., 4996 (iii).
Resignations of Conservative Ministers in 1896 (personal explanation) 845 (i).
Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Form of Oath at Elections, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7365 (iv).
Rideau Canal Extension (remarks) in Com. of Sup.. 1523 (i).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1982 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Expenditures *re* (remarks) 2455 (ii).
'Scout,' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, &c. (remarks) 4842 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. G.—*Con.*
Seeds Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 361, 1214 (i).
Sifton, Hon. C., Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 1862 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
——— Resignation, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 4370 (iii).
Starkey, W. W., Duties *re* Cattle Diseases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6718 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year Book) 1476 (i).
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne elevator) 1275 (i).
Charges of Management (bank notes) 6261 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries, &c.) 103 (i); Post Office (contingencies) 6240 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424 (iv); (homestead inspectors) 9265 (v); (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors' salaries) 2892; (protection service) 2907 (ii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c., salaries) 7685 ; (agencies, salaries) 6384 (iv) ; (bonuses to SS. Cos.) 9329 (v); (contingencies) 7710; (printing, &c.) 7710 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (travelling expenses) 6556 (iv); Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 9338 (v); Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521; N.B. (medical attendance) 6516 (iv); Ont. and Que. (park improvements) 9335 (v).
Interior—Miscellaneous (litigation expenses) 7720 (iv).
Legislation—Debates (expenditure) 6594 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (keepers' salaries) 2697 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).
Militia (Accountant of Board) 434 (i).
Miscellaneous (Alaska boundaries) 7719; (legal expenses, *re* Martineau case) 6723; (legal service, Mr. Patterson) 6723 ; (maps, *re* N.W.T.) 7721; (printing, &c.) 6723 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic expedition) 6472; (Harrison, Capt., allowance, &c.) 6466 (iv).
Penitentiaries (Archibald, W. T., Parole Officer) 6721 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers, firemen, &c.) 6822; (fuel) 6822; (furniture) 6817; (rents) 6818 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—General (armouries) 1656 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Richibucto) 6732 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (London drill hall) 6732 (iv); (military college) 1561 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevator attendants) 1667 (i); (grounds) 6817 (iv); (lighting) 1667 (i) ; (repairs, &c.) 6815 ; (Rideau Hall) 6824 (iv); (steel shelving) 1564 (i); (telephones) 6814 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—B.C. (new plant) 7578; Dom. (repairs to vessels) 6890 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Lake Dauphin) 7571; (Lake St. Francis) 7572; (Narrows Lake) 7572; (Selkirk) 7573 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Clifton breakwater) 7497 ; (Dipper harbour) 7498; (Mud Cove) 7500; N.B. (Quaco harbour) 7501 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Inverness Mines) 7405; (Margaree harbour) 7411; (Port Hawkesbury) 6837 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Barry's Bay wharf) 6873; (Blind River dredging) 6871; (Fort William and Port Arthur) 6900 ; (general vote) 6729 ; (Grand River dredging) 6873 ; (Haileybury wharf) 6887 ; (Honora wharf) 6887 ; (Little Current channel) 6886 ; (Otonabee River) 6886 ; (Owen Sound harbour) 6886 ; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 ; (Whitby harbour) 6880 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Grand Machins) 7304 ; (harbour works) 6728 ; (Lake St. Peter pier) 6459 ; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Montmorency wharf) 6853 (iv); (St. Lawrence ship channel) 2455 (ii); (St. Louis Feeders) 7386; (Yamaska Lock) 6868 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Deep Waterways Commission) 6895 ; (engineers, &c.) 6895 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Ottawa (bridges) 6889 (iv).
Public Works—Telegrams—Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6896 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (Drummondville improvements) 1961 (i) ; (Halifax terminals) 2032 (ii) ; (St. Fabien subway) 1982 ; (Sydney accommodation) 1912 (i).
Railways—P.E.I. (Murray Harbour and Bridge) 2159 (ii) ; (working expenses) 6901 (iv).
Yukon Govt. (salaries, &c.) 7716 (iv).
Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement of remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Trading Stamps : *See* 'Criminal.'
Ventilation in Chamber of Commons (remarks) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
Veterinary Surgeons, Emplymt. by Govt., &c., in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6710 (iv).
Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8676 (v).
Wire Fencing : *See* 'N.W.T.'

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*
Cement in Com. on Ways and Means, 8990 (v).
Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 144) 1°*, 4644 (iii).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 143) 1°*, 4644 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Miscellaneous (assay office, B.C.) 7720 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (Yukon force) 8662 (v).
Yukon Govt. (local Govt. grant) 7719 (iv).

Thompson, Mr. A. —*Con.*

Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provinces (remarks) 6509 (iv).

——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of F. T. Congdon (Ques.) 7020 (iv).

——— Reforms, &c., Necessary, on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).

Tisdale, Hon. David, *Norfolk.*

Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) on M. to ref. back to Com., 8655 (v).

Citizens' Bank of Canada B. 133 (Mr. Barr) in Com., 5973 (iv).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4204 (iii).

London Militia and London Elections (remarks) 7255 (iv).

Militia Act (permanent force) Amt. B. 170, on prop. Res. (Sir Frederick Borden) 6905; in Com. on Res., 6985; on M. for 2°, 7272 (iv).

Militia Estimates, Reply to General Statement, in Com. of Sup., 9136 (v).

Militia Force, Reduction of, on Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) 6995 (iv).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Pringle) in Com., 5743 (iii).

Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman's Tender, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4478 (iii).

Postmasters as Political Partisans (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6246 (iv).

Provident Savings Association B. 134 (Mr. Gervais) in Com., 5974 (iv).

Railways and Canals Act Amt. B. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1675 (i).

Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6967; in Com., 7262 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6246 (iv).

Militia (Military college) 9170; (permanent force) 9111; (reply to general statement) 9136 (v).

Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Ross) in Com., 8638 (v).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 2184; 2° m., 2296; in Com., 3669 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—Que—(Sherbrooke drill hall) 1141 (i).

Turgeon, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4155 (iii); in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8377 (v).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Miscou harbour) 7499 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co. (B. 83) 1°*, 1788 (i).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 88) 1°*, 1933 (i).

Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5457, 5482 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3813 (ii).

——— in Com. (Alberta boundaries) 5625 (iii).

——— (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7941 (iv).

——— (election of members) 5772 (iii).

——— (seat of govt.) 8255 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re* Genuineness (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

See 'Pet.,' 'Separate.'

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 179) in Com. (M.) to ref. back to Ry. Committee 8652 (v).

Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 50) 1°*, 817 (i).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 174 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 9404 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 1671 (i).

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. (B. 28) 1°*, 493; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2050, 2323 (ii); 3° m., 2714 (ii), 6346; on Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv).

Petitions *re* Autonomy Bill (remarks) 2260, 2320 (ii).

Schukin, Ivan, Cancellation of Homestead Rights (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).

Separate Schools, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2412 (ii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*

Beauharnois Canal, Opening Waterways: in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).

Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievances *re*, &c. (Ques.) 8886 (v).

Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 675 (i).

Census in Eastern Townships, Par. in Huntingdon 'Gleaner' (read) 675 (i).

Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8221 (v).

Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 5028 (iii).

Walsh, Mr. R. N.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control, Cor. *re* Sale, &c. (Ques.) 6477 (iv).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 334, 373, 1192, 1801 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Louis Feeders) 7380 (iv).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4951 (iii).
Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Clark (M. for cor.) 1396 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1166 (i).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Trent (construction) 1476 ; (surveys) 1471 (i).
Trent Canal—Surveys *re*, Letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth (read) 1476 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re*, Mr. Clark, Cor., &c. (M. for copy) 1396 (i).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. (Ques.) 153 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Autonomy Bill, Distribution of Printed Copies *re* (remarks) 2046 (ii).
Campaign Literature Franked by Minister of Crown (remarks) 1809 (i).
Census and Statistics B. 5 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 631 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolutions, 631 (i).
Franking Privilege *re* Campaign Literature (remarks) 1809 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies, 822 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
——— Traffic Arrangements and Freight Diversion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2214 (ii).
Manitoba Boundaries, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools from M'gr. Sbarretti (remarks) 3871 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* Political Debts, 3858 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Military Training Tramp, Central, Site, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3198 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman, on M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4480 (iii).
Railway Commission B. 36, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1628 (i).
Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 1798; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1868 (i).

White, Hon. P.—*Con.*
Steward for Speaker's Rooms (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 101 (i).
House of Commons (messengers) 240; (salaries) 238 ; (Sergeant-at-Arms) 240 ; (sessional clerks) 239 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (archives) 605 (i).
Railways—I.C.R. (revenue collections) 2214 (ii).
Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 1697; (inspections, &c.) 1694 (i).
Union Labels B. 10 (Mr. Smith) on M. for 3°, 1779 (i).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*
Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5309 (iii).
Fisheries Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond at Carleton, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 590 (i).
Hay, Free Transportation on I.C.R. O.C., &c., (Ques.) 108 (i).
St. John River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Dredging (new plant) 6893 ; Mar. Provs. (new plant) 7578; Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (St. John tributaries) 7501; Que. (St. Jean, Orleans) 7393 (iv).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters, Contribution, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c. (remarks) 404 (i).
——— Number of Witnesses, Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1398 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Distribution (remarks) 2262 (ii).
Autonomy Bill 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 5470 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 3893 (ii).
Autonomy Bill, Official Report of Division (remarks) 5432 (iii).
——— Saskatchewan B. No. 70, in Com. on Res., 8702 (v).
Brothers Light, Keeper, Appnmt., Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Child Immigration, Mrs. Close's Scheme (Ques.) 1936 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv.).
Doukhobor Homestead Entries *re* Village Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6845 (iv).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost (Ques.) 729 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 7622 (iv).
Haggard, H. Rider, Inquiry for Rep., 9523 (v).
See 'Salvation.'
Immigrants, deported from Can. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
Immigrants deported from Can., &c. (Ques.) 1847 (i).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 2187 (ii).
Immigrants from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill, &c. (Ques.) 6188 (iv).
——— Importation, 1904, &c., Number, Nationality, &c. (Ques.) 1592 (i).
Immigration, Bonus paid to Transportation or Booking Cos. (Ques.) 7811 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
——— Cost of Criminal Law (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
——— Literature (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
Immigration of Children to Canada, Assistance by Govt. (Ques.) 1341 (i).
Immigration of State Children, Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke *re* (Ques.) 5478 (iii).
Immigration of Skilled Labour, and Toronto Labour Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) 7509 (iv).
Mail Delivery, Free, System, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 729 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2745 (ii).
Mineral Specimens *re* Exhibitions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6271 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Inquiry for Copy of Contract, 8145 (v).
——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) 9455 (v).
——— (remarks) 7907 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 472 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada (Ques.) 451 (i).
Private Bills, Extension of Time, on M. (Mr. Grant) 449 (i).
Public Works under Contract, Supervision Charges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 3246 (ii).
Ry. Commissioners (chairman) B. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 576 (i).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 452 (i).
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 6976 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, R. Haggard's Rep. (Ques.) 6188 (iv).
See 'Haggard.'

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Entries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
Smart, Jas. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6932; (creameries) 6939; (experimental farms) 6172; (experimental farms bulletins) 6930; (exhibitions) 1834 (i), 6271 (iv).
Canals—Trent (surveys) 6293 (iv).
Charges of Management (Receiver Gen.'s office) 6249 (iv).
Chinese Immigration (salaries) 981 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 9058; (patent branch) 9057; (private secretary) 9054; (salaries) 9057 (v).
Civil Govt.—Finance (Private Secretary) 6268 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 6266 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 9058 (v).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (private) sec., 9062; (salary increases) 9062 (v).
Civil Govt.—Sec. of State (salaries) 9071 (v).
Culling Timber (salaries) 7236 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff, pamphlets *re*) 6424; (maps, printing, &c.) 6425 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G.B., salaries) 7685; (agencies, salaries, &c.) 6385; (contingencies, &c.) 7709; (interpreters, &c.) 7701 (iv).
Legislation (H. of Commons) 6268; (voters' lists) 6722, 6954 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouse repairs) 9036 (v); (salaries) 2702 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 979 (i).
Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 9050 (v).
Militia (Royal Military college) 7003 (iv).
Miscellaneous (consolidation of statutes) 7244; (Keewatin lunatics) 7720; (legal expenses *re* Martineau case) 6723 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers, repairs) 9034 (v).
Pensions (compensations) 6956 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.W.T. (Lloydminster immigrant sheds) 6724 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (grounds) 6817 (iv); (new deptl. buildings, site, &c.) 9608 (v); (Rideau Hall) 6823 (iv); (Rideau Hall, repairs) 9550 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Grand River dredging) 6873; (Ottawa locks) 7561; (Penetanguishene) 7563; (Point Edward dredging) 6869 (iv); (Stokes Bay) 9599; (Trenton dredging) 9600 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Canton Fabre) 7289; Que. (harbour works) 6727; (Maskinongé River dredging) 6845; (Montmorency wharf) 6853; (Ottawa River) 7375; (Little Rapids dam) 6839; (Saguenay dredging) 7379; (Sorel ice piers) 6841 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7238; (architects, &c.) 7619; 'Canada Gazette') 6723; (cement testing) 7614 (iv); (Ottawa river works) 7612; (Pacific cable grant) 7240; (printing, &c.) 6957; (surveys) 7611 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges—Dom. (traffic bridges) 7592; N.W.T. (Battle River) 7588; (colonization roads) 7597; (Shellmouth) 7592 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Slides and Booms (working expenses) 7632 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraphs—P.E.I. (Anglo-American Co.) 7632; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).

Quarantine (organized districts, salaries) 2303 (ii); (Winnipeg hospitals) 1846 (i).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9490, 9497 (v).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 9037 (v).

Water Meters Inspection B. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8675 (v).

Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals Govt. Grant *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*

Ammunition, Inspection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).

Ammunition, Small Arms, &c., Control of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).

Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 268 (i).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 5290 (iii).

Autonomy Bill, Pets. *re*, presented (remarks) 2321 (ii).

Camps for Militia Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).

Camps of Instruction, Indemnity *re* Casualties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).

Inspector General of Militia (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of (Ques.) 4373 (iii).

Magog Post Office, Erection of (Ques.) 5784 (iii).

Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4372 (iii).

Military Sites, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).

Militia, Col. Drury, Duties *re* Command (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9130 (v).

Militia Medical Officer, Allowances and Independence of Parlt. Act (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9148 (v).

Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia (Ques.) 266 (i).

——— Immediate Erection (Ques.) 5784 (iii).

——— Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 427, 1139 (i).

Sherbrooke Postal Rate and Delivery (Ques.) 378 (i).

Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).

S. A. Veterans and King's Medal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9159 (v).

S. A. War, King's Medal to Canadians, Cor., Telegrams, &c. (M. for copies*) 3204 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Militia (annual drill) 442; (military council) 424 (i); (quick-firing guns) 9124 (v).

Worthington, Mr. A. N.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford drill hall) 1550; (Chatham armoury) 1553; (Cobourg armoury) 1555; (Guelph armoury) 1556; (Kingston barracks) 1560 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Sherbrooke drill hall) 1139 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*

Apples, Packing and Sale B. 121 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 682 (i), 2422 (ii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4960, 4978 (iii); (lands vested in Crown) in Com., 6002 (iv).

Autonomy Bills, Pets. *re* (remarks) 2321 (ii).

Budget, on The, 8949 (v).

Criminal Code (trading stamps) B. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 9428 (v).

Gillies Bros., Limited (B. 95) 1°*, 2005; in Com., 2763 (ii).

Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 4220 (iii).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3191 (ii).

Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 334, 375 (i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Experimental Farms bulletins) 6927 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and W. Indies) 7186 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Bracebridge) 7547 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (general vote) 7494 (iv).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Animal Diseases, Provincial and Dom. Jurisdiction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5511, 5543 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 2°, 4349 (iii).

——— in Com. (distribution of seats) on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8063 (v).

Autonomy Bill, Census *re* Town and Rural Population (remarks) 8094 (v).

Bank Notes, Printing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6260 (iv).

Bracebridge Dry Dock, Supt. *re* Construction (Ques.) 6654 (iv).

Cement, Tariff Changes, in Com. on B. 190, 9766 (v).

Census *re* Urban and Rural Populations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

Customs Tariff Act Amt. B. 190, in Com., 9766 (v).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c. (remarks) 6477 (iv).

Seeds, Inspection and Sale B. 7 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 371, 1195; on Amt. (Mr. Cockshutt) to M. for 3°, 1880 (i).

Wright, Mr. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock records) 6688 (iv); (quinquennial census, N.W.T.) 9609 (v); (statistics) 6274 (iv).

Canals—Trent (Holland River) 9372 (v).

Customs (expenses) 261 (i).

Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (live stock) 6545; Miscellaneous (unforeseen expenses) 6521 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Can. and S. Africa) 978 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Antigonish) 1019; Ottawa (lighting) 1669 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Depot Harbour) 7552 (iv); (Honora wharf) 9597 (v); (Lake Temiskaming) 7559 (iv); (Rossead wharf) 9600; (Severn River) 9602 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Lake St. Peter piers) 6462 (iv).

Quarantine (cattle) 6714 (iv).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*

Autonomy B. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res. (subsidy) 5554 (iii).

Cadet Corps in Dom. (remarks) 7815 (iv).

Campaign Literature franked by Ministers of Crown (remarks) 1821 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Cement, in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 122) 1°*, 2681 (ii).

Hamilton Patronage *re* Postal Service (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6229 (iv).

Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 2959 (ii).

Returning Officers, Instructions *re* Forms of Oath, on Ques. of Order, 7361 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Hamilton) 7557 ; Miscellaneous (cement testing) 7615 (iv).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, plans, &c.) 9496 (v).

Telephone Grievances and Telephone Com., Discussion out of Order (remarks) 9535 (v).

Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Ry. Co.'s (B. 79) in Com., 4259 (iii).

Vibert, Philip, Relief B. 172 (Mr. Campbell) 2° m., 7218; on M. for 2° (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Yukon, Reform *re* Govt. of Country (remarks) on M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com of Sup., 7072 (iv).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

'Aberdeen' Boilers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7238 (iv).

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

Accountant of Militia Board : in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).

Acetylene Gas Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1053 (i).

——— Invention of Mr. Painchaud *re* Safety Appliances : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

——— Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).

——— Plant, St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).

——— System, Saving in Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).

Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Saskatchewan, &c., disposed of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).

See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

Additional Sidings, I.C.R., Spur Lines, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne : moved (Mr. Macdonald) 9 (i).

——— seconded (Mr. Parent) 17 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 50 (i)

——— Reply to from His Ex.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1340 (i).

ADJOURNMENTS :

Ascension Day : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).

Ash Wednesday, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).

ADJOURNMENTS—*Con.*

Easter : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

24th May, Adjournment for : M. (Mr. Fielding) 6384 (iv).

Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Administration of Justice, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).

See 'Justice.'

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 5 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 197 (Mr. Bergeron) 1°*, 9179 (v).

Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Camples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).

——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).

See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

Advances by O.C., Total Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 267 (i).

Advertising Car, I.C.R., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising, I.C.R., in Newspapers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).

Agents, I.C.R., Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Agents' Houses, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).

See 'I.C.R.', &c.

'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).

——— Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS :

Acadian Historical Data, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1830 (i).

Academy of Arts : in Com. of Sup., 6959 (iv).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Agricultural Meetings in Eastern Townships, Purposes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 268 (i).
Agriculture Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 404 (i).
——— Number of Witnesses, Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 1398 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 4081 (iii).
——— 4th Rep.: Presented (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 4984 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Greenway) to conc., 6310 (iv).
——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).
——— M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc., 8998 (v).
Agriculture, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 91 (i), 9053 (v).
See 'Arts.' &c.
Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Agricultural Statistics, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. on B. 5, 990 (i).
Aids to Agricultural Societies : in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).
Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
See 'Cold Storage.'
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).
See 'Doughty.'
——— Reconstruction of, &c. in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).
Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).
Buffalo Specimens for Exhibitions : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G. B. : on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Ag. Com., 8998 (v).
Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Canadian Shippers *re* Atlantic SS. Contract with Armours', &c. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).
Cattle Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).
Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets : Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Census, Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c. : in Com. of Sup. 9608 (v).
Census, Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c. : Ques. (Mr Taylor) 588 (i).
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup., 8183 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
See 'Thermograph.'
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic SS. Service : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 6938, 7014 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).
Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).
Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).
Embargo on Canadian Cattle : *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'
Exhibition (Dom.) at New Westminster, B.C., Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Exhibitions, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
——— Liege, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
See 'Liege,' 'New Westminster,' 'St. Louis.'
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Freight Rates : *See* 'Holstein.'
Fruit Growers' Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 381 (i).
Fumigating Stations : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Grimsby, Establishment of Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight Handling : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
See 'Agricultural Com.,' &c.
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Liege Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).

AGRICULTURE AND STATISTICS—*Con.*
Liege Exhibition, Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).
Live Stock Record Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).
——— Nationalization, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i).
Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).
Maladie du Coit, Horse Disease : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).
New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Patent Examiners, Salary Increases : in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).
Patent Record : in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Patent Record supplied to Members : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1827 (i).
Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).
Quarantine, Cattle : in Com. of Sup., 1838, 6690 ; conc., 6911 (iv).
——— Organized Districts, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).
Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
St. Louis Exhibition : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Ag. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).
——— Statements *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).
Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm : in Com. of Sup. (remarks) (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).
Thermograph Record, *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).
Thermograph Records *re* Atlantic Steamers : M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).
See 'Cold Storage.'
Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog, &c., Diseases : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).
Williams Head Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Year Book : in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 997 (i).
Aids to Agricultural Societies : in Com. of Sup., 1829 (i).
Aids to Navigation, Repairs to Lighthouses, &c. : in Com of Sup., 6636 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, Programme *re* Boards of Trade : Read (Mr Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).
Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2891 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Alaska Boundary Demarcation, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 118 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 51.)
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. No. 83 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)
Alberta, Creation of Province : *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'
Alberta District Postal Business, &c. : M. for Ret., (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of : M. for Ret.*, (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Alberta Steamer Service, Navigable Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6904 (iv).
Alexandra Bridge, Ottawa, Lighting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Alexandria P.O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 116 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)
Algoma Copper Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 54.)
Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Appeal against Judge Anglin's Declaration : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 8147 (v).
Alien Labour Investigation *re* G. T. P. Surveys: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).
Alien Labour Laws, Legislation *re* Amts.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 6232 (iv).
Aliens : *See* 'Naturalization,' 'Telegraph,' &c.
Allandale Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Allan SS. Contracts *re* Cold Storage, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 865 (i).
Allan Steamers, List of Sailings : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 885 (i).
See 'Agriculture,' 'Trade and Commerce.'
American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).

American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).
Amherst Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Anglo-American Convention respecting Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., Agreement *re* Charges : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— P.E.I., Charges, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
——— Subsidy Increases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 108 (i).
Animals slaughtered under Diseases Act : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on conc., 6911 (iv).
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Annual Drill for Militia : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Annual Statement, I.C.R., on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Anse à Beaufils, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).
Anthracite Coal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 136 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) Imported, Commercial Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Anthracite Coal used by Govt. in each Province, Quantity, Amount paid, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1398 (i).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
Antigonish Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Apples, Packing of, &c.: *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Apple River Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects, Public Works, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
Archives, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 6826 (iv).
——— F. W. Grey's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6679 (iv).
——— Reconstruction of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1823 (i).
Archives, on conc., 6918 (iv).
Arctic Expedition, Fitting of Boats, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6468 (iv).
——— Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
'Arctic,' Hudson Bay Exploration, Provision for : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Arichat (west) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423, 1547 (i).
Armoury at Woodstock, N.B., Ownership of Land by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Arsenals, Dominion, Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Dom.', &c.
'Arthur Binney,' Fishing Schooner, Small-pox Quarantine : Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2307 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1472 1823 (i), 6165, 6269 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'
Art Gallery, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Ascension Day Adjournment : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 6825 (iv).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Ashcroft Water and Light Co., Condition of Lease *re* Lands : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2492 (ii).

Ash-Wednesday, Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2112 (ii).
Assay Apparatus for Geological Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Assent to Bills : *See* 'Bills.'
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Astronomical Observatory, Ottawa, Fittings, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Technical Officers and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9248 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 88 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)
Athabaska Ry. and Oil Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c 58.)
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv), 9382 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' Allan's,' &c.
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 13 (Mr. Gauvreau) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)
Atlantic SS. Service, Shipping Space for American Shippers : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261, 7422 (iv).
Atwater Avenue Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
Audit Act Amts., Govtl. Intention : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Audit Act and Aud. Gen.'s Resignation : on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 9623 (v).
Audit Act, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2190 (ii).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lemieux) 1935 (i).
Auditor General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 77, 91 (i) ; 6721 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Part I. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Additional Copies, Letter from Aud. Gen. to Sec. of State : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4271 (iii).
——— Distribution *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2262 (ii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1151 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 51, 97 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation, Acceptance by Govt., and Audit Act Amts. : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6522 (iv).
Aud. Gen.'s Resignation and Legislation *re* Audit Act : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 590 (i).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 9541 (v).
Autonomy (Alberta) for N.W Ter., B. No. 69 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°, m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893 (ii), 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. (Y. 59, N. 140) 5401 ; 2 m., 5423 ; in Com., 5423 ; in Com., on Res., *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470, 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com., on B., 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983, 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv) ; 8530 (v) ; in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916, (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier *re* School Clause, No. 2, 8269; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41, N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831 ; Neg. (Y. 7, N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37, N. 106) 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg, (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42, N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Crown Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3° agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 3.)

Autonomy B. 69, 2° m., 2915 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2979 ; Neg., (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400.

Debate :

(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2963 ; Amt., 2979 ; (Mr. Fielding) 2979 ; (Mr. Sproule) 3010 ; (Mr. Paterson) 3045 ; (Mr. Monk) 3064 ; (Mr. Sifton) 3092 ; (Mr. Northrup) 3121 ; 3136 ; (Mr. Oliver) 3152 ; (Mr. Bourassa) 3252 ; (Mr. Blain) 3284 ; (Mr. Lemieux) 3304 ; (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 3332 ; (Mr. Foster) 3363 ; (Sir Wm. Mulock) 3400 ; (Mr. Lancaster) 3424 ; (Mr. L. P. Demers) 3450 ; (Mr. Bergeron) 3462 ; (Mr. Belcourt) 3498 ; (Mr. Lake) 3532 ; (Mr. Scott) 3591 ; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3672 ; (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 3713 ; (Mr. Perley) 3739 ; (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3745 ; (Mr. S. Hughes) 3766 ; (Mr. Turriff) 3813 ; Mr. U. Wilson) 3893 ; (Mr. Béland) 3906 ; (Mr. Barr) 3921 ; (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 4086 ; (Mr. LeCnox) 4112, 4136 ; (Mr. Turgeon) 4155 ; (Mr. P. Talbot) 4176 ; (Mr. Pringle) 4273 ; (Mr. Miller) 4292 ; (Mr. Staples) 4312 ; (Mr. Lamont) 4329 ; (Mr. W. Wright) 4349 ; (Mr. Bickerdike) 4360 ; (Mr. Alcorn) 4375 ; (Mr. Beauparlant) 4395 ; (Mr. Osler) 4404 ; (Mr. Hall) 4409, 4415 ; (Mr. Boyce) 4433 ; (Mr. Fisher) 4481 ; (Mr. Ames) 4504 ; (Mr. Crocket) 4532 ; (Mr. Bruneau) 4552 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 4580 ; (Mr. Crawford) 4607 ; (Mr. Schaffner) 4622 ; (Mr. Grant) 4703 ; (Mr. Porter) 4726 ; (Mr. Laurence) 4745, 4753 ; (Mr. Armstrong) 4767 ; (Mr. Bole) 4784 ; (Mr. Paquet) 4798 ; (Mr. Henderson) 4811 ; (Mr. Cash) 4833 ; (Mr. Broder) 4846 ; (Mr. Bureau) 4861 ; (Mr. Herron) 4878 ; (Mr. Parmelee) 4886 ; (Mr. Taylor) 4896 ; (Mr. Kemp) 4922 ; (Mr. German) 4944 ; (Mr. Ward) 4951 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 4960, 4978 ; (Mr. Campbell) 5037 ; (Mr. Lalor) 5055 ; (Mr. T. Martin) 5083 ; (Mr. Elson) 5100 ; (Mr. Black) 5109 ; (Mr. Adamson) 5114 ; (Mr. Sinclair) 5121 ; (Mr. Bristol) 5140 ; (Mr. Guthrie) 5153 ; (Mr. Boyer) 5189 ; (Mr. McIntyre) 5179 ; (Mr. Derbyshire) 5197 ; (Mr. Forget) 5206 ; (Mr. Brodeur) 5211 ; (Mr. Macdonell) 5240 ; (Mr. Kennedy) 5256 ; (Mr. Bennett) 5262 ; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 5276 ; (Mr. Worthington) 5290 ; (Mr. J. D. Reid) 5301 ; (Mr. Wilmot) 5309 ; (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5317 ; (Mr. Barker) 5354 ; (Mr. Stockton) 5380 ; (Mr. Leonard) 5393 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) negatived (Y. 59, N. 140) 5400; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 (iii).

Autonomy (Saskatchewan) for N.W.Ters. B. No. 70 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii); 2° m., 5424 (iii); 2° M. of B., 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699 ; in Com. on Res., *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873 ; Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882 ; Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884; 3° agreed to, on division, 8885 (v) (5 Edward VII, c., 42).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com. (Alberta Boundaries) 5601 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69 (Arbitration *re* Assets) 5946 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act. s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii).

——— (B.N.A. Act, s. 2) 5719, 5750 (iii), 8526 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8526 (v) ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8530, 8613 (v).

——— (C.P.R. Taxes) 6049 (iv).

——— (compensation for lands) 5817 (iii).

——— (date of Act) 8634 (v).

——— (distribution of seats) 7724 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) to ref. to Judges, 7770 ; Newspaper Rumors, Quotation : Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 7744 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7817, 7864, 7917 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8004, Neg., 8092 (v).

——— (election of members), 5766, 5809 (iii).

——— (Executive Council), 5781 (iii).

——— (House of Commons representation), 5685 (iii).

——— (Hudson Bay Co. Rights) 5947 (iii), 6049 (iv), 8166 (v).

——— (Joint Stock Companies) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick), 6083 (iv).

——— (lands vested in Crown), 5918, 5946 (iii), 5986 (iv), 8171 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8171, 8256-7 (v).

——— (laws, courts, &c.) 5783, 5812 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5927 (iii), 6101 (iv), 8170, 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8244 (v).

——— (Legislative Assembly) 5815 (iii).

——— (Lt. Gov.'s Powers) 5781 (iii).

——— (readjustment *re* census) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5753 (iii).

——— (school clause Amt.) 7103 (iv) ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) 8387 ; Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8292 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) 8491 (v).

——— (seat of government) 5781 (iii), 8244 (v).

——— (Senate representation) 5674 (iii).

Autonomy B. 69, in Com., on Schedules (Athabaska) 8163 ; (Cardston) 8149 ; (Edmonton city) 8160 ; (Gleichen) 8153, 8166 ; (High River) 8155 ; (Lacombe) 8156 ; (Leduc) 8157; (Lethbridge) 8150 ; (Macleod) 8150 ; (Medicine Hat) 8148 ; (Peace River) 8163 ; (Pincher Creek) 8153 ; (Ponoka) 8156 ; (Red Deer) 8155 ; (St. Albert) 8163 ; (Saskatchewan) 8161 ; (Stony Plain) 8157 ; (Strathcona) 8157 ; (Sturgeon) 8162 ; (Vermilion) 8155 ; (Wetaskiwin) 8157 (v).

Autonomy B. 69 (Alberta) on 3°, Amt. (Mr. S. Hughes) B.N.A. Act, sec. 2, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106) 8834 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. Scott), C.P.R. Land Taxes, 8777.

——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8804 ; Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8817 (v).

——— Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) Distribution of Seats, 8858, Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 (v).

Autonomy B. 69, on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche). Distribution of Seats, 8860.
——— Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) Dual Language (Neg. Y. 7, N. 140) 8854 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Monk) Dual Language, 8839, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 140) 8855 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Barker) Rupert's Land, 8864 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) Schools (Neg. Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8831 (v).
——— Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) School Fund, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7, N. 132) 8837 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Separate Schools (Mr. Léonard) 8857 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. (annual subsidy), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8760 (v).
——— (B.N.A. Act) Amt. (Mr. Monk) 8702 (v).
——— Amt. *re* C. P. R. (Mr. Scott) 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 (v).
——— (Crown lands) 8760 (v).
——— (distribution of seats) : Remarks (Mr. Lake) 8704 (v).
——— (H. of C. Representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
——— (law courts, &c.) Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8758 (v).
——— (Rupert's Lands) Amt. (Mr. Barker) 8761 (v).
——— (schools), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8759 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 8759 (v).
——— (Senate representation), Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8703 (v).
Autonomy B. 70 (Saskatchewan) in Com. on Schedules (Grenfell) 8757 ; (Lumsden) 8757 ; (Moosejaw) 8757 (v).
Autonomy (Saskatchewan) B. 70, 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Exemption, 8873; Neg. (Y. 11; N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Léonard) *re* Schools, Neg. (Y. 6 ; N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) Schools, 8884 (v).
Autonomy Bills, Amendments : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2840 (ii).
——— Approval of Cabinet, Resignation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2263 (ii).
——— Alberta Boundaries, Letter *re* Naming of Prov.: Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5637 (iii).
——— Changes since First Reading, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2046 (ii).
——— Circulars, &c., Denial (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2570 (ii).
——— Circular signed by T. Brown, Sec. of Public Instruction, N.W.T., Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3009 (ii).
——— Constitutionality of, Changes *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2192 (ii).
——— Cor. referred to by Prime Minister : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 2593 (ii).
Autonomy Bills, Delay in Printing : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1671 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 1754 (i).
——— Discussion, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6726, 6836 (iv).
——— Haultain, Mr., Letter to Prime Minister: on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2493 (ii).
——— Information asked for in Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3091 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2594 (ii).
——— Letter from Hon. G. W. Ross to Min. of Fin. (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).
——— Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).
——— Notice of Amendment, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2761 (ii).
——— Official Record of Division : Remarks (Mr. McIntyre) 5428 (iii).
——— Papers *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3008 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Le Soleil' : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 1745 (i).
——— Personal Explanation, Debate and Absence : (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2043 (ii).
——— Personal Explanations (Mr. Bourassa and Mr. A. Lavergne) 8865-6 (v).
——— Personal Explanation *re* Draft Bill of 1902 (Mr. Lake) 4348 (iii).
——— Petitions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 2260, 2319 (ii).
——— Pets. *re* : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Macpherson) 2681 (ii).
——— 'Political Pay,' Charge by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech : Ques. of Order (Mr. Foster) 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
——— Population *re* Saskatchewan : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5919 (iii).
——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 1788 (i).
——— Printing, &c., for 3° : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 8762 (v).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Circular sent by Jacques Cartier Club, 2569, 2590 (ii).
——— Ry. Subsidies by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4202 (iii).
——— Ref. to Speech on 'Doukhobors and Englishmen' (Mr. Black) 5901 (iii).
——— Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : Personal Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
——— Res. *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1594 (i).
——— Schedules *re* Constituencies : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5815 (ii).
——— Schedules, Population and Votes cast : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5575 (iii).
——— Schedules, Preparation of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375, 4750 (iii).

Autonomy Bills, Schedules *re* Saskatchewan, Preparation of Maps, &c.: Ramarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5475 (iii).

—— School Clause Amt.: Remarks *re* Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5673 (iii).

—— School Clauses, Attack on Orangeism: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5873 (iii).

—— School Clause, Explanation *re* Amended clause 16: Read in Com. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 (iv).

—— School Clause Amts., Explanation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5818 (i); Quotations from Regina 'Leader' (read) 5851 (iii).

—— School Clause in Com.: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5817-18 (iii).

—— School Clause: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) 7175 (iv).

—— School Clause 16: Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick *re* Drafting, 4829 (iii).

—— Second Reading *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2022 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2112 (ii).

—— School Pets.: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).

—— personal explanation (Mr. Sproule) 2320 (ii).

—— in Com. on Res. (subsidy clause), 5479; Statement *re* Net Rev. of Public Lands: read (Mr. Scott) 5505 (iii).

—— 'Yellow Dog,' Quotation from Halifax Chronicle: Read (Mr. Sproule) in Com., 5879, 5901 (iii).

See 'Mackenzie,' 'Keewatin,' 'Controverted Elections,' 'Northwest Territories,' 'Land Titles Act,' 'Northwest Irrigation,' 'Census and Statistics,' 'N. W. Territories B. 160,' 'Northwest Territories Representation Act. Amt. B. 156,' 'Census and Statistics B. 163,' 'Northwest Irrigation B. 161,' 'Manitoba Boundaries'.

Baddeck and East SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).

Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).

Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses Granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).

Bait Freezers Deep Sea Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).

—— Establishment in Canso, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).

—— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).

Ballots, Bank, Method of Issuing, Complains *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

—— Printing, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

—— Printing, &c., for Carleton, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 587 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box: (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1337 (i).

—— Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' 'Voters' Lists,' &c.

Balsam Lake Waterways, Agreeement *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).

Bank Act Amt. B. No. 181 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 7642 (iv); 2°*, 8688; in Com., 8688; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 4).

Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2441 (ii).

Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).

See 'Finance, &c.'

Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges; in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

Banff, N.W.T. Water Works and Sewage Construction: in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution; in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Barachois Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).

Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River: in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).

Bass River Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Batiscan Channel Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).

Battery Point Breakwater Extension: in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Battleford and Lake Lenore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 75 (Mr. Lamont) 1° m., 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works: in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).

Bayfield Pier, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.'s B. No. 85 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 1788; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour: in Com. of Sup. 7397 (iv).

—— Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).

Bear Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Water Power, Utilization : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).

Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).

Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Beet Sugar Industry, Encouragement of &c.: M. for Copies of Cor* (Mr. Clements) 3204 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).

Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Bell, Dr., Director of Geological Survey : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).

Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).

Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).

Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).

Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Cote : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

——— Land purchased from P. Ross : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).

Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).

Bills from Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper amongst Private Bils (Mr. R. G. Macpherson) 8001 (v).

——— M. (Mr. A. Johnston) to place on Order Paper, 8096 (v).

——— Amendments *re*, Correction of Clerical Error (Mr. Fielding) 8383 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Bickerdike) to place on Order Paper, 9278 (v).

Bills, Royal Assent.: Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen's Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent to in Senate, 9820 (v).

BILLS :

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, pro forma, 5 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312 ; agreed to (Y. 85, N. 45) 315 ; in Com., 1780 (i), 3223 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 3) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)

1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean, York.)

1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; withdn., 3743 (ii).

Bill (No. 5) Respecting the Census and Statistics.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°*, 52 ; 2°* 625 ; in Com., 625 ; Res. prop., 820 ; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 5.)

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, North Simcoe.)

1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher.)

M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2°, 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3° m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Mounted Police Act, 1894.—(Sir Wilfrid Laruier.)

Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

1°, 263 (i).

Bill (No. 10) Respecting Labour Union Labels.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo.)

In Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting the Columbia and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1° m., 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; on Order for Com., 1338 ; in Com., 1888; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393 ; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398 ; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)

1°, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 59.)

Bill (No. 14) Respecting the Molsons Bank.—(Mr. Ames.)

1°, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Bill (No. 15) To incorporate the St. Mary's and Western Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. McIntyre.)

1°* 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 16) Respecting certain patents of the Canada Car Company, Limited.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting certain patents of the Goodwin Car Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)

Bill (No. 19) To incorporate the Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)

Bill (No. 20) To incorporate the Moosejaw and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762, (iii) ; 3°*, 2763 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com., 731 (i).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)

Bill (No. 23) To amend the provisions of the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to common bawdy houses.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Railway Company—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. McKenzie, Bruce.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583, in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)

Bill (No. 26) To incorporate the Sovereign Fire Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting certain patents of the Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Company, of Perth, Limited.—(Mr. Caldwell.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 91.)

Bill (No. 28) To incorporate the North-west Telephone Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1890 (i), 2047, 2323 ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3°, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Canada Southern Bridge Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the London and St. Clair Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)

Bill (No. 33) Respecting certain patents of Jean Effront.—(Mr. Demers, St. John and Iberville.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)

Bill (No. 36) To amend the Railway Act 1903.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°* of B., 582 ; 2°, 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) Neg., (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act, 1899.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)
1°, 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii) ; wthdn., 4749 (iii).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)

Bill (No. 40) Respecting the Niagara-Welland Power Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Regina and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Scott.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173.)

Bill (No. 43) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)
1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)

Bill (No. 44) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster.)
1°, 684 ; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)
1°, 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii), 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. E. M. Macdonald.)
1*, 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)

Bill (No. 47) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 48) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°, 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)

Bill (No. 49) Respecting the Century Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 80.)

Bill (No. 50) To incorporate the Calgary and Battleford Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)
1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)

Bill (No. 51) Respecting Contracts for Government Works.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick)
1°, 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)

Bill (No. 52) To amend the Franchise Act, 1898.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).
1°, 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°*, 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)

Bill (No. 53) To amend the Act respecting the Department of Railways and Canals. —(Mr. Emmerson.)
1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)

Bill (No. 54) To amend the Public Works Act.—(Mr. Hyman.)
1°, 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) To incorporate the Canada-Middlesex Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Bill (No. 56) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°*, 985 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 73.)

Bill (No. 57) To incorporate the Three Rivers, St. Maurice and Champlain Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)
1°, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 167.)

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Canadian Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)
1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 72.)

Bill (No. 59) To amend the Act respecting the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court as to Railway Debts.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399 ; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) To incorporate the Algoma Copper Range Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c. 54.)

Bill (No. 61) To incorporate the Lebonk and Thunder Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 117.)

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)
1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the Brantford and Woodstock Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)
1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 63.)

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Central Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart.)
1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 78.)

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 110.)

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, with respect to appeals from certain summary convictions.—(Mr. Porter.)
1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2°, 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3°, 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII, c. 10.)

Bill (No. 67) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 1421 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting a patent of the Paper Goods Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 146.)

Bill (No. 69) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Alberta.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1° m., 1421 (i) ; Res. prop., 2913 ; 2° m., 2915, on M. for 2°, 2963, 3010, 3091, 3136, 3252, 3363, 3400, 3450, 3591, 3598, 3672, 3745, 3893, 4078, 4086, 4136, 4273, 4375, 4414, 4480, 4552, 4598, 4703, 4753, 4811, 4846, 4922, 4978, 5037, 5083, 5113, 5140, 5211, 5317, Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Neg. Y. 59 ; N. 140) 5401 ; 2°, 5423 ; in Com., 5423, in Com. on Res. *re* Subsidy, 5434 ; Amt. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Subsidy, 5470 ; 5479 ; Res. ref. to Com. on Bill, 5575 ; in Com. on Bill, 5601, 5719, 5749, 5808, 5927 (iii) ; Explanation (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 5983 ; in Com. on B., 6048, 6086, 7103 ; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 7583 (iv), 8530 (v); in Com., 7724, 7817, 7864, 7916 (iv), 8004 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8004 ; in Com., 8148 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8173 ; in Com., 8240 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) 8259 ; in Com., 8268 ; Amt. (Sir W. Laurier) *re* School Clause No. 2, 8269 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Amended School Clause, 8292 ; in Com., 8317 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* School Clause, 8341 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* School Clause, 8387 ; Amt. (Mr. Lamont) *re* School Clause, 8493 ; in Com., 8530 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Mr. Monk's Amt., 8593 ; 3° m., 8777 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8792; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8804, Neg. (Y. 41 ; N. 109) 8816 ; Amt. (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Schools, 8831, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 138) 8832 ; Amt. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) *re* Schools, 8833, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 106), 8834 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) *re* Schools, 8835, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 132) 8837; Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Dual Language, 8839 ; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to Amt., 8852, Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8854 ; Amt. Neg. (Y. 7 ; N. 140) 8855 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) 8857 ; Amt. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8858 ; Neg. (Y. 42 ; N. 97) 8859 ; Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) *re* Distribution of Seats, 8860 ; Amt. (Mr. Lake) *re* Lands, &c., 8863 ; Amt. (Mr. Barker) *re* Preamble, 8864 ; 3°, agreed to on division, 8866 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 3.)

Bill (No. 70) To establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Saskatchewan.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 1467 (i) ; Res. prop., 2914 (ii) ; 2° m., 5424 (iii), 8698 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8698, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 90) 8699; in Com. on Res. *re* Financial Subsidy, 8701 ; in Com., 8702, 8718 ; 3° m., 8866 ; Amt. (Mr. Scott) *re* C.P.R. Taxes, 8873, Neg. (Y. 11, N. 126) 8881 ; Amt. (Mr. Leonard) *re* Schools, 8882, Neg. (Y. 6, N. 124) 8882 ; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Schools, 8884 ; Amt. (Mr. Sproule) *re* Schools, 8884 ; 3°, agreed to, on division, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 42.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 71) Respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)

1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 99.)

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Canadian Canals Corporation.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i).

Bill (No. 73) To incorporate the Montreal, Quebec and Southern Railway Company. —(Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 1592 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Railway Company. (Mr. Talbot, Strathcona.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the Battleford and Lake Lenore Railway Company.—(Mr. Lamont.)

1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 60.)

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Red Deer Valley Railway and Coal Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°, 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Canadian Agency.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Macleod, Cardston and Montana Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

Bill (No. 79) Respecting the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)

Bill (No. 80) To incorporate the Woodstock and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Ottawa River Railway Company, and to change its name to the 'Central Trunk Railway Company.'—(Mr. Piché.)

1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)

Bill (No. 82) To incorporate the Dominion Annuity Company.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 1745 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., 2767 ; 3° m., 2768 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 55.)

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 52.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)

Bill (No. 85) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty).

1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the International Terminal and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)

Bill (No. 88) To incorporate the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 193 (i); 2°*, 2060 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 57.)

Bill (No. 89) Respecting Monterey Electric and Gas Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Monterey Railway, Light and Power Company.'—(Mr. Macdonell.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c., 126.)

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. — (Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 90.)

Bill (No. 91) Respecting the Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Ottawa and New York Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii) ; in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Bill (No. 93) Respecting the Grand Council of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada.—(Mr. Hughes, Kings.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and North-western Railway.—(Mr. Derbyshire.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64.)

Bill (No. 95) Respecting Gillies Brothers, Limited.—(Mr. Wright, Renfrew.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Montreal and Southern Counties Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Bill (No. 97) Respecting the Kingston and Dominion Central Railway, and to change its name to 'The Montreal, Ottawa Kingston and Georgian Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Harty.)

1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)

Bill (No. 98) To incorporate the Imperial Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 2043 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 2770 ; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Title Guarantee and Trust Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii), 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Guelph and Georgian Bay Railway Company.— (Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)

Bill (No. 101) To incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company.—(Mr. Costigan.)

1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting a certain patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.— (Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Tobin.)

1°*, 2184 ; on Order for 2°, 2296 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3669 ; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)

Bill (No. 104) Respecting the Northern Bank.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the Ontario Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Boyce.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Bill (No. 106) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Black.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4971, 5113 ; 3°*, 5113 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Bill (No. 107) Respecting a certain patent of Celeste Joly.—(Mr. Smith.)

1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) To incorporate the Western Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Adamson.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°* 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Hudson's Bay and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatchewan Bridge Company.—(Mr. Scott).
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Bill (No. 114) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII,. c. 120.)

Bill (No. 115) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7625; in Com., 7622, 7677; 3°, 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)

Bill (No. 116) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 53.)

Bill (No. 117) To incorporate the Athabaska Railway and Oil Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°* 2298 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 58.)

Bill (No. 118) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 51.)

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)

Bill (No. 120) Respecting False Representations to Induce Immigration.—(Mr. Logan.)
1°*, 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 121) To amend the Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Staple Commodities.—(Mr. Fisher.)
M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441; 2°, and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

Bill (No. 122) To incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).

Bill (No. 123) Respecting the Board of the Presbyterian College, Halifax.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Wellington.)
1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)

Bill (No. 125) To incorporate the Crown Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Gervais.)
M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593 ; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83.)

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) For the relief of Edward Albert Murphy.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate) For the relief of James Arthur Pryor.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)

Bill (No. 128) To amend the Canada Temperance Act.—(Mr. Gervais.)
1°, 3359 (ii).

Bill (No. 129, from the Senate) Respecting certain patents of William A. Damen.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 3834 (ii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 84.)

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate) For the relief of Jane Marie Fitz-Simons.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m., 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)

Bill (No. 132) To amend the Government Railways Act.—(Mr. Emmerson.)
1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3°, 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 133, from the Senate) Respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Barr.)

1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 81.)

Bill (No. 134) To incorporate the Provident Savings Association, Limited. — (Mr. Gervais.)

1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com., 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate) Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company. —(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate) To incorporate the Anthracite Coal Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

M. to receive Pet., 4550 ; Pet. ref. back to Sel. Com., 4644 ; 1°*, 4807 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 5976 ; 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 56.)

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate) Respecting the Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate) Respecting the Montreal Bridge Company, and to change its name to the Montreal Bridge and Terminal Company.—(Mr. Piché.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°, 4703 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Bill (No. 139) Respecting the Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Duncan Ross.)

M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)

Bill (No. 140) Respecting the Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company, and to change its name to the Great West Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)

Bill (No. 141) Respecting the Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii), 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)

Bill (No. 142) For the relief of Edward Norman Lewis, a Member of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate) To incorporate the Owen Sound and Meaford Railway Company.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Company of Canada.—(Mr. Telford.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)

Bill (No. 145 from the Senate) Respecting a Patent, No. 69772, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—(Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 168.)

Bill (No. 146 from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Underwood Typewriter Company (Mr. Grant.)

1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 169.)

Bill (No. 147) To amend the Seamen's Act.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 40.)

Bill (No. 148) Respecting the incorporation of Live Stock Record Associations.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1° m., 5076 ; Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 ; 2°*, 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°*, 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 21.)

Bill (No. 149) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Brown.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 158.)

Bill (No. 150 from the Senate) Respecting the Interprovincial and James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Devlin.)

1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 109.)

Bill (No. 151) To incorporate L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to rec. Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 170.)

Bill (No. 152 from the Senate) For the relief of Clara Bidwell McDermot.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; Agreed to (Y. 38 ; N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 121.)

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) For the Relief of George Pearson.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3°, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 147.)

Bill (No. 154, from the Senate) For the relief of George Dance Harper.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 103.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 155, from the Senate) Respecting the Administration of an Act respecting the Packing and Sale of Certain Staple Commodities.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 45.)

Bill (No. 156) To amend the North-west Territories Representation Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 23.)

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the District of Mackenzie.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

Bill (No. 158) To amend the Keewatin Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschgd., 8176 (v).

Bill (No. 159) To amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6103-4 (iv) ; 2°*, and in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 8.)

Bill (No. 160) With respect to the North-west Territories.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°, 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 27.)

Bill (No. 161) To amend the North-west Irrigation Act, 1898.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 28.)

Bill (No. 162) To amend the Land Titles Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°*, 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 18.)

Bill (No. 163) To amend the Census and Statistics Act.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°, 6105 (iv) ; 2° 8774 ; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6.)

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) To incorporate the Monarch Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Gordon.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Bill (No. 165) Respecting the Canadian Yukon Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76.)

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of the Ideal Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) For the relief of Arthur Howe Hersey.—(Mr. Johnston, Lambton.)

1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; M. for Com., 7624 ; On Order for Com., 7682 ; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 168) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)

Bill (No. 169) To amend the Act respecting the Royal Military College.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6904 ; in Com. on Res., 6966 ; 1°* of B., 6984 ; 2°*, 7262 ; in Com., 7262; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Bill (No. 170) To amend the Militia Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)

Res. prop., 6905 ; in Com. on Res., 6984 ; 1°* of B., 6991 ; On Order for 2°, 7263; 2° m., 9179 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)

Bill (No. 171) Respecting the Fort and Pilotage District of Quebec.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) For the relief of Philip Vibert.—(Mr.Zimmerman.)

1°*, 7095 ; On Order for 2°, 7218 ; 2°, 7261; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)

Bill (No. 173) Respecting the St. Maurice Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To amend the Grain Inspection Act as regards the Selection of Commercial Grades and Samples.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)

Bill (No. 175) Respecting the Pacific Bank.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°, 7420 ; 2°, 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)

Bill (No. 176) To amend the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

1°, 7421 (iv) ; 2°*, 8676 ; in Com., 8676 ; 3°*, 8685; Sen. Amts., 9411 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)

Bill (No. 177, from the Senate) Respecting certain Patents of David Thomas Owen.—(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 143.)

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate) Respecting the Canada Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate) Respecting the Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) : M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146; in Com., 8652; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate) Further to amend the Act of 1899 respecting the City of Ottawa.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686 ; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 29.)

Bill (No. 181) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)

1°, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8688 ; in Com., 8688 ; 3°*, 8689 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 4.)

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) Respecting the Sterling Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place or Orders for 2°*, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate) Respecting a certain patent of the Metal Volatilization Company.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Coc., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.)

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate) To amend the Acts respecting Naturalization and Aliens.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) For the relief of Isaac Pitblado.—(Mr. Bole.)

1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)

Bill (No. 186) For the regulation of Wireless Telegraphy in Canada.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)

Bill (No. 187. from the Senate) To amend the Companies Act.

(This Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.)

Bill (No. 188) Respecting the Inspection of Water Meters.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Res. prop., 8385 : in Com. on Res., 8674 ; 1°* of B., 8676 ; 2°*, 9409 ; in Com., 9409 ; 3°*, 9524 ; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)

Bill (No. 189) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 8775 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 190) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983; 1°*, of B., 8997; 2°*, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*, 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)

Bill (No. 191) Respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. O. E. Talbot.)

1°*, 9072 ; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)

Bill (No. 192) Respecting the Powers of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Préfontaine.)

1°, 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Bill (No. 193) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the salaries of certain public functionaries and other annual charges on the Consolidated Revenue.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Revised Statute respecting the House of Commons, and the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. —(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1° m., 9073 (v).

Bill (No. 195) Respecting Roads and Road Allowances in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 9075 ; 2°, 9525 ; in Com., 9526 ; 3°*, 9529 ; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)

Bill (No. 196) In amendment of the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3°, 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)

Bill (No. 197) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Bergeron.)

1°*, 9179 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate) For the relief of Agnes Hedevig Helga Salusbury Trelawney.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)

Bill (No. 199) To amend an Act respecting an Arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com., 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 15.)

Bill (No. 200) Respecting the Inspector of Insurance and the Director General of Public Health.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 9688 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 46.)

Bill (No. 201) Respecting the Salary of the First Minister.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9700 : in Com. on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*. 9790 ; in Com., 9790 ; 3°, 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 12.)

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 43.)

Bill (No. 203) Respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors.—(Mr. Fielding.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 30.)

Bill (No. 204) To amend the Act respecting Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 31.)

Bill (No. 205) To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

Res. prop., 9705; in Com. on Res., 9760; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°*; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 47.)

Bill (No. 206) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1905, and the 30th June, 1906.—(Mr. Fielding.)

M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*; 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 2.)

Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).

Binder Twine, Home Consumption Manufactured in Can., Quantity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1759 (i).

Binder Twine Industry, Kingston, Output, Distribution, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 482 (i).

Binder Twine, Raw Material imported from Mexico : Remarks (Sir William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).
See 'Cordage.'

Bissonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal, P. O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Blair, Mr., Resignation of, Conspiracy, Cor., Tels., &c. : Read (Mr. Bennett) 541-6 (i).

——— Denials of Ministers, Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 546 (i).

——— Irrelevancy of Debate : Ques. of Order (Mr. Henderson) 558 (i).

——— Letter *re* Resignation : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 697 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 55 ; on M. for Com. or B. 36, 511 (i).

Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).

Boisdale Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.

Bonusing SS. Cos. for Cold Storage, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1101-4 (i).

Book-keeping Methods I.C.R., &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

Books purchased for Library, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Boundary Line Fence : *See* 'Wire Fencing.'

Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).

Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service Inspection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).

Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).

Boyd, Geo. A., Emplymt. at Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).

Bracebridge Dry Dock, Local Supt., Remuneration, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 6654 (iv).

Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).

Brandon, Saskatchewan and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 179 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 8655 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 62.)

Brantford and Woodstock Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 63 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1241; 2°*, 1339 (i); in Com., and 3°, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 63.)

Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550, 1633 (i).

Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).

Brantford Parade Grounds : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com of Sup. 860, 1553 (i).

Bredt, Mr. P. M., Emplymt. by Govt.: (Mr. Lake) 189, 265 (i).

Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).

Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).

Bridges, Dr., Resignation as Medical Officer of No. 8 District : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).

Bridges, Strengthening of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'
B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).
B. C. Dom. Lands, Sale to Mr. T. W. Patterson, Prices paid, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).
B. C. Indian Inductrial Schools : in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
——— Travelling Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
B. C. Legislation *re* Immigration, Disallowance of : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 189 (i), 6474 (iv).
Britton, Judge, Rep. *re* Alien Investigation : Inquiry for (Mr. Sproule) 1152 (i).
Broad Cove Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Broad Cove Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Brockville, Westport and North-western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. Derbyshire) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 64).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., (2868 ii).
——— Statement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Bruce County Armouries : Remarks (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 1658 (i).
Brunet, Mr., G.T.P. Ry. Commissioner, Resignation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 ; Res. moved, 8914 (v).
Debate :
(Mr. Foster) 8915 ; (Mr. Cockshutt) 8936 ; (Mr. Clements) 8957 ; (Mr. Paterson) 8934 ; (Mr. Campbell) 8938 ; (Mr. A. A. Wright) 8949 ; (Mr. Caldwell) 8965 ; (Mr. Galliher) 8971 ; (Mr. Daniel) 8978 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2685 (ii).
——— Date of Delivery : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4920 (iii).
Budget. The, Statement *re* Delivery (Mr. Fielding) 8762 (v).
——— Inquiry *re* (Mr. Foster) 2006, 2441, 2762 (ii) ; 7100 (iv).
Buffaloes, Specimens for Exhibitions : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6272 (iv).
Buildings, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Govt. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Buildings, Govt., Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i) ; 9549.
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 9550 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).
——— Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Burritt's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Business of the House, Cold Storage Discussion : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8181 (v).
——— Procedure *re* Supply Motions : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1241 (i).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Butter and Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Grievance *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 8886 (v).
Butter in Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 881 (i).
See 'Agriculture.'
By-Elections, Resignations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 7423 (iv).
Cabinet Changes from 1904 : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Cabinet Ministers-ex, Annuities B. No. 203 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com., on Res., 9733 ; 1°* of B., 9739 ; 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9796 ; 3°*, 9797 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 30.)
Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on Orders of the Day, 3555 (ii).
——— Interior Dept., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii), 4085 (iii).

Cabinet Vacancies and Absent Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).
—— Representation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3252 (ii).
—— Minister of Public Works : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
Cables of the Empire, Cor. with Govt.: M. (Mr. Logan) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Calgary and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 65.)
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 22 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 378 ; 2°*, 534 ; in Com., 1100 ; 3°*, 1100 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 66.)
Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
—— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Calgary, Red Deer and Battleford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 19 (Mr. Scott) 1° m., 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 67.)
Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'
Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).
—— I.C.R. Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).
—— Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 728 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; M. for Com., 4236 ; in Com., 4240 ; 3° m., 4412 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 50.)
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).
—— Running Rights : *See* 'I.C.R. and C.A.R.', 'Govt. Rys. B. 132,' 'Transportation.'
Canada Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 16 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).
Canada Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 178 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 68.)
'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case' : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).
—— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).
'Canada-Cape Breton' Accident, Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Canada Eastern Ry., Improvements of Roadbed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
—— Cor., Names of Officials, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).
—— Purchase, Expenditure *re* Litigation : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
—— Total Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
'Canada Gazette' Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).
Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Post Office,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Canada Life Assurance Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 108, 4684 (iii).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v) ; conc., 6909 (iv).
Canada and Mexico SS. Communication : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Canada and Michigan Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 31 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 69.)
Canada-Middlesex Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 55 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 908 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).
Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Canada Southern Bridge Co.'s B. No. 29 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1286 ; 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 70.)
Canada Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. German) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 71.)
'Canada' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Canada Temperance Act Amt. B. No. 128 (Mr. Gervais) 1° m., 3359 (ii).
Can. Temperance Act, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
Canadian Agency B. No. 77 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; on Order for Com., 9049 ; in Com., 9077 (v).
Canadians arrested by U.S.: *See* 'Walton, R. M.'
Canadian Bank of Commerce, Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).

Canadian Canals Corporation incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1592 ; 2° m., 1757 (i).
Canadian Cattle, Embargo in G.B.: on M. to conc. in 6th Rep. of Agr. Com., 8998 (iv).
——— Par. in Montreal 'Star': Read (Mr. Lennox) 454 (i).
'Canadian Citizenship,' Political Speech by Min. of Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Crockett) 2214 (ii).
Canadians detained at U. S. Borders: Letter read (Mr. Barker) 5920 (iii).
Canadians, Distressed, Relief to: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).
Canadian Exhibit, Imperial Institute: in Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Canadian Fast Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).
——— Tel. read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Canadian Hard Wheat, Drawbacks by U. S., &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).
Canadians in S. Africa, Claims *re* Mining Rights: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Macdonnell) 9530 (v).
Canadian Mining Institute: in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 72).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 56 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 985 ; 2°, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 73).
C.P.R. Land Tax Exemption, Interpretation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).
——— Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup.. 2022 (ii).
C.P.R. Lands Taxation *re* Autonomy B. 69: 6049 (iv).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Canadian Products sent to Mexico, &c.: Remarks (William Mulock) in Com. of Sup., 897 (i).
Canadian Shippers, and Atlantic SS. Contracts with Armours, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4235 (iii).
Canadian Yukon Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 165 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 7218 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 76).
CANALS:
Arbitrations and Awards *re* Canals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1508 (i).
Atwater Bridge over Lachine Canal, Contract *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
——— Name of Contractor, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7422 (iv).
CANALS—*Con.*
Beauharnois Canal Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Water Power, Utilization: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6307 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
Burrit's Rapids Locks, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Canal Tools, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1546.
Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Swing Bridge and Wharf: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).
Carillon and Grenville Canals, Guide Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Ste. Therese Island Culvert: in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Cornwall Canal, Concreting Apparatus: in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Dredging, Contract *re* Advertising, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588, 686 (i).
——— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).
——— Lock Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
——— Stone Facing between Locks: in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Cote. St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i) ; 9061 (v).
Dep. Minister Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).
Farran's Point Gas Plant: in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Galops Channel, Completion: in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
——— Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Removing Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Repairs *re* Leakage: in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).
Gamebridge Mason Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750, 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).
See 'Ritchie.'

CANALS—*Con.*

Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

Holland River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).

Inspection and Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).

Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water-power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).

——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).

——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).

——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).

——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).

——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).

——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).

——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).

——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).

——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).

——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).

See 'Atwater,' 'Cote St. Paul,' 'Hanault.'

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Matthews, Geo. Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

Murray Canal, Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Port Colborne, Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).

——— Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).

——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).

——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).

See 'Welland.'

CANALS—*Con.*

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).

——— Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).

Rideau Canal Extension : in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).

Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).

St. Peters Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).

St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).

——— Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).

——— Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).

Sunday Work : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9383 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Tools, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1546 (i).

Trent Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for copy, 1395, (i).

——— Dismissal of J. Ritchie, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).

——— incomplete return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).

See 'Gamebridge.'

——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).

——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup.. 6302 (iv).

——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).

——— Staff on Dams, taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).

——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i), 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).

——— letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).

——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).

CANALS—*Con*:
Trent Canal, Surveys, Rice Lake, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
See 'Holland.'
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Deepening Long Level : in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
——— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
——— Electric Plant : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
——— Employees during Oct., Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
——— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
——— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1 : in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
——— Port Colborne Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
See 'Magann,' 'Port Colborne.'
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (ii).
Yamaska Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Herring Industry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Canso Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Road Crossing, I.C.R., Elimination of : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Capital Account, I.C.R., Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii)
Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).
Carbide purchased, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 1055 (i).
Carbide purchased for Lighthouses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Cardigan and Montague Bridge Branch, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I.' &c.
Cardinal Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Contractors : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Swing Bridge and Wharf : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1418 (i).
Carillon Canal, Fishway, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
——— remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).
——— Works, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election : Notification (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 583 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
See 'Borden, R. L.'
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Carpets purchased by Govt. for House of Parlt., Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Carter, C. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Cast-Iron, Quantity furnished to Marine Dept. at Sorel : Ques. (Mr. Bruneau) 2328 (ii).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Catholic Mutual Benefit Association of Canada B. No. 93 (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2769 ; 3°*, 2770 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 77.)
Cattle, Canadian Embargo, 6th Rep. of Agriculture Com.: Presented (Mr. McIntyre) 8097 (v).
Cattle Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii), 6690, 6911 (iv).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Celeste Joly Patent Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. Smith) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 112.)
Cement : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8985 (v).
——— Tariff Changes *re* : in Com. on Customs Bill, 9765 (v).

Cement, Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Census and Statistics B. No. 5 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 52 ; 2°*, 625 ; in Com., 625; Res. prop., 820; in Com. on Res., 989 ; M. for Com. on B., 1013 ; in Com., 1069, 1467 ; 3°*, 1506 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 5).
——— Order, Ques. of (Mr. Monk) *re* Resolution, 629 (i).
——— Ruling Reserved (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 632 (i).
Census and Statistics Act Amt. B. No. 163 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 6105 (iv) ; 2° m., 8774 ; in Com., 8775; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 6).
Census in Eastern Townships, Incorrect Rets.: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) 675 (i).
Census Enumerators, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1073 (i).
——— (1901) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
——— Quinquennial, *re* Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
——— Total Expenditure for Completion, Dismissal of Staff, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
——— *re* Urban and Rural Population : Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Central Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., 3598 ; 3°*, 3598 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 78.)
Central Trunk Ry. Co.; *See* 'Ottawa River Ry.', &c.
Century Life Insurance Co.'s B. No. 49 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 817 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; in Com., 2765 ; 3°*, 2767 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 80.)
Certificates of Masters and Mates B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 (i).
See 'Masters and Mates,' 'Seamen's Act,' &c.
Chambly Canal, Macadamizing Road : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Ste. Therese Island Culvert : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain's Monument, Erection, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 9340 (v).
'Champlain' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Charlottetown Station Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii).
——— Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
——— Track Extension, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6433 (iv).
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement: in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer, Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works : M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
Chateau Richer, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
——— Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
——— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
——— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Child Immigration to Can., Assistance by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1936 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 7204 (iv).
——— Salaries to Customs Officers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).
Choquette, Judge, Date of Resignation and Appnmt. to Senate : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1344 (i).
See 'Political Crisis.'
Circulars, Addressed to and distributed by Orange Lodges *re* Separate Schools : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2405 (ii).
——— Issued by Jacques Cartier Club : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2408, 2410 (ii).
Circulars issued by Political Associations *re* Census, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1097 (i).
Citizen's Bank of Canada B. No. 133 (Mr. Barr) 1°*, 4271 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., 5973 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII, c., 81.)

Civil Govt., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70, 120 (i), 6240, 6721 (iv), 9034 (v).
Civil Service Appointments since 1896, Inside Services, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 2333 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 585 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5808 (iii), 6232 (iv), 8002 (v).
Civil Service Examiners : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Clarke, Mr. E. F., Late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2042 (ii), 2108 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2108 (ii).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Clinton Post Office Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal, Anthracite, Quantity used by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 192 (i).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Coal carried Free on I.C.R. to Ottawa, 1902-3 ; Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).
Coal Contracts and Supplies for Penitentiaries : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).
Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
——— Quantity : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).
Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, Handling, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 263 (i).
Cobourg Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
Cobourg Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Colborne Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1655 (i).
Cold Storage *re* Atlantic Steamers, and Thermograph Records : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Com. of Sup.. 8183 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
See 'Thermograph,' &c.
Cold Storage, Bait Freezers, Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1769 (i).
Cold Storage Plant for Bait, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1505 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Contracts, &c., Remuneration : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Collingwood Customs Collector Watson, Superannuation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Collingwood Dock, Conroy Bros., Cheque : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6572 (iv).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Payments by Govt., *re* Bounty, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 6653 (iv).
——— Mr. Conroy's Cheque, Retention by Govt.: Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6654 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Collingwood Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7549 (iv).
Colonial Conference and Tariff Revision : Par. in Montreal 'Star' : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7098 (iv).
Colonial Stock Act, and Investment of Funds in G. B. : M. for Copies of Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9540 (v).
Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).
Colson, Mr. F., Duties and Salary : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Columbia and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 11 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 82.)
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Commercial Agencies in Can. Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv), 9037 (v).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's Ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Commercial and Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Commercial Travellers' Tax in Quebec : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9811 (v).
Committees, Sel. Standing : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
——— Lists : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 60 (i).
——— Addition of Mr. Bristol's Name : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5210 (iii).
——— Change of Names : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 227 (i).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 110, 624 (i), 3090 (ii), 5576 (iii).
Commodities, Packing, &c. : *See* 'Apples.'
Companies Act Amt. B. No. 187 (from the Senate) this Bill was not read the first time in the House of Commons.
Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).

Congdon, F. T., Appnmt. as Legal Adviser to Yukon, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7717 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Conroy Bros. Cheque : *See* 'Collingwood Dock.'
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Contagious Diseases, Prevention in Man. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1843 (i).
Contracts for Govt. Works : *See* 'Govt. Contracts.'
Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Conventions between United Kingdom and U.S. *re* Personal Property : Remarks *re* Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1068 (i).
Copyright Act *re* Photographs, Legislation *re* Amt. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Cordage at Kingston Penitentiary, Sale of 58 Tons, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 6827 (iv).
——— Plant established at Kingston : Ques. (Mr. Clare) 2329 (ii).
See 'Binder Twine.'
Cornwall Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 1552, 1659 (i).
Cornwall Canal, Basin Dredging Contract, Amount, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
——— Concreting Apparatus : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Dredging, Contract *re*, Advertising, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 686 (i).
——— Employees for Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 107 (i).
——— Employees, Payment to *re* Election Campaign : Remarks (Mr. Pringle) 1224 (i).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1219 (i).
——— Lock Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
——— Stone Facing between Locks : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Corporation, Trusts, &c. : Remarks in Deb. on Address (Mr. Maclean) 42 (i).
Corry Block, Rental, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
Cote St. Paul, Bridge, Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Water Power, Lease to J. Frothingham : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3360 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
County Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Cow Bay, Port Morien Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
Creameries : in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Creameries, Butter and Cheese, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6938 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Criminal Code (bawdy houses) Amt. B. No. 23 (Mr. Bole) 1°, 450 ; on Order for 2°, 733 (i).
——— (summary appeals) B. No. 66 (Mr. Porter) 1°*, 1336 (i) ; 2° m., 4260 ; in Com., 4260, 5137 (iii) ; 3° m., 9699 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 10.)
——— B. No. 67 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 1421 (i).
——— (trading stamps) Amt. B. No. 196 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9075 ; 2°*, 9411 ; in Com., 9411 ; 3° m., 9524 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 9.)
Criminal Statistics, Compilation of : in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Crown Casualty Co.'s incorp. B. No. 125 (Mr. Gervais) M. to receive Pet., 2203, 2322, 2593; 1°*, 2593 ; 2°*, 3136 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 83).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Culbute Canal, Litigation *re* Flooding, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Cu[illegible]nd Sorel Bridge Scandals, Ref. to in Debate : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8142 (v).
Customs Tariff (1897) Act Amt. B. No. 190 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 8888 ; in Com., 8983 ; 1°* of B., 8997 ; 2°, 9760 ; in Com., 9760 ; 3°*. 9769 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 11.)
CUSTOMS :
Agricultural Exports and Imports, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Clements) 909 (i).
Anthracite Coal (Scotch) imported, Commercial Value &c : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonald) 9697 (v).
Boots and Shoes, Imports and Exports, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

B. C. Customs Collector, Victoria, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Salaries to Customs Officers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 981 (i).

Coatsworth Customs Collector, Salary, Revenue, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 261 (i).

Collector at Victoria, B.C., Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 270 (i).

Collectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 407 (i).

Collections on Sundays : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i), 9069 (v).

Dredging Plant, &c., imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).

Dumping Clause, Customs Instructions *re*, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).

Duties, Remission *re* Army and Navy Articles: in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Gratuities : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).

Harvey, N. B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).

Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).

Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).

Imports and Exports, Agriculture Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).

Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).

Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).

Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

——— Officers' Uniforms : in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).

——— Ports, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 256, 405 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Remission of Customs Duties on Army and Navy Articles : Explanation (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 6724, 6812 (iv).

Revenue collected in N.W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).

Revenue Cruisers for Customs : in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).

Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).

Sawlogs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).

Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).

Tobacco and Cigars imported from U.S., Duties paid, &c.: (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).

U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).

Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).

Yukon Customs, Living Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).

Dairying, Live Stock, and Fruit Industries : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Dairy Products, Classification for Export, &c: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7810 (iv).

Damen, Wm. A., Patent Relief B. No. 129 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3834 (ii) ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; ref. back to Sel. Com., 6379 ; in Com., and 3*°, 7624 (iv) ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII, c., 84.)

Dams across River, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).

David Thomas Owens Patent Relief B. No. 177 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., 8652 ; 3°*, 9049. (5 Edward VII, c., 143.)

Davie. Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Debates. Official, Sel. Com. : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 3090 (ii).

——— 1st. Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 493 (i).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 683 (i).

——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: (presented) 4457.

——— M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 4550 (iii).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4549 (iii).

——— M. to conc. (Mr. Gervais) 4551 (iii).

Debates Committee, 4th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 4983 (iii).

——— M. to conc., 5034 (iii).

——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 7096 (iv).

——— 6th Rep.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9392 (v).

——— 7th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 9773 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Ethier) to conc., 9801 (v).

Debates, Delay in French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 239 (i).

Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6592 (iv).

Deep Water Ways Commission: in Com. of Sup., 6894 (iv).

See 'International Water,' &c.

'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. J., Late M.P., Decease of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5139 (iii).

Dental Institute Circulars: *See* 'Franking Privilege.'

Depot Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).

Descente des Femmes, Tel. Lines: in Com. of Sup. 9604 (v).

——— Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island: in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).

Desks in House of Commons, Improvement in: Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).

See 'House of Commons,' &c.

Detective Service P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).

Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).

Digby Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).

——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).

Director of Operations *re* Militia Council: Remarks (Mr Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).

See 'Militia,' &c.

Disallowance of B. C. Legislation: Ques. (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 189 (i).

Discrimination in Freight Rates *re* Atlantic Steamers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 888 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Dismissals from Public Office: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).

Disraeli Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).

Divorce Bill: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Vote, 6405, 6571 (iv).

See 'Fitz-Simmons, Jean Marie,' 'Harper Geo. Dance,' 'Hersey, Arthur Howe,' 'McDermot, Clara Bidwell,' 'Murphy, E. A.,' 'Pearson,' 'Pitblado, Isaac,' Pryor, J. A.,' 'Vibert, Philip.'

Dobie, W. J. B., Dismissal as Postmaster at Thessalon: M. for Com. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).

See 'Thessalon Postmaster.'

Dodd, Judge, N.S., Salary: in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).

Dog-Fish Experimental Works, Construction of: in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).

Dominion Annuity Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1745; 2°*, 1891 (i); in Com., 2767; 3° m., 2768; 3°*, 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII, c., 55.)

Dominion Arsenal: in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).

——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).

——— Col. Gaudet's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).

——— Establishment of: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 106 (Mr. Black) 1°*, 2184; 2°*, 2298 (ii); in Com., 4971, 5113; 3°*, 5113 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 85.)

Dom. Buildings, Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Fuel, &c: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).

——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).

——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).

——— Que., Renewals, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).

See 'Pub. Works,' &c.

Dom. Controverted Elections Act Amt. B. No. 159 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv); 2°*, and in Com., 8769; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 8.)

Dom. Elections Act Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Guthrie) 1° m., 263 (i).

——— B. No. 189 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 8775 (v).

——— B. No. 194 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 9073 (v).

Dom. Election Law, Amt. Bills: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9812 (v).

Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).

——— Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).

Dom. Lands, in N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c.: Ques (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).

Dom. Lands, N.W.T. Sales, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).
——— Surveys, Maps, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914.
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Dom. Police, Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Dom. Police, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. and Provincial Legislation, Compilation of Reps., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9685 (v).
Dom. Steamers, Maintenance, Purchase of Supplies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Doncaster Indian Reserve, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Double Tracking I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).
Doucet's Landing Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Doughty, Mr. A. G., Dom. Archivist, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9053 (v).
See 'Agriculture,' &c.
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 142 (i), 6247 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i).
Dredging Contract, Conmee & Bowman : *See* 'Port Arthur.'
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredging Plant, &c., Imported into Canada, Valuation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5591 (iii).
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Dredging, Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
Dredging in Mar. Provinces, Number of Vessels, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7578 (iv).
Dredging, Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Dredging, P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6891, 7576 (iv).
Dredging, System of Hiring Dredges : Remarks (Mr. Barr) in Com. of Sup., 6842 iv).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).
Dredging Vessels, Dom., Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works.'
Dress Regulation for Military Officers : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
D. R. Fraser and Company, Limited, Co.'s incorp. B. No. 119 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 87.)
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
'Druid' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1941 (i).
Drummondville Improvements *re* I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).
See 'I.C.R.' &c.
Dukis Indian Reserve, Sale of Timber : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Dumping Clause. Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9767 (v).
——— Customs Instructions *re*, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Kemp) 695 (i).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Paterson) 81 (i).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.C.'s, &c., *re* Dismissal : M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Dundonald Park and Ottawa Improvement Commission : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 180, 8686 (v).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Earnings per Train Mile, I.C.R., Stmnt. : Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).
Easter Adjournment : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4750 (iii)
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4375 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4458 (iii).

Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Educational Clauses : *See* 'Autonomy Bill.'
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton Election, and Toronto Election, Tests *re* Feeling of Country : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com., 5886 (iii).
——— date of nomination of Min. of Int.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., 5890 (iii).
——— Certificate of Election ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).
——— Printing of Voters Lists, Refusal to Conservatives, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. on B. 69, 5852 ; Names of Voters (read) 5855 (iii).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4200 (iii).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup. 9684 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup. 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Edmonton, Yukon and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 62 (Mr. Lamont) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1339 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 88.)
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Effront : *See* 'Jean.'
Election General, 10th Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8001 (v).
See 'Dom. Election Bills,' &c.
Electoral Atlas, Distribution to Members : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— New Edition : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).
Electric Lighting, Geological Museum, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Elevator at Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263, 1266, 1288 (i).
Elevators in Ottawa Buildings, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Embargo on Canadian Cattle : *See* 'Canadian Cattle.'
'Emigration of State Children,' Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
See 'Immigration,' &c.
Employees, I.C.R., Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, &c., Political Partisans : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).
——— Pensions, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).
Engine House, Rivière du Loup : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
——— Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv).
——— Railway Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 90 (Mr. Smith, B.C.) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII, c., 90.)
Esquimalt Defences : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
See 'Halifax,' 'Militia,' &c.
Estimates, Delay in Suppl., Criticism *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 9085 (v).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Exchequer Court (railway debts.) Act Amt. B. No. 59 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1° m., 986 ; 2°*, 1399; in Com., 1400 (i), 2105, 3205 (ii).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c.: M. (Mr. A. H. Clark) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
Exchequer Court Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Exchequer Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for Extra Works : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors, Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).

Exhibitions, (Dom.) at New Wesminster, B.C., Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).
——— Generally : in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
——— Liege, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Expenditure *re* Capital, I.C.R., &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Experimental Farms : in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
——— Distribution of Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 6926 (iv).
——— Establishment of in Alberta : Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Experimental Station in Niagara District, Cor., &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 7677 (iv).
Exports and Imports, Returns, Issue of Monthly Rep., and Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7214 (iv).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Express Cos.: *See* 'Ry. Bill 36.'
Extradiction Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Facer Solid Steel Car Wheel Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 27 (Mr. Caldwell) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1285, 1339 ; 3°*, 1340 (i). (5 Edward VII, c., 91.)
Facilities, I.C.R., Increased : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Farmers' Bank of Canada B. No. 124 (Mr. T. Martin) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii) ; Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 92.)
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contractor, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Farran's Point Gas Plant : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Fencing Wire, Inspection by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585 (i).
See 'N.W.T., Boundary,' &c.
Fenian Raid Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fessenden Wireless Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 144 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., 6380, 6607 ; 3°*, 6609 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 93.)
FINANCE :
American Currency, Circulated in Canada, Prevention *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bickerdike) 3010 (ii).
See 'Foreign,' 'Silver.'
FINANCE—*Con.*
Assistant Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 9052 (v).
Audit Act and Treasury Board, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1935 (i).
See 'Auditor General,' &c.
Banking Act Amts., Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 6112 (iv).
Bank Notes, Supervision *re* Printing and Circulation, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6251 (iv).
See 'Dom. Notes.'
Binder Twine Bounties, &c. : Statement read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7221 (iv).
Canadian Bank of Commerce-Yukon, Compensation *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9615 (v).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Dom. and Provincial Accounts : in Com. of Sup., 6959, 7241 (iv).
Dom. Notes, Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6826 (iv).
Estimates, (1905-6) : Presented Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 58 (i).
——— (1905) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 6165 (iv).
——— (1906) Suppl. : Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8718, 9392 (v).
Finance Dept., Private Sec. Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78, 118 (i). 9060 (v).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
Mint, Royal, Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— inquiry for cor. (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Estimated Cost of Equipment, Capacity, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185 , 2326 (ii).
See 'Pub. Works—Ottawa,' &c.
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).
Ontario Subsidies, Letter from G. W. Ross to Fin. Min. : Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*
Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).
Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re* Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).
Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).
First Minister (Increase of Salary) B. No. 201 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 9700 ; in Com., on Res., 9725 ; 1°* of B., 9726 ; 2°*, 9790; in Com., 9790 ; 3° m., 9790 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 12.)
Fiscal Year, Change in Ending of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 9096 (v).
Fisher, Mr. P. G., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).
FISHERIES :
American Fishermen on N. S. Coasts, Protection *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 7907 (iv).
Atlantic Fisheries Investigation, Rep. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 270 (i).
Bait Freezers, Deep Sea Fisheries : in Com. of Sup., 9620 (v).
——— Establishment in Canso, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
——— Mar. Canada, Number, Location, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 2067 (ii).
British American Fish Co., Contract *re* Fishing Rights in Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
B. C. Canning Industries : *See* 'Salmon Canning.'
Canso Herring Industry, &c. : Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Carillon Canal Fishway, Construction, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2910 (ii).
Cowie, Mr., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Herring Experiments : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
Dog-fish Experimental Works, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).
Fish-breeding Establishments, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Fishing Bounty Distribution, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— Fraud *re* Payment, Rep. of Mr. Matheson : M. (Mr. Ganong) for Copy*, 1770 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2911 (ii).
Fish-Curing Establishments : in Com. of Sup., 9173 (v).
Fish exported into New York State, Prohibition of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. L. P. Demers) on M. for Sup., 6177 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries, Distribution of : in Com. of Sup., 2904 (ii).
Fish Hatcheries in Lake Winnipeg: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6635 (iv).
Fishing Regulations, Conflict between Dom. and Provinces, &c. Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 4751 (iii).
Fishing Rights in Estuaries, Jurisdiction by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
Fisheries Industry, Commission of Investigation, Recommendation, &c.: M. (Mr. Ganong) to adjn., 6312 (iv).
——— Expenses *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).
See 'Herring,' &c.
Fishermen Immigrants from England and Scotland for Cod Fisheries, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 586 (i).
Fish Transportation from Boston to Montreal via G. T. Ry., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1930 (i).
Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).
Halifax Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).
Halifax Fishery Award and Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
——— Payment to Provs., Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).
Hatcheries, N.B., Salmon Pond, N.B., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 590 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).
Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Herring Industry, Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
Hurley, J.M., Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Inspection, N.S., Violation of Regulations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9687 (v).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2878, 2890 (ii), 6630 (iv).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B. District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).
——— Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).
Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Industry,' &c.
Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).
Lobster Fisheries, Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).
Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).
Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Overseers, Complaints against : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Overseers in Colchester Co., N.S., Number and Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 5978 (iv).
Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
——— Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).
P. E. I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).
Protection Service : in Com. of Sup., 2907 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Protection Service, Strs., Monthly Pay-roll, &c., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
Protection Steamers, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).
FISHERIES—*Con.*
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Fitz-Simons, Jean Marie, Relief B. No. 130 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., 6377 ; 3° m.. 6378 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 94.)
Fog Horns, Toronto Harbour, Testing, &c., Complaints *re* : Cor., &c., Read (Mr. Kemp) 9281 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Fog Signals, Submarine : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
Foote, J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6434 (iv).
Foreign Coin Circulation, Prevention *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 8776 (v).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).
——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).
Fort Macleod Court House, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (i).
Fort William and Port Arthur Harbours, Number of Tenders, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Fort William and Port Arthur Open Navigation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6645 (iv).
Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i), 6900 (iv).
See 'Pt. Arthur,' &c.
Ft. William, G. T. P. Ry. Station Plans, filed in Ry. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 2009 (ii).
See 'G. T. P. Ry.', &c.
Franchise Act (1898) Amt. B. No. 52 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 (i) ; 2°*, 2112 ; in Com., 2112 (ii), 9198 ; 3°* 9199 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 13.)
Franking Privilege Abuse *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).
——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c. : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).
——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).
——— Use of Stamp *re* Documents : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134, 5963 (iii).
See 'Campaign,' &c.
Frank, Relief to Settlers *re* Land Slide : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9603 (v).
Frechette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch: in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).

Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton, Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
——— Post Office, Equipment, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
——— Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White : M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Freetown Agent's Dwelling House, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
Free Transportation of Hay, &c., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
See 'Hay', 'Passes,' &c.
Freight Diversion I.C.R. and Traffic Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).
——— Letter from C. W. Stewart : Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545 (i).
——— Discrimination, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).
——— Increases of, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to Mr. Taylor, 6112 (iv) ; Cor. read, 6115 (iv).
——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton : Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).
See 'Agriculture-Holstein,' 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Fruit Growers Association, P.E.I., Res. *re* Maintenance of Industry : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 381 (i).
Fruit Inspectors, Number, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 588 (i).
Fruit Marks Act, Convictions under : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 3010 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act, Inspectors appointed, Names, Salaries, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 736 (i).
Fuel Inspector, I.C.R., Duties, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Fumigating Stations : in Com. of Sup., 1831 (i).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased for I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Galician Vote *re* Edmonton Election : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 4201 (iii).
Galops Canal, Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
——— Channel Completion : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
——— Removing Shoals : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Repairs *re* Leakage : in Com. of Sup., 1492 (i).
Gamebridge Masonry Inspector, Dismissal, Imperfect Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 8004 (v).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Gananoque Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
See 'Acetylene,' &c.
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
General Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
Geographical Board of Canada, Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Geological Museum, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 122(i). 6248 (iv).
——— Director, Name, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
——— Explorations, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 8669, 9685 (v).
——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).
——— Mr. F. Nicolas' Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Engineers, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
——— Instructions *re*, Inquiry for Copies (Mr. White) 822 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (iv).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).
——— Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).
——— Sale of : Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).
Georgian Bay and Lake Huron Fisheries, Requests for Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5479 (iii).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1288 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 95.)
Gillies Brothers Limited B. No. 95 (Mr. A. A. Wright) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2763 ; 3°*, 2765 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 96.)
Gillis, N. J., Emplymt. by Govt. at St. Louis Exhibition : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
Glanders, Spread among Horses, Prevention of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6690 (iv).
Glenn Ross P.O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 102 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3399 ; 3°*, 3400 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 97.)
Gold of the Yukon purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Goodwin Car Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 17 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3361 (ii).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays and Thursdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 820 (i).
See 'Business.'
Government Legislation : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 820 (i).
Govt.Railways Act Amt. B. No. 132 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 4186 (iii) ; 2°*, and in Com., 6139, 7583 ; 3° m., 7584 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 36.)
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
See 'I. C. R.', 'Old Rails,' &c.
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).
——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii).
——— statement of expenditure : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).
——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Govt. Works Contract B. No. 51 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 818 ; 2°*, 1672 ; in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 7.)
Gov. Gen.'s Instructions, Changes in : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 227 (i).
Gov. Gen. Secretary's Office, Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 70 (i), 9053 (v).
Grades and Curves, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
See 'Immigration.'
Grain carried and exported through Govt. Elevators, Arrangements *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 1917 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grain Inspection Act (commercial grades) Amt. B. No. 174 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 7420 (iv) ; 2°*, 9395 ; in Com., 9395 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 14.)
Grain Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6901 (iv).
Grain Inspectors, List of, &c.: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7224 (iv).
Grain Standards *re* Inspection : Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 9681 (v).
Grain Survey Boards, Appnmt. for Montreal and Toronto : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 910 (i).
——— Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7230 (iv).
Grain Warehouses, Montreal, Preparation of Plans : Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).
Grand Bend Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend Pier, Delay in Building, &c.: (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland : SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).

Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 122 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 115 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 2185 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; on Order for Com., 7621, 7622 ; in Com., 7622, 7625 ; 3° m., 7853 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 98.)
G. T. P. Ry., Agreement with National Transcontinental Ry. Act: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2776 (ii).
——— Commissioners, Appnmts., Total Amount expended : M. (Mr. Foster) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Commission, Appnmt. of Hon. S. N. Parent : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).
——— Commission, Staff and Salaries : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
——— Commission, Surveys, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2277 (ii).
——— Commission, Surveys, &c., Number of Employees : M. (Mr. Gervais) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Contracts, Awarding of, &c.: Answer to Question (Mr. Emmerson) 9782 (v).
——— Construction, Location from Winnipeg, &c., Rumours *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 9814 (v).
See 'Route.'
——— Contracts, Winnipeg Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Estimates : Remarks (Mr. Foster) *re* Discussion, 2182 (ii).
——— Interim Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6310 (iv).
——— Plans *re* Terminal Points, deposited with Ry. Dept.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Ret., 917 (i), 2816 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1150 (i).
——— Plans of Terminal at Port Arthur, Approval of Location : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6138 (iv).
——— Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1595 (i).
——— Route proposed, West of Winnipeg, Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 729 (i).
See 'Construction.'
——— Surveys and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2282, 2298 (i)), 7498 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys in B.C., Information *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 3009 (ii).
——— Surveys, Information given out by Mr. Hays in Address: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2007 (ii).
——— Surveys, Number and Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 686 (i).
——— Surveys, O.C. *re* Commission : Remarks (Mr. Maclean, York) 229 (i).
——— Surveys, Plans, Field Notes, &c., Repayment for, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9490 (v).
——— Surveys, Quebec and Moncton Route, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 228 (i).
——— Survey of Route, Moncton to Winnipeg, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6134 (iv).
——— Surveys through Madawaska, N.B., Suggested Route : Ques. (Mr. Costigan) 5688 (iii).
——— Terminals, Right of Way, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9498 (v).
——— Canadian Northern, Joint Terminals : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9499 (v).
——— Terminals at Winnipeg, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9541, 9812 (v).
G.T.Ry., Appeal in *re*, 4 Edward VII., c. 31 : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9080 (v).
G.T.Ry. Arbitration Act Amt. B. No. 199 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9279 ; 2°*, 9280 ; in Com. 9529 ; 3°*, 9529 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 15.)
G.T.R. and I.C.R. Arbitration, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).
——— Arbitration *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
See 'I.C.R.'
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. No. 45 (Mr. Macdonald) 1° m., 727 ; 2°*, 909 (i) ; on Order for Com., 2765 ; in Com., 3649, 3879 (ii) ; 4123, 4202 ; 3° m., 4228 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 75.)
Grand Trunk Ry. B. No. 45, Statement *re* Amalgamation with C. A. R. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 4222 (iii).
——— Statement *re* Mileage (Mr. Ingram) 4223, 4231 (iii).
——— 3° m., Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 4228 (iii).
Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch P.E.I. Ry., Location, &c., Cor. : M. (Mr. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
Grasshopper Scourge, Claims for Relief to Man. Farmers : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Grass Seed Exports, Quantity and Quality : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 913 (i).
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See 'Employees,' &c.

Grazing Leases, &c. : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).
See 'Interior.'
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce,' 'Atlantic,' &c.
G. B. and Her Colonies, Inter-Imperial Parliament : Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 2401 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2401.
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Ingram) 2402 ; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2402 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 71 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1504 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., 4258 ; 3°* 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 99.)
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Great West Ry. Co. : *See* 'Northwest Coal,' &c.
Gregory, Col., Retirement of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Grenville Canal, Appnmt. of Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1509 (i).
——— Guide Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Grimsby. Establishment of Experimental Farm: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6165 (iv).
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
Grosse Isle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Steamer : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
——— Telegraph System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph and Georgian Bay Ry Co.'s B. No. 100 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 101.)
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haggard, Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
Haileybury, Lake Temiscaming Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).
Haldimand Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1656 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip issued to United States Citizens : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).
——— Memo. from Mr. Cote : Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip to non-residents, Cancellation of O.C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).
Half-Breeds Patents, Issue of, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).
——— Inquiry for : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020, 7099 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor., &c. : Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).
——— Charges, &c. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).
——— Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).
——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv).
——— O. C., *re* Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— patents issued, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).
——— scope of instruction to Judge Myers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8170 (v).
——— Mr. Chaffey's letter : Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).
——— Investigation, Apppmt. of Counsel : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).
——— Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).
——— statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9725 (v).
——— inquiry for papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9028 (v).
——— further papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075, 9179 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).
——— Application by Norman Oulette and Others, Purchase of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
See 'Immigration,' 'Indians,' 'Interior,' &c.
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halibut Fisheries, B.C., American Encroachments, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 585 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O. C.'s, &c., with Dom. Govt. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G. B. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6510 (iv), 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control : Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).

Halifax, Deep Water Dredging *re* I.C.R. Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
——— Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
——— Fishery Award, Amount received by Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 8886 (v).
——— Claims of P.E.I., Memorials, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. McLean) for Copies, 1386 (i).
——— Distribution *re* Provinces, Basis *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
——— Payment to Provs. Ref. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 2065 (ii).
Halifax Immigrant Building : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Halifax, I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii), 9391 (v).
Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Halifax Military Equipment : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
Hamilton Cove P.O. Mail Service and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
Hamilton, Galt and Berlin Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 102.)
Hamilton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
Hanault, L. O., Payments *re* Lachine Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
'Hansard' Index, Change of : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1570 (i).
See 'Debates,' &c.
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).
Harbour Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c., Contracts *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).
Harbour Commissioners, Control by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6725 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, N.W.T., General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— N.W.T. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.S., Govt. Policy *re* Breakwaters, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— Ont., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 2448 (ii), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
See 'Public Works,' 'Marine,' &c.
Harper, Geo. Dance, Relief B. No. 154 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6377 ; 3°*, 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c., 103.)
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services : in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Harvey, N.B., Customs Collector, Appnmt. of : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 9696 (v).
Haultain, Mr., Letter *re* Autonomy Bill : Remarks (Mr. Borden) on M. for Sup., 2493 2548 (ii).
See 'Autonomy.' &c.
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com of Sup., 1560 (i).
Hay exported from Quebec to Boston, Number of Tons : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 689 (i).
Hay, Free Transport over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c. : M. for copies (Mr. Foster) 164
——— O.C., Circulars, &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
Hay Imports from U.S., Quantity, Duties collected, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1064 (i).
Hay Lake Channel, Lowering of Water : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 701, 1420 (i).
Herring and Fishing Industry, Rep. of Commission, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4552 (iii).
Herring Industry and Bait Freezers, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1146 (i).
Herring Industry Experiments at Canso, N.S., Emplymt. of Mr. Cowie : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5425 (iii).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.

Hersey, Arthur Howe Relief B. No. 167 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868; M. for Com., 7624 ; On Order for Com., 7682 ; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 7682 (iv).

Hersey, Arthur Relief B. No. 167 : M. (Mr. L. P. Demers) to employ Stenographers, 8527 (v).

Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).

High Commissioner's Office : in Com. of Sup., 120 (i).

High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).

Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re* : Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
See 'Militia,' &c.

Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii).
See 'Murray Harbour,' &c.

Hodgins, Jonathan,, Resignation from Montreal Harbour Commission : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Hog Cholera in Essex and Kent Cos. : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
See 'Agriculture.'

Holland River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9359 (v).
See 'Trent,' &c.

Holliday Bros., Contract *re* North Shore Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).

Holstein Breeders, Complaints *re* Freight on Rys., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).

Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).

Homesteads Inspectors as Active Politicians : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).
See 'Interior,' &c.

Honora Wharf, Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).

Hope Island Timber Cutting : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Bennett) 2759 (ii).

Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Ballots, Blank, Printing, Custom *re* Procedure : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 911 (i).

Ballot Box Frauds in Dom. Elections, Demonstration *re* Fraudulent Box : (Mr. Porter) on M. for Sup., 9199 (v).

Ballots, Blank, Method of Issuing, Complaints *re* S. Lanark and Ottawa : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1342 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ballot Boxes, Payment to Mr. Cayouette : Letter read (Mr. Morin) 989 (i).

Bills, Royal Assent : Mess. from Dep. Governor (Mr. Speaker) 6084 (iv).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6991 (iv).
See 'Bills.'

Books purchased for Library, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 75 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L., Notification of Election (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Introduced, 624 (i).

Carleton Co., Electoral District, Certificate *re* Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 583 (i).

——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).

——— Committee Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6594 (iv).

Controverted Elections, Lisgar, Judges' Certificate : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 9 (i).

Desks, in House of Commons, Improvement in : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 1566 (i).
See 'Locked.'

Doorkeepers Inattention : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6600 (iv).

Dorchester Co., Returning Officers, Appnmt. of, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Morin) for Copies*, 916 (i).

Edmonton Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 5131 (iii).

Electoral Lists in N.W.T., Names of Qualified Electors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7422 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7684 (iv).

——— Employees : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 5209 (iii).

Internal Economy Commission : Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

——— Res. *re* Purchasing Furniture : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612 ; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).

——— Reps. presented to the House : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Legislation, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).

——— Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).

Library, Books and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 75 (i), 6944 (iv).

——— Enlargement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).

——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).

Locked Desks for Members' Papers : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
See 'Desks.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
London and N. Oxford By-Election, Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).
——— Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).
See 'Oxford.'
Man. Elections : Duties of Ret. Officers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).
——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown : Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy : M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 97 (i).
Meetings after six o'clock, Recess : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).
Members, New, 111, 624, 1846 (i), 7420 (iv).
Messengers, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).
Ministers, Absence from House : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).
Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).
Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).
N.W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).
Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).
Oxford N., Electoral Vacancy : Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).
Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).
P.O., Complaints *re* Delivery of Mails : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com of Sup., 199 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Purchases, Auditing of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).
Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Ret. Officers, Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker : Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Ret. Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections : M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
——— for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man. Special Reps. Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Rooms for Members, Allotment : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 238, 250 (i).
Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).
———M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6612 (iv).
Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).
Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).
Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).
Stationery : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6594 (iv).
Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3251 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster 2777 (ii).
——— Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362
Ventilation in the House of Commons : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).
——— Edmonton Election, Preparation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
——— Electoral Atlas : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
——— Macdonald, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).
——— N. W. Ters., Use in Dom. Elections, 1905 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).
See 'N.W.T.'

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Voters' Lists, Man., Printing, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
See 'Man.' &c.
——— Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
——— Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re*, Instruction, &.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Wright Electoral District : Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
Yukon Election, and Returning Officer, Cor. : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
Yukon Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
——— Ret. of Member Elect, Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
——— Returning Officer, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
——— Return of Member Elect : Telegrams Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Territorial District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hudson's Bay and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 109 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 104.)
Hudson's Bay Servants, Claims *re* Lord Selkirk's Estate, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lamont) 9698 (v).
Hudson's Bay, Sovereignty over : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 69, 5608-9 ; Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5609 (iii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Hurley, J. M., Fishery Inspector, Rep., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1788 ; 2°*, 1891 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 105.)
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Ice-Breakers, Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
——— 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).
——— statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
——— *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Ice Jam in St. Lawrence River, Govtl. Action *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 699 (i).
Ice Jam on Thames River : Remarks (Mr. Clements) on M. for Sup., 1013 (i).
Ideal Manufacturing Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 166 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 6232 ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°* 7625 ; M. *re* Amts., 8383 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 106.)
Immigration, Fraudulent Representation B. No. 120 (Mr. Logan) 1° m., 2323 (ii) ; 2°*, 9699 ; in Com., 9699 ; 3°*, 9700 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 16.)
IMMIGRATION :
Agents, in Canada and G. B., &c., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9308 (v).
——— Memo. from Toronto Trade and Labour Council : Read (Mr. Osler) 9309 (v).
Agents, G. B., &c., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6384, 7685 (iv), 9226 (v).
——— on Conc.: M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Mr. Nixon's Salary, 9770 ; Neg. (Y. 30, N. 66) 9770 (v).
Associated British Canadian Society, Charges against Graeme Hunter : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Association in Prince Edward County : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 7706 (iv).
Austrians stranded in Ottawa, Provision for, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 4845 (iii).
Bonus to Transportation and Booking Agents : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 7811 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Children from English Workhouses, Proposal of Mr. Neill : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
——— Govt. Assistance: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Citizen' *re* Mrs. Close's Scheme (remarks) 1933 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) on M. for Sup., 2125 (ii).
——— Cor. with Mr. C. Kinloch Cooke : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 5478 (iii).
——— Reply to Ques.: Read (Mr. Oliver) 5576 (iii).
Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 7709 (iv).
Detention Hospital, B.C., Proclamation *re* : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 9331 (v).
——— Authority, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9927 (v).
False Representations to, &c. : Remarks *re* Bills (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8177 (v).
Farmer, Bonus paid by Govt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7811 (iv).
Graeme Hunter, Charges *re* Immigration Society : Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 2188 (ii).
Haggard, H. Rider, Rep. to Imp. Govt., &c. : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 9523 (v).
See 'Salvation,' &c.

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants deported in 1904-1905, Nationalities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1592, 1847 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 7702 (iv).
——— Examination *re* Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2187 (ii).
Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).
——— Interpreters, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7701 (iv).
——— Literature, Distribution of Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7710 (iv).
——— Medical Inspection, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9226 (v).
——— Office, G. B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Ten Year Contract *re* Immigrants, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv), 8387 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).
——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).
——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8887 (v).
See 'SS. Subsidies,' &c.
Number of Immigrants arriving in 1904, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1148 (i).
Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re*: Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c., Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
Salvation Army and Immigration, Cor., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7684 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Haggard.'
Skilled Labour, Allegations from Toronto Labour Council: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 7424 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 7504 (iv).
——— SS. Steamship Bonuses to by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).
——— Subsidies to SS. Companies, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7699, 7705 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Imperial Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 98 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2043; 2°*, 2297; in Com., 2770; 3°*, 2772 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 107.)
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Imports and Exports, Agricultural Products, Duties paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Clements) 3203 (ii).
Imports and Exports for Home Consumption, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 380 (i).
Imports from United Kingdom, Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 267 (i).
Imports under Preferential Tariff, Amounts paid, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
Indemnity of Members, &c.: *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,' &c.
Indian Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Pet. *re*: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
INDIANS:
Agents acting as Magistrates: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6545 (iv).
Blankets, Clothing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
B. C. Indians, Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
——— Industrial Schools: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
——— Travelling Expenses *re*: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Bryce, Dr., Payments to: in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Caughnawaga Indians, Medical Attendance: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Bergeron) 225 (i).
Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Deptl. Salaries, Indian Affairs: in Com. of Sup., 116 (i).
Doncaster Reserve, Abolition of: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 7812 (iv).
Dukis Reserve, Sale of Timber: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3202 (ii).
Georgian Bay Indian Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Grants to Agricultural Societies: in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip, Applications by Norman, Oulette, and Others, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 9078 (v).
Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table: (Mr. Oliver) 9197 (v).
See 'Interior,' &c.
Inspectors, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Lands Management Fund : in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
Legal Expenses *re* Test Case at Oka : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Statement : Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Indians, Man. and N.W.T., Annuities : in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
——— Implements : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
——— Provisions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9338 (v).
Medical Inspection, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 6555 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
——— Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
Medical Inspection, Payments *re* : Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6553 (iv).
Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).
N.B., Indians, Supt.'s Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Indians, N.S., General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).
Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).
Ont. and Quebec, Indians, Medical Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
Pemberton Band of Indians, B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Printing for Indians, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6558 (iv).
Promotions, Indian Dept., &c.: Conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Promotion of Mr. Bray : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6920 (iv).
Purchase of Provisions : in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Reserves, Sale of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes), on M. for Sup., 6563 (iv).
Salaries, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man. and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Schools, Indian : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 225 (i).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 230 (i).
INDIANS—*Con.*
Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).
Surveys, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
———Que. and Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 236 (i).
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Treaty No. 9, Payments *re* Indians : in Com. of Sup., 9336 (v).
Unforeseen Expenses, Indians : in Com. of Sup., 6517 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Industrial Schools, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).
Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. No. 176 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 7421 (iv) ; 2°, 8676 ; in Com., 8676; 3°*, 8685 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 17.)
INLAND REVENUE :
Adulteration of Food, Centralization of Samples : Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 1717 (i).
——— Violations of Act, Prosecutions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1699, 1710 (i).
Cement Testing Laboratory, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7613 (iv).
Culling Timber, Inspectors, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7236 (iv).
Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i), 4085 (iii).
Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Electric Light Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1696 (i).
Excise, Additional Remuneration for extra work : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
——— Allowance to Customs Collectors : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1679 (i).
——— Inspectors' Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1689 (i).
——— Officers, B.C., Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Fertilizers, Inspection of : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1726 (i).
Fréchette, L. A., Translation *re* Excise Branch : in Com. of Sup., 1690 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection at Three Rivers, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Gas and Electric Light Inspection, Rep. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

INLAND REVENUE—*Con.*

Jams, Preserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Béland) 1340 (i).

Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Exercise Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).

Metric System, Adoption of : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).

Preventive Service *re* Excise : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).

Weights and Measures Inspectors : in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

——— Travelling Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Weights and Measures Standards : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).

Inspection of Staples, Grain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6901, 7224 (iv).

Inspector General of Militia : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).

Inspectors of Customs, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

See 'Customs,' &c.

Inspector of Insurance and Director General of Public Health B. No. 200 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 9688 ; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 46.)

Inspectors of Weights and Measures, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).

See 'Inland Revenue,' &c.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

Additional Sidings, Spur Lines, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1970 (i), 6431 (iv).

Advertising Car, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Advertising in Newspapers, &c. : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2236 (ii).

Agents, Dwelling Houses, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Amherst Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1983 (i).

Annual Statement, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 1888, 1891 (i).

Antigonish Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G. T. R., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 68, 165 (i).

Arbitration, I.C.R. and G.T.R., *re* Traffic Arrangements, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Book-keeping Methods, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1928 (i).

Bridge Strengthening : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i), 9384 (v).

Campbellton Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).

Cape Road Crossing, Elimination of : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

Capital Account, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 2064 (ii).

Chapman, F. B., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1342 (i).

Coal carried to Ottawa Free : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 2065, 2192 (ii).

Coal purchased, 1904, Quantity : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 910 (i).

Coal for Govt. Railways, Quantity accepted from N.S. Mines : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).

Double Tracking : in Com. of Sup., 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9390 (v).

Drummond County Ry., Expenditure on Capital Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).

Drummondville Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1960 (i).

Earnings per Train Mile, Stmnt.: Read in Com. of Sup., 9503 (v).

Employees, Messrs. Weldon, McDougall, Political Partisans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1146 (i).

Employees, Pensions, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) 9029, 9288 (v).

See 'Pensions.'

Engine Houses, Riviere du Loup : in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).

Expenditure *re* Capital, &c: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Facilities, Increased : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).

Financial Statement : (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. of Sup., 1888, 1891 (i), 7448 ; Reply (Mr. Haggart) 7447, 7457 (iv).

Fredericton Station Agent, Dismissal of Mr. O. White : M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 192 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 698 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).

See 'White.'

Freight Diversion and Traffic Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2219 (ii).

——— Letter from C. W. Stewart : Read (Mr. Daniel) 2227 (ii).

Freight Rates, Increase in, &c.: Statement (Mr. Emmerson) in Reply to (Mr. Taylor) 6112 (iv) ; Cor. read, 6115 (iv).

——— Ref. to Gananoque and Fredericton : Reply (Mr. Taylor) to Min. of Rys., 6585 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Fuel Inspector, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 451 (i).
Galena Oil Co., Oil purchased : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
See 'Oil.'
Government Railways, Disposal of Old Rails, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2066 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Grades and Curves : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Halifax, Deep Water Terminals, Dredging *re* I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2026 (ii).
Halifax, Terminals : in Com. of Sup., 2032 (ii).
Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Hay transported free over I.C.R., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).
——— O.C., Circulars, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 280 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 919 (i), 2005, 2595, 3450 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 59 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 108 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1929 (i).
Increased Expenditure : Remarks (Mr. White) in Com. of Sup., 2215 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
I.C.R. and P.E.I. Rys., Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
Locomotives, Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
Locomotive Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).
'Maritime Express,' Running Time : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Mitchell Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line : in Com. of Sup. 1940 (i).
Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i)., 9391 (v).
——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).
Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).
Oil and Supplies, Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).
See 'Galena.'
Original Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Parlour, and Dining Cars, Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).
Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).
Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).
Passes issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).
Pension Scheme for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).
See 'Employees.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2127 (ii), 8692 (v).
———Agents' Houses ; in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
——— Charlottetown, P.E.I. Ry., Station, Cor. and Reps. *re* Construction : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 194 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
——— Charlottetown Railway Station, Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin) 60 (i).
——— Charlottetown Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2025 (ii), 6433 (iv).
——— Freetown Agent, Dwelling House : in Com. of Sup., 2180 (ii).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
——— Grand View Station, Murray Harbour Branch, Location, &c., Cor.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 1770 (i).
——— Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
——— Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— M. C. B. Coupler : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Morrell River Bridge Swing Span : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Morrell River Ry. Bridge, Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 7494 (iv), 8692, 9482, 9488 (v).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
P.E.I. Ry., Murray Harbour Branch, Amount due Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).
——— Murray Harbour Branch, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 189 (i).
——— delegation *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. Mc- 265 (i).
——— and Murray Harbour Branch Expenditure to Jan. 1st, 1905: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Standard Gauge, Cost of Construction: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 266 (i).
——— Stanley Bridge, Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 587 (i).
——— Summerside Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
——— Train Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 697 (i).
——— Vernon River Bridge Branch Line: in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
——— Water Service Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys: Ques (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Westinghouse Brakes: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
——— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
Private Cars, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).
Receipts and Expenditures, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Revenue Collections: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Rivière Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Number added 1900-4: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost: Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Running Rights over C. A. Ry.: *See* 'Govt. Rys. B. 132.'
Running Time, Connections at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line: in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway: in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Flavie Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. John Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. Lambert and Beloeil Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Moise Station Improvements: in Com. of Sup.. 1976 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Semaphores: in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Snow Blockades, Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).
Station Accommodation along Line: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Steel Rails and Fastenings: in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
See 'Govt. Rys.', &c.
Superannuation Scheme: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
Sydney, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).
——— Collections for Freight, &c.: M. Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).
Sydney Mines, Extension of Line: in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).
Ties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Time Table, Changes and Delays: on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
Time Tables, Printing in English and French: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Traffic and Freight Arrangements, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Traffic Arrangements with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
Traffic Arrangements with other Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
Train Service, Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Transportation Facilities *re* Fish Trade with Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Truro, Dining Room: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
——— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
White, Odbur, Dismissal as Station Agent: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2295; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Inter-Imperial Parliament between G. B. and Her Colonies: Prop. Res. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2334 (ii).
INTERIOR:
Acreage in Provisional District Alberta, Sas., &c., Disposal of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).
Acres of undisposed Lands, N. W. Ters.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Alaska Boundaries, Demarcation, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).

Alberta, Provisional District, Acreage disposed of: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 601 (i).

Assay Apparatus for Geological Survey: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).

Badgley Island Timber Cutting, Licenses granted: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).

Banff Hot Spring Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

Banff Pamphlets, Printing and Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Cabinet Vacancy, Interior Dept., Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 3450 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4085 (iii).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Colonization Roads, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7594 (iv).

Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).

Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 114 (i), 6264 (iv), 9070 (v).

Dep. Minister of, Resignation, Appnmt, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).

Dom. Lands, Homestead Inspectors' Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6407 (iv).

——— Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

——— Maps, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6406, 6424 (iv).

——— N.W.T., Open to Applicants for Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1935 (i).

——— N.W.T. Sales, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).

——— Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9251, 9289 (v).

——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 8671 (v).

Doukhobors Homestead Entries *re* Village Lots: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).

Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).

Entennier, Mr. Henry, Entries for Homestead Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).

Forest Protection in Man.: in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).

Geological Survey, Appnmts. and Absences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 382 (i).

——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6248 (iv).

——— Director, Appnmt., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).

——— Explorations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8669; on conc., 9685 (v).

——— Maps, Printing and Distribution, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8670 (v).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale, Jurisdiction, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. Wright) 6477 (iv).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale to Mr. F. W. Grant: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6479 (iv).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Grant) 6736 (iv).

Govt. Lands, N.W.T., Sale of in 1903-4, Rates, &c.: M. for O. C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).

Grazing Leases, N.W.T., Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 8529 (v).

Half-Breed Patents, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for Sup., 6907 (iv).

Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. Chaffee's Claims: Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 7916 (iv).

Half-Breed Scrip, Charges *re* Mr. McDonald, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr. Foster) 7647 (iv).

——— Charges, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bole) 7812 (iv).

Half-Breed Scrip, issued to United States Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6311 (iv).

——— Memo. from Mr. Cote: Read (Mr. Oliver) 6403 (iv).

——— to non-residents, Cancellation of O. C.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6489, 6560 (iv).

——— O. C.'s, Forms, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 7099 (iv).

——— Instructions to Judge Myers *re* Investigation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7723 (iv), 8170 (v).

——— Mr. Chaffey's letter: Read (Mr. Foster) 8183 (v).

Half-Breed Scrip, O. C. *re* Judge Myers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).

——— Patents issued, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8003 (v).

Half-Breed Scrip Investigation, Appnmt. of Counsel: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8528, 8697 (v).

——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8777 (v).

——— Progress, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster 9725 (v).

——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8777 (v).

Half-Breed Scrip, Further Papers laid on Table (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 7422 (iv), 9029 (v).

——— Issue of Patent, Inquiry for: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7020 (iv).

——— Unsettled Claims in N. W. Ter., Complaints from Old Settlers: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9813 (v).

Homesteads for Residents, N.W.T., Second Applications, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 2067 (ii).

Immigration Property, Montreal, Leases by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 913 (i).

INTERIOR—*Cno.*
Interior Dept.. Appnmt. of Minister : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4200 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1152 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
——— Dep. Minister, Resignation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
——— Vacancy in Cabinet : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3362 (ii).
Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).
Litigation Expenses, Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373, 4457 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).
Maps for Dom. and N.W.T. Engraving, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
National Boundary Fence : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).
See 'Wire Fence,' &c.
Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept.: on Conc., 9685 (v).
Nixon, Jos., Appnmt. as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T.: Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).
——— Charges *re* Irregularities : M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).
——— Delays in Answers to Questions : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).
——— Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).
——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money : Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).
N.W.T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).
N.W. Ters., Land Sales : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).
N.W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).
Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).
Preston, Mr., Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
Preston, W. T. R., Visit to Canada : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).
School Lands sold by Auction, in N.W.T., Number of Acres : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).
Schukin, Ivan, Homestead Patent cancelled : Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408

INTERIOR—*Cno.*
Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).
Settlers Effects, Duty *re* : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8996 (v).
Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).
Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
Surveys, Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).
Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).
Young, Thos. and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).
Internal Economy Commission : Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).
——— Res. *re* purchasing Furniture : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6612 ; Res. read (Mr. Speaker) 6614 (iv).
——— Reps. presented to the House : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).
International Boundary Fence : *See* 'N.W.T. Boundary Line,' 'Wire Fencing,' &c.
International Congress of Americanistes. Cebration at Quebec, Grant to : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
International Terminal and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. T. G. Johnston) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3° m., 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9695 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 108.)
International Water Ways Commission, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 701 (i).
See 'Deep Waterways,' &c.
Interprovincial and James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. Devlin) 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., and 3°*, 7060 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 109.)
Inverness Mines, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).
Inverness, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
Irish Cove Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7216 (iv).
Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re* : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

Jacques Cartier Surveys, Costs, Reports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Lobsters, Investigation *re* by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 65 (Mr. Watson) 1°*, 1336 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 110.)
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).
Jamieson, Dr., Payment to by Govt. *re* Indian Attendance : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6552 (iv).
Jams, Reserves, Adulteration of, Prosecutions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).
Janvrin's Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7406 (iv).
Japan Exhibition, Trade Increase : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6273 (iv).
——— Discrimination *re* Canadian Goods, Quotations *re* in 'Industrial Canada': Read (Mr. Barker) 6654 (iv).
——— Relations with Canada, Treaty, &c.: Statement (Mr. Fisher) 7908 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7816 (iv).
Jean Effront, Patent Relief B. No. 33 (Mr. Demers, Iberville) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 89.)
'J. I. Tarte' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Johnston, Mr. T. G., late M.P., Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8694 (v).
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s B. No. 191 (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 1°*, 9072; 2°*, 9179 ; M. to place on Orders for Com., 9278 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9340 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 111.)
Joliette County Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
Judge Advocate General, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 204 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9702 ; in Com. on Res., 9740, 9797 ; 1°* of B., 2°*, 9792 ; in Com., 9792, 9798 ; 3°*, 9798 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 31.)
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
JUSTICE :
Admiralty Court Registrars, Fees, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
JUSTICE—*Con.*
Atlin, B.C., Living Allowance to Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (v).
B. C. Judgeship, Appnmt. of W. W. B. McInnes : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 382 (i).
Castonguay, Dismissal and Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5688 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. O. E. Talbot) 6653 (iv).
Consolidation of Statutes : in Com. of Sup., 7244 (iv).
Court Room, Prince Albert : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dodd, Judge, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Dominion Police Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 138 (i).
Dorchester Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481, 1638 (i).
——— Extension of Building : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Exchequer Court, Admiralty Jurisdiction, Number of Actions, &c. M. (Mr. A. H. Clarke) for Ret.*, 1770 (i).
——— Judgeship in Ont., Appnmt. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Extradition Cases by U.S., before Commissioners at Montreal : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Gaynor-Greene Extradition, Charges against Mr. Lafontaine, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3937 (ii).
Hamelin and Gosselin, Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1849 (i).
High Court Judgeship, Exchequer Court Division, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5209 (iii).
Judges, Man. and N.W.T., Travelling Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Judges Salaries in Yukon : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Judicial Vacancies, Length of Vacancies, Appnmts., &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7423 (iv).
——— Promotions and Appnmt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8002 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 8002 (v).
Justice, Administration of, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 101 (i), 6721 (iv).
——— Prisoners' Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 122 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup.,72 (i).
——— Penitentiaries : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kingston Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
New Westminister, B.C., Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

JUSTICE—*Con.*
N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com. of Sup., 9683 (i).
Parole Officer, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).
Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Prince Albert Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
Prince Albert Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Sheriffs of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Statutes Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).
——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).
——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).
Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036, 5209 (iii), 6837 (iv).
Supreme Court Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Yukon, Court Fees : in Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
——— Judges Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
——— Law Books : in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
——— Prisoners, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
——— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kaslo and Lardo-Duncan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. Galliher) M. to receive Pet., 3744 (ii) ; 4375 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 113.)
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Keewatin Act Amt B. No. 158 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103-4 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176 (v).
Keewatin Ter., Maintenance of Lunatics : in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kensington Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).
Kentville Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c. : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— Statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
Killam, Judge : *See* 'Ry. Com. B. 36.'
Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs., SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
King, Mackenzie : *See* 'Labour Gazette,' &c.
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston and Dom. Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 97 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2325 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5113 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 86.)
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
Kingston Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Kingston, N.B. and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Kingston, Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 477 (i).
——— [illegible] Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s B. No. 137 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°* 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 114.)
Kitchen, Mr., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 2138 (ii).
Kootenay, Cariboo and Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*. 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 115.)
Labels, Union : *See* 'Union Labels.'
Labourers employed by Govt., Political Partisanship : Remarks (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6858 (iv).
Labour [illegible] Gazette : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

'Labour Gazette,' and Partisan Officials : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7511 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 100 (i).
Labour Unions : *See* 'Aliens,' 'Union Labels.'
Lachine Canal, Cote St. Paul, Water Power used for Manufacturers : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 1515 (i).
——— Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6294 (iv).
——— Installation of Electrical Appliances : in Com. of Sup., 9354 (v).
——— Lock Gates, Suspension : in Com. of Sup., 6300 (iv).
——— Machinery for Shops : in Com. of Sup., 1240 (i).
——— Mill Street Paving : in Com. of Sup., 6301 (iv).
——— Power House Flumes : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Rebuilding Wall Basin, Lock No. 2 : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Rebuilding Wharf below Dock : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6306 (iv).
——— St. Gabriel's Basin Walls : in Com. of Sup., 9378 (v).
——— Tail Race Widening : in Com. of Sup., 6299 (iv).
——— Wall Underpinning : in Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
——— Water Privilege, Lease to Wm. Parkyn, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5132 (iii).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111
La Compagnie de Chemin de fer Electrique : *See* 'Three Rivers,' &c.
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
——— Number of Crew at Halifax : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 43 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2042 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 116.)
Lake Champlain Co. : *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Lake Daulphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake Manitoba, Closing *re* Fishing, Protests, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Superior and Sault Ste. Marie Co., Purchase of Steel Rails, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1995 (i).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fish Hatcheries : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Land Titles Act Amt. B. No. 162 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 6104 (iv); 2°*, 9082 ; in Com., 9082 ; 3°*, 9085 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 18.)
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup. 7306 (iv).
Law Clerk, Railways and Canals, Appnmt. of : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup. 9066 (v).
Lawson, Mr. H., Dismissal of as Postmaster, Cor., &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Laws, Printing and Binding : in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).
Leach, Mr. R. E. A., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1151 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1065 (i).
Lead Bounties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 7222 (iv).
Leather Trunks for Members : in Com. of Sup., 6606 (iv).
Lebonk and Thunder Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 1241 ; 2°*, 1338 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 117.)
Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).
Legal, M'gr., Quotation *re* Separate Schools, N. W.T..: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6187 (iv).
Legislation by O.C., Payments of Moneys, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6700 (iv).
Legislation, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 238 (i), 6268, 6592 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).
Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c. : Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).
Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).
——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: (Remarks) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).
——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).
Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Levis Electoral District, Certificate of Election: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 7175 (iv).
Levis Property for I.C.R. Purposes, Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) on M. for Sup., 6668 (iv).
Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).
Levis Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6474 (iv).
Lewis, Edward Norman, M.P., Relief B. 142 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 5136 ; in Com., 5136 ; 3°*, 5137 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 19.)
Library, Accommodation in Archives Building Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Books and Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
——— Enlargement of, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6944 (iv).
——— Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 8 (i).
Library and Printing Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 5685 (iii).
Liege Exhibition : in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
——— Cor. between Govt. of Quebec and Dom. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Lavergne) 9698 (v).
Lt. Governors, Alberta and Saskatchewan B. No. 193 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 8693 ; in Com. on Res., 9033 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9033 ; in Com., 9033 ; 3°*, 9033 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 20.)
Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).
Life Insurance Companies Funds, Total Amount, Par Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3204 (ii).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Life Saving Stations and Rewards : in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Lighting Ottawa Buildings : in Com of Sup., 6816 (iv).
See 'Public Works—Ottawa.'
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).
Lighthouse in Bay of Quinté : Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 2697, 2859 (ii), 9035 (v).
——— Keepers' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).
——— Maintenance and Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— Steamers, Ports of Call, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract : Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).
Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Lighthouse Keeper, at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9035 (v).
See 'Marine.'
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Litigation Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7247 (iv).
——— Interior Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
——— Railways and Canals : in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).
Little Brook Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7559 (iv).
Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).

Live Stock, purchased for Indians, Man. and N. W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Statement ; Read (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).
Live Stock Records Associations incorp. B. No. 148 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 5076 ; 2°* 5922 ; in Com., 5922 ; 3°* 5927 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 21.)
Live Stock Records Associations, Delay to Farmers, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5577 (iii).
——— Notice of resuming in Com. on B. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5808 (iii).
Live Stock Records, Associations : in Com. of Sup., 6680 (iv).
——— Nationalization, Establishment of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1848 (i), 2185 (ii).
Loans by Govt., Temporary or Permanent, Total Amount, Rate of Interest, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 4921 (iii).
Lobster and Herring Industry, Rep. of Commissioners : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 4371 (iii). *See* ' Fisheries.'
Lobster Canneries, Licenses, Applications, &c., N.B., District No. 1 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).
Lobster Fishing, Open Season in 1903-4-5 : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1504 (i).
——— Res. of Board of Trade, Moncton : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Lobsters, Legal Length in Bay of Fundy, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 583 (i).
——— Licenses, District No. 1, N.B., Number issued by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 910 (i).
Locked Boxes : *See* ' Post Office.'
Locomotive Machinery for I.C.R. Shops : in Com. of Sup., 6428 (iv).
Locomotives, I.C.R., Purchase of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1964 (i).
Logberg Printing Co., Winnipeg, Payments to : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4373 (iii).
——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 4374 (iii).
Lloydminster as Meridian Divisional Line : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8634 (v).
Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).
London Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
London By-Election, Resignation of Mr. W. F. Maclean : Remarks (Mr. A. Lavergne) 6384 (iv).
London Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
——— Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).
London Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8001 (v).
London Military Stores, Magazine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
London Militiamen at Niagara : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv). *See* ' Militia.'
London Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
London and Saint Clair Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 32 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1287 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 118.)
London Vacancy, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6473 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ : Notification (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6311 (iv).
Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).
Lotbinière Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).
Lowe, Mr., Refusal to accept Boat ' Neptune ' : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6472 (iv).
——— Honorarium to: in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).
Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
Lumber purchased by Govt. for Grenville Canal, Price, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1514 (i), 2711 (ii).
Lumpjaw in Cattle, Prevention of : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on conc., 6917 (iv).
Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
L'Union Saint Joseph du Canada incorp. B. No. 151 (Mr. Belcourt) M. to present Pet., 2490 ; M. to receive Pet., 2491 (ii) ; 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 170.)
Lurcher and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
' Lurcher ' Lightship, Expenditure, *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Accident : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).
——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon, Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).
——— Submarine Signal *re* : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii). *See* ' Marine,' &c.
Mackenzie, District of, B. No. 157 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6103 (iv) ; Order dschd., 8176
Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps. from Ret. Officers, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Macleod Board of Trade, Pets. *re* Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Macleod, Cardston and Montana Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 119.)

McAlpine, Mr. E. H., Litigation Expenses *re* Purchase of Canada Eastern Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1522 (i).

McCormack & Sharples Patent Relief, Pet. *re* : M. (Mr. Calvert) to receive, 6558 (iv).

McDermot, Clara Bidwell, Relief B. No. 152 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 5976 ; in Com., 6275, 6347 ; 3° m., 6376 ; agreed to (Y. 38, N. 13) 6377 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 121.)

McDonald, Mr. J. L., Dismissal as Indian School Teacher, N.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6514 (iv).

McGill University Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).

McGillicuddy, Mr. D., Emplymt. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6601 ; Letter to Sir William Mulock, Ref. to, 6601 (iv).

McKenzie, D. D., M.P., Resignation *re* Autonomy B.: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).

——— Ques. of Order (Mr. A. Johnston) 8475 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8476 (v).

McKnight, Mr. A., Dismissal as Postmaster from Boissevain P.O.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).

McLaren's Creek Bridge, Trent Canal : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).

McMichael, Mr., Customs Inspector, Duties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 406 (i).

McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).

Mabou Harbour Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

M. C. B. Coupler for Rolling Stock, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).

Magann & Finn, Payments to *re* Port Colborne Contract : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).

Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).

Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).

Mahone Bay Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup. 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).

Mail Service, General Vote : in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9609 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Post Office.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919 (i), 6901, 6909, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).

——— Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Main à Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

'Maisonneuve' Steam Launch, Expenditure by Govt. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2744 (ii).

Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).

Maladie du Coït, Horse Disease : Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6702 (iv).

Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).

Mallein Test for Cattle : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2317 (ii).

Manchester SS. Line Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Man. and N.W.T. Govt., Officials, Resignation, &c., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Herron) 1344 (i).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Pets., &c., *re* : M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) for Copies, 1768 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2067 (ii).

——— O. C. March 21st, 1905, Reply of Man. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3744 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Res. passed by Man. Legislature : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4082 (iii).

——— Mr. Jackson's Speech *re* Settlement : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4842 (iii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3834 ; Cor. read, 3841 (ii).

——— 'Payment of Political Debts,' Ques. of Order : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3857 (ii).

——— Naming Member, &c. (Mr. Speaker) 3858.

——— 'Scurvy Politician,' Quotation, &c. : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, M'gr. Sbarretti's Explanation : M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to adjn., 3938 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries, Letter to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3956 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Chas. Russell to Cardinal Rampolla : Read (Mr. Foster) 3957 (ii).
——— Letter of Mr. Fitzpatrick to Bishops of Quebec : Read (Mr. Bergeron) 4053 (ii).
Manitoba, Dom. Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
See 'Public Works.'
Man. Elections, Duties of Ret. Officers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i).
Manitoba Election Returns, Duties of Returning Officers : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4678 (iii).
——— Voters' Lists returned to Clerk of Crown: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1405 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1672 (i).
Manitoba Farmers, Relief from Grasshopper Scourge : Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).
Manitoba Lake Fishing, Closing of, Cor., Pets., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Crawford) 9698 (v).
Manitoba Public Works, Claims for Damages, Pet. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7571 (iv).
Manitoba School Fund, Amt. paid to Man. Govt. Ques. (Mr. Bole) 379 (i).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Manitoba, Stony Mountain Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Manitoba Voters' Lists, Control of by Dom. Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Greenway) on M. for Sup., 6738 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 114 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 6610 ; Sen. Amts., 7625 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 120.)
Manufacturing Industries, Statistics *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. on B. 5, 1085 (i).
Maple Products, Adulteration of, Prevention by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Beland) 1340 (i).
Maps for Dom. and N.W.T., Engraving, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Maps, Sale by Govt. : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1476 (i).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Marconi Station at Table Head, Glace Bay, Amount expended, Delays, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 383 (i).
Marconi Stations, List : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).
Marconi System, Grosse Isle : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Marconi Stations, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6625 (iv).
Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marconi Wireless Cable Service : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
See 'Wireless,' &c.
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
MARINE :
'Aberdeen,' Boilers, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
'Acadia' Str., Disposition of Fittings, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1849 (i).
Acetylene Gas Lights, Annual Saving, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1592 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
See 'Carbide.'
'Agnes Donahoe,' Schr., Seizure by Uruguayan Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6106 (iv).
——— Seizure : Telegram read (Mr. Wm. Roche) 6137 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 1507 (i).
Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2758 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 2850, 2891 (ii).
——— Repairs to Lighthouses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6636 (iv).
——— programme *re* Boards of Trade : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6641 (iv).
Anglo-American Tel. Co., P.E.I., Charges, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Anticosti Lightships, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Arctic Expedition, Capt. Peary's Voyage : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4753 (iii).
Bicquet Lighthouse Keeper, Name, Salary, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Bout de L'Isle Ferry Service, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 9696 (v).
Bronte Pier Lighthouse : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 2868 (ii).
——— Statement *re* : (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).
Brothers' Light, Salary of Keeper : Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 2702 (ii).
Buoy Contracts, Tenders, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2742 (ii).
Buoys, Construction and Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 2729 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
'Canada'-'Cape Breton' Accident, 'Statement of Case': M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2067 (ii).
——— Report *re* Investigation, Instructions, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2625 (ii).
——— Capt. Salmon's Resignation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 384 (i).
'Canada,' Str., Expenditure *re* Equipment, Names of Employees, Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
Carbide for Acetylene Gas Purposes, Quantity purchased: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 914 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2710, 2743 (ii).
'Champlain,' Str., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 149 (i).
See 'Ice Breakers.'
Coal Supply for Govt. Steamers, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2613 (ii).
'De Levis,' Str., for Hydrographic Survey, Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 914 (i).
Dom. Lighthouse Depot, Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
'Druid,' Str., Expenditure *re* Maintenance: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
Fog Signals, Submarine: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
Gas Plant, Parry Sound, Purchase of Property: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
Godbout, Mr. J., Lighthouse-keeper, Political Partisanship *re* Dom. Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1349 (i).
——— Maintenance, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6464 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
——— Statement of Expenditure: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2597 (ii).
Grand Manan, N.B., Life-saving Crew, Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Halifax Lightship, Maintenance, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2708 (ii).
Harbours and Boards of Commissioners, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1063 (i).
Harbours Buoys, Maintaining, Placing, &c.; Contracts *re*: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 917 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Marine Dept., Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
Harrison, Capt., Allowance *re* Services: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
MARINE—*Con.*
Hospital Dues for Sick Mariners Fund, Surplus, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
See 'De Levis.'
Ice-Boats, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Ice-breaker 'Montcalm,' Accident to, Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4752 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
Ice-breakers *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv), 9617 (v).
——— Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
See 'Champlain.'
'James W.', Schooner, Rescue of Crew by SS. 'Durango': Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4198 (iii).
Kingston Lighthouse Depot, Establishment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
'Lady Laurier,' Govt. Str., Accident, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2597 (ii).
——— Number of Crew at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2616 (ii).
Lemieux, Jos., Appnmt. *re* Lightship Service, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1762 (i).
Lepreaux Point Light, &c., Caretaker, Investigation *re* Dismissal: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 6475 (iv).
Leslie, Capt., Wrecking Plant in St. Lawrence Channel: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Lifeboat Crews, N.S., Number, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 912 (i).
Life-saving Crew, Grand Manan, N.B., Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4921 (iii).
Life Saving Stations and Rewards: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2705 (ii).
Lighthouse Construction as Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Service and Aids to Nav., Applications from Lighthouse Board: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 917 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 2850 (ii), 9035 (v).
——— Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 2697 (ii).
Lighthouse, Bay of Quinté: Remarks (Mr. Alcorn) in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Lighthouse Depot at Kingston, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 914 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 915 (i).
——— Prescott, Tenders *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 1340 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Lighthouse Engineers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Lighthouse Keeper at Bicquet, Name, Salary, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 2698 (ii), 9175 (v).
Lighthouse Revolving Lights, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service Steamers, Ports of Call, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1850 (i).
Lighthouse Supply Depots : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2709 (ii).
Lightships, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2706 (ii), 6636 (iv).
Lightships, &c., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9035 (v).
'Lurcher' and East Point Lightships, Amounts paid to Contractors, Renewals, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
'Lurcher' Lightship, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 2747 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Accident : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2851 (ii).
——— Memoranda to Dep. Minister of Marine: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lewis) 2333 (ii).
——— Rep. of Capt. Salmon laid on Table 2878 (ii).
——— Submarine Signal *re* : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2873 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Cable Service : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Tel. Service *re* Govt. Steamers : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2615 (ii).
——— on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marconi Stations, List : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 2869 (ii).
Marconi Tel. System on Strs. 'Stanley' and 'Minto' : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 188 (i).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Circulars *re* Private Tenders, Cor., &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1399 (i).
Marine Supplies, Purchase of : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 4753 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Orders with or without Tender : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lalor) 1397 (i).
Marine Deptl. Supplies : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lalor) 2594 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, Fernhill Cemetery, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Marine Hospitals for Sick Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii).
Marine Hospital, Yarmouth : in Com. of Sup., 9172 (v).
Marine Insurance, Decrease of Rates : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2865 (ii).
MARINE—*Con.*
Marine Officers at Halifax, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Johnston) 2755 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 102 (i), 2443 (ii), 6266 (iv), 9050 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i), 2594 (ii).
Marine Schools : in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).
Marine Technical Officers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9050 (v).
Masters and Mates Examination : in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 9812 (v).
Meteorological Service : in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).
——— Pay-roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Midland Harbour, Range Lights, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).
——— Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2852 (ii).
Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Ice-breaker, Accident to : Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).
——— Experiments *re* Ice-breaking : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor.: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).
——— Total Cost : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).
Montevideo, British Seamen Imprisoned in, Litigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada' : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).
Naval Militia for Canada, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
——— Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Ocean and River Service, Amounts of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).
———Maintenance of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).
——— Removing Obstructions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).
——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).
Parry Sound Buoy Contract : Statement Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).
'Petrel,' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Prescott Lighthouse Depot, Total Area, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication Contract with Steam Nav. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii)
P.E.I. and Mainland, Winter Communication, Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
P. E. I. Steam Communication, Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i)
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P. E. I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin), Tel. Read, &c., 831 (i).
——— Tidings of Str. 'Stanley' : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
P. E. I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 2594 (ii).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 (ii).
——— Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 (ii).
——— Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
St. Lawrence River Channel, Dredging, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm' Ice Breaker, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
St. Lawrence Channel, Lights, Buoy Service, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
——— New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Louis, Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to Lurcher, Laid on Table 2878 (ii).
——— Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision: M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).
See 'Canada-Cape Breton.'
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639 (ii).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Cost Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
See 'Fog,' &c.
Steamboat Inspection : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii).
Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' Accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).
Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).
Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
——— Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— Reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Toronto Island Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281, Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).

MARINE—*Con.*
Vessels, List of: Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat: in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates (read)—(Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats: Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel: in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii).
Express,' I.C.R., Running Time ...ks (Mr. Lavergne) 6831 (iv).
Markey, F. H., Lease to *re* Fishing Rights in N. Western Lakes: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
Martineau Defalcations, Evidence *re* Bank Suit: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 112 (i).
Martin, Eli, Emplymt. in Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7097 (iv).
Marquette Voters' Lists, Original Copy: M. for Copy* (Mr. Roche) 97 (i).
Maskinongé River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 3 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9; on Order for 2°*, 733 (i).
——— B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 684; on Order for 2°, 918, 1399 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificate B. No. 44 (Mr. Lancaster): Remarks on M. to adjn., 3249 (ii).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Matthews, Geo., Co., Claims *re* Damages by Flooding: in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Meadow Creek Ranching Co., Patent *re* Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6476 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Mr. A. Pigott's Claims: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medical Attendance, Indians, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
——— Indians, Ont., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 223 (i).
——— P.E.I., Indians: in Com. of Sup., 6537 (iv).
See 'Indians.'
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia, and Independence of Parlt. Act: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 418 (i).
Medicine Hat and Northern Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 74 (Mr. P. Talbot) 1°*, 1671; 2°*, 1758 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 122.)
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Meetings after six o'clock Recess: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 450 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).
Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Board of Trade, Saskatchewan, *re* Delays: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).
Members introduced: 111, 624, 1846 (i), 5234 (iii), 7420 (iv).
Members Speeches, Delay in Printing at Bureau: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).
Memramcook Ry. Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1077 (i).
Mess. from His Ex., Opening of Parlt.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4 (i).
——— Read (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).
——— (Suppl. Estimates) 1906 (read) 8718 (v).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Metal Volatilization Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 183 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 7810 (iv); M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096; 2°*, 8146; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 123.).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Meteorological Building, Toronto, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Meteorological Observatory, Removal to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9800, 9810 (v).
——— Statement (Mr. Prefontaine) 9812 (v).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 2679 (ii).
——— Pay-Roll List, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Methylated Spirits, Purchased by Excise Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 1691 (i).
Metric System, Adoption of: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1694 (i).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Middle Fork Falls, Location of, Sale or Lease by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 9079 (v).
Midland Govt. Dock and Storehouse, Tenants and Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5428 (iii).

Midland Harbour, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— Range Lights, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2734 (ii).
——— Statement Read (Mr. Prefontaine) 2852 (ii).
Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).
Military College : *See* 'Royal.'
Militia Act Amt. B No. 170 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6905 ; in Com. on Res., 6984 ; 1°*, of B., 6991 ; on Order for 2°, 7263 ; 2° m., 9179 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9198 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 22.)
MILITIA :
Accountant of Militia Board : in Com. of Sup., 434 (i).
Advisory Board *re* Militia, Constitution of, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
Ammunition, Small Arms, Inspection of : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Annual Drill *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Cadet Corps, Ammunition supplied : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 7815 (iv).
Dominion Arsenal : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
——— Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
——— Col. Gaudet's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
——— Establishment of : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Dress Regulation for Military Officers : in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Dundonald, Earl of, Cor., O.Cs., &c., *re* Dismissal : M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 3205 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Garrisons, Situation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9128 (v).
Esquimalt Defences : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Esquimalt Naval Station, Abandonment by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 188 (i).
Halifax and Esquimalt Defences, Cor., O.Cs., &c., with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 2334 (ii).
——— Abandonment of by G.B.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9677 (v).
——— Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Govt. Control : Read (Mr. S. Hughes) 1402 (i).
Halifax Fortifications, Retention of Imperial Troops : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Halifax Military Equipment : Semarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6511 (iv).
Highland Cadet Corps, Montreal, Letter *re* : Read (Mr. Monk) 7813 (iv).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Hospital, St. John's, P.Q., Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
Inspector General of Militia : in Com. of Sup., 437 (i).
Kentvile Militia Camp, Purchase of Site, Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) on M. for Sup., 6656 (iv).
——— Judgment of Exchequer Court, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6664, 7584 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) on M. for conc., 9686 (v).
——— statement read (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 9706 (v).
——— Rep. of Evidence, Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8698 (v).
King's Regulations and Orders : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
London Militiamen at Niagara : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) *re* London Elections, 7249 (iv).
——— Telegrams read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
Manitoba Grenadiers, 95th Batt. Reduction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Medical Officers in Militia Districts, Appnmt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 417 (i).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Military Camp Casualties, Indemnity *re* : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 9147 (v).
Military Camps : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 442 (i).
Military Camp, Establishment of at S. Simcoe : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
Military Depots, Chain of, Ref. to in General Statement, on Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) 9112 (v).
Military School for Montreal, Selection of Site : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7009 (iv).
Military Sites, Purchased of : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Military Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 439 (i).
Military Training Camp, Central Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. White) 268 (i).
Militia and Defence, Accountant's Salary : in Com. of Sup., 9067 (v).
——— Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 9068 (v).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 112 (i).
Militia Council, Appnmt. of Officers : Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 415 (i).
——— Memorandum laid on Table (Sir Frederick Borden) 9073 (v).
——— Memorandum : Read (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9116 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*
Militia Council, Regulations: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 420 (i).
——— Appnmt. of Heads: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 432 (i).
Militia, Equipment for Defences: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 446 (i).
Militia Estimates, Permanent Force (general statement): in Com. of Sup., 9105 (v).
——— Unfair Criticism *re*: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) 9099 (v).
Militia Force, Reduction of: Explanation (Sir Frederick Borden) on M. for Sup., 6992 (iv).
——— Infantry Corps, Reduction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 7019 (iv).
Militia Medical Officers, Disqualifications as Members of H. of C.: Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8997 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., Cor. read, 9149 (v).
Militiamen at London Elections, Voting, Tel.: Read (Sir Frederick Borden) 7331 (iv).
See 'London.'
Militiamen, Pensions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).
Militia, Officers gazetted *re* Examinations, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 8886 (v).
——— Orders and Civil Servants: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1260 (i).
——— Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
———Staffs of Officers, Reduction in Number: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5315 (iv).
——— Stores: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
———Tranportation: in Com. of Sup., 6513 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Ninety-Fifth Batt, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jackson) 909 (i).
Pay and Allowance *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of: Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Rifle Grants: in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c.: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
MILITIA—*Con.*
Royal Military College: in Com. of sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties: in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
S.A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers: M. for Cor., &c.,* (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).
Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Target Ranges: in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).
Uniforms for Militia, Regulation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Veterans of 1866 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Rifle Range, Purchase of Land: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Milk River Ranche, Quarantine, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Mill Cove Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vache Landing Pier: in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miltimore, Lt. J. M., Application *re* Permission to attend Cavalry School, Toronto: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 6383 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Mineral Specimens for Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 6269 (iv).
Mines Branch, Int. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 6264 (iv).
Mines Branch, Smelting Ore Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Ministers' Absence from House: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1285 (i).
Ministerial Changes since 1904, Mr. Aylesworth's Position (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336
Ministers of Finance and Interior, Absence, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
'Minto,' Str., Losses to P.E.I. Merchants *re* Damaged Goods: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2623 (ii).
Mint, Royal, Building: in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
Mint, Royal Canadian, Estimated Cost, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2185, 2326 (ii).
——— Establishment of in Can., Cor. with Imp. Govt.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2595 (ii), 7424 (iv), 8387 (v).

Miscellaneous Expenditure, Charwomen : in Com. of Sup., 6268 (iv).

Miscellaneous Legal Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6723 (iv).

Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).

Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Mitchell Bridge, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Mitchell, Diversion of Line, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1940 (i).

Molsons Bank B. No. 14 (Mr. Ames) 1° m., 317; 2°*, 415; in Com., 1755; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 124.)

Monarch Bank of Canada incorp. B. No. 164 (Mr. Gordon) 1°*, 6232; 2°*, 6868 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 125.)

Moncton Harbour Master, Appnmt. of Mr. D. Robertson : Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).

Moncton, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1946 (i), 9391 (v).

——— Shops, Capacity of : Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 1965 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in Quebec Papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

'Montcalm.' Ice-breaker, Accident to : Statement (Mr. Préfontaine) 4752 (iii).

——— Experiments *re* Ice breaking : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6626 (iv).

——— Rep. of Capt. Koenig, and Cor. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2451 (ii).

——— Total Cost : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 150 (i).

See 'Marine.'

Monterey Electric and Gas Co.'s B. No. 89 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 126.)

Montevideo, British Seamen imprisoned in, Litigation *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).

See 'Marine—Agnes,' &c.

Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).

Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).

Montmorency Wharf, Expenditure *re* by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).

See 'Chateau Richer,' &c.

Montreal Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).

Montreal Bridge Co.'s B. No. 138 (Mr. Piché) 1°*, 4550; 2° m., 4703 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6275 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 127.)

Montreal Customs, Dep. Collector, Appnmt. of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 256 (i).

Montreal Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

Montreal Free Port, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7317 (iv).

Montreal Grain Warehouses, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1345 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Power B. No. 192 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 9028 ; 2°*, 9288 ; in Com., 9288 ; 3°*, 9288 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 23.)

Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commission, Appnmt. of Members : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 150 (i).

——— Expenditure, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 779 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Grain Conveyors, Preparation of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2187 (ii).

——— Permanent Sheds, &c., Cor. between Govt., &c.: M. for copies (Mr. Monk) 153 (i).

——— Preparation of Plans and Specification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2186 (ii).

——— Claims of P. Lyall & Sons, &c.: M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

———Ques. (Mr. Ames) 687 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Question, 696 (i).

——— Cor. between P. W. St. George and Mar. Dept.: M. for Copies (Mr. Ames) 689 (i).

——— Rep. of Mr. Geo. S. Green, *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 3204 (ii).

——— Steel Sheds, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 761 (i).

Montreal Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

Montreal Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).

——— Addition, Site, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 1120 (i).

Montreal Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).

Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston & Co. : *See* 'Kingston and Dom., &c.'

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 47 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 728 ; 2°*, 1101 (i).

Montreal Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letters for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).

——— cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

Montreal Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).

——— New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

——— Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

Montreal Post Office, St. Catherine St. Branch, Rents paid and unsanitary condition : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 201 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Montreal, Quebec and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 73 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 1592 ; 2°*, 1757 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 128.)

Montreal and Southern Counties Ry. Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 129.)

Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness, Collections, &c. : M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 402 (i).

Montreal Wharfs, Removal of Shoals, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 7319 (iv).

Moosejaw and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 20 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 318 ; 2°*, 415 (i) ; in Com., 2715, 2762 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 130.)

Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Moose Lake Fishing Licenses, Grants to by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Moose Mountain Indian Agency, Letter from Rev. E. Mackenzie : Read (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 9337 (v).

Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9081 (v).

Morrell River Bridge Swing Span, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).

——— Complaints *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).

Morrison, Hector D., Customs Officer at Pinette, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).

Motions, Notices of, and Order Paper : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9523 (v).

Mounted Police Act Amt. B. No. 8 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Res. prop., 59 ; in Com., 98 ; 1°*, 109 ; 2°*, 459 ; in Com., 459 ; 3°*, 465 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 24.)

See 'N. W. M. P.' &c.

Mount Stewart Wharf, P.E.I. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).

Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

Municipal Telephone System, Application *re* Port Arthur, &c., before Ry. Commission : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).

See 'Telephone.'

Murphy, Albert Edward Relief B. No. 126 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 131.)

Murray Bay and Riviere Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Murray Canal Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 1512 (i).

Murray Canal Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1495 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Amount due Contractors, &c. : (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2064 (ii).

——— Claims for Land Damages from T. Curley, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2334 (ii).

——— Completion, Delegation *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 265 (i).

——— Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Martin) 189 (i).

——— Total Expenditure to Jan., 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 106 (i).

Murray Harbour Branch and Hillsborough Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 2038, 2127 (ii), 8692, 9482 (v).

See 'I.C.R.-P.E.I. Ry.'

Museum, Geological : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).

See 'Interior,' &c.

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

See 'Stewart.'

Mutual Reserve Insurance Co., Payment of Claims, &c. : Ques. (Mr. T. Martin) 2332 (ii).

Narrows Lake Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

National Boundary Fence : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

See 'N.W.T. Boundary,' &c.

National Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.,' &c.

Naturalization Act, Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

Naturalization and Aliens Act Amt. B. No. 184 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; 2°*, 8685 ; in Com., 8685, 8689 ; 3°*, 8690 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 25.)

Naval Militia and Cruiser 'Canada' : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

Naval Militia of Canada, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).

——— Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).

Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Nelson River, &c., Fishing Rights : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).

New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).

New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

New Carlisle Wharf Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).

Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Newcastle Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1967 (i).

Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup.. 1735 (i).

Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Newspapers, Sensational Reports *re* Interviewing Prisoners : Remarks (Mr. Lavergne) 3250 (ii).

New Westminster, B.C., Dom. Exhibition, Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9339, 9608 (v).

——— Penitentiary, Payment to W. A. Duncan : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

Niagara Fruit Growers' Association, Cor. *re* : Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 9395 (v).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 39 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 132.)

Niagara-Welland Power Co.'s B. No. 40 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1710 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 133.)

Nicola, Kamloops and Similkameen Coal and Ry. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1706 ; 3°*, 1755 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 134.)

Nicolas, Mr., Emplymt. by Geological Survey Dept. : on Conc., 9685 (v).

Nicolet, Controverted Election, Certificate from Judges : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 9081 (v).

Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).

Ninety-Fifth Battalion, Reduction and Disbandment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. J. Jackson) 909 (i).

Nixon, Jos., Appnmt., as Lands Agent at Macleod, N.W.T. : Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 6110 (iv).

——— Appnmt. as Land Agent : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5718 (iii).

——— Charges *re* Irregularities : M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 8098 (v).

——— Delays in Answers to Questions : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9075 (v).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 6048 (iv).

——— Investigation : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8697 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Foster) to reduce Vote *re* Salary, 9316 (v).

——— Second Investigation, Letter *re* Payment of Money : Read (Mr. Foster) 9787 (v).
See 'Interior,' &c.

Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Noonday Gun, Firing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 121 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co. and Bonuses *re* Immigrants : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9318 (v).

——— Notice of M. (Mr. Osler) 9329 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7705 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8182 (v).

——— Prop. Res. (Mr. Osler) on M. for Sup., 9437 ; Neg. (Y. 40, N. 76) 9480 (v).

——— Protests *re*: Remarks (Mr Monk) 8887 (v).

——— Inquiry for Contract (Mr. U. Wilson) 8145 (v).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 7906 (iv).

North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).

Northern Bank B. No. 104 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 135.)

North Hastings, Census Enumerators, Payments to : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 1077 (i).

North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

North Thompson River, B.C., Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).

Northwest Cases, Re-hearing before Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).

Northwest Coal and Coke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4550 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 100.)

Northwest Irrigation Act Amt. B. No. 161 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2°*, 8775; in Com., 8775 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 26.)

N. W. Land Titles Office, Registrars' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9249 (v).

N. W. Mounted Police, Patrol Boat : in Com. of Sup., 9178 (v).

——— Pay of Force, N. W. Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 8657 (v).

——— Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6957 (iv).

——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 78 (i).

——— Yukon Force : in Com. of Sup., 8662 (v).
See 'Mounted Police,' &c.

Northwest Telephone Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., for 3°*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m., 2325 ; on Order for 3*, 2714 (ii) ; 3° m. 6346 ; Sen. Amts., 7683 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 136.)

N. W. Ter. Autonomy : *See* 'Autonomy,' &c.

Northwest Territories B. No. 160 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6104 (iv) ; 2° m., 8763 ; in Com., 8764 ; 3°*, 9408 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 27.)

N. W. T. Boundary, Erection of Wire Fencing, Contract *re* : Ques (Mr. Clements) 5478 (iii).

——— Contract *re* Erection of Wire Fencig : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., 5578 (iii).

N. W. T., Boundary Line, Wire Fence Contract, Letter from Dep. Min. Cory and Hon. R. F. Sutherland: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5689-91 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5808 (iii), 5961 (iv).

Northwest Territories, Govtl. Grant : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).

N. W. T. Govt. Lands, Sale of in 1903-4, Rates &c: M. for O.C.* (Mr. Foster) 164 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1154 (i).

N. W. T. Govt. Officials, Interference *re* Elections and Political Partisanship : Amt. (Mr. Lake) to Com. of Sup., 9713 (v).

N. W. T. Grazing Leases, Number issued, Names of Lessees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5478 (iii).

N. W. T. Officials and Interference in Political Campaigns : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9254 (v).

Northwest Territories Representation Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 6046 (iv) ; 2°*, 8769 ; in Com., 8769 ; 3°*, 8885 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 28.)

N. W. T. Supreme Court Judges, Additional : in Com of Sup., 9683 (v).

Northwest Ters. Surveys, Number of Milles, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1396 (i).

N. W. Ter., Voters' Lists : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2594 (ii).

Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Oaths of Office, Administration of, B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5, pro forma.

Obstructions, Removal of in Navigable Waters : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
See 'Marine.'

Ocean and River Service, Amount of Payments on Pay-roll, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1349 (i).

Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2595 (ii), 6463, 6623 (iv), 9171, 9617 (v).

——— Maintenance of Steamers : in Com. of Sup., 9034 (v).

——— Removing Obstructions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

——— Strs., Names and Tonnage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 1347 (i).

Officials dismissed by Mr. Whitney : Remarks (Mr. Finlay) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).

Oil and Supplies, I.C.R., Purchases *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2246 (ii).

Oka Indians, Settlement of Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 235 (i).

Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank, Appnmt. as Minister of Interior : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4201
See 'Interior' &c.

Ontario Boundaries, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 3590 (ii).

——— Cor. with Ross Govt.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 4078 (ii).

Ontario Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp B. No. 105 (Mr. Boyce) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 ; in Com., 2772 ; 3°* 2950 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 137.)

Ontario, Hudson's Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 113 (Mr. Dyment) 1°* 2185 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5132 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 138.)

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s, Limited, B. No. 86 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1933 (i) ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 2715, 2763, 3134 ; 3°*, 3135 (ii) ; Sen. Amts., 9817 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 139.)

Ontario Subsidies, Letter from Premier of Ont. to Fin. Min.: Read (Mr. Henderson) 6092 (iv).

Orangemen, Attack by Quebec papers 'Yellow Dog' Quotations : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. on B. 39, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Order, Ques. of, Naming Member : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3858 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. S. Hughes) 3879 (ii).

Order, Ques. of, 'Political Advantage,' Charges by Mr. Belcourt *re* Mr. Foster's Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3517 ; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 3520 (ii).
See 'Personal,' 'Privilege.'

Original Construction, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

Ormrod, Wm., Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8381 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).

Oshawa Harbour Revenues, Amounts, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1504 (i).

Oshawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).

Otonabee River, Damages by Floods, Claim of Mr. Jas. Clarke : M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy of Cor., 1396 (i).

Otonabee River, Peterborough Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7564 (iv).

Ottawa, Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Surveys : Inquiry for Copies of Plans, &c. (Mr. White) 822 (i).

Ottawa and New York Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 (ii); in Com., 4965, 5736 (iii), 5963 ; 3°*, 5973 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 141.)

Ottawa, Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889, 7585 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Corry Block, Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 9551 (v).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Heating : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C. Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &. : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— P. O. Savings Bank Dept. : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Purchase of Site, Stmnt., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Rentals : List Read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Stmnt. *re* Rentals, &c. (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
——— Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).
Ottawa City Act Amt. B. No. 180 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 7642 (iv) ; 2°*, 8686 ; in Com., 8686; 3°*, 8688 (v). (5 Edward VII., c., 29.)
Ottawa Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
Ottawa Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) 1°, 316 ; 2°*, 404 ; in Com., 1283 ; On Order for 2°, 1338 ; in Com., 1888 ; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 1890 (i), 2532 ; on Order for House again in Com., 2714 ; in Com., 2950, 3170 ; 3° m., 3393; Amt. (Mr. Stewart) Neg. (Y. 56, N. 80) 3398; 3°*, 3399 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 140.)
Ottawa Electric Co.'s B. No. 12 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from W. A. Littlejohn, Toronto City Clerk : Read (Mr. Maclean) 3170 (ii).
——— Letter from Sec. Treas. D. R. Street : Read (Mr. Stewart) 3183 (ii).
——— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3199 (ii).
Ottawa Grounds, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7280 (iv).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Préley) 382 (i).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 18 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 142.)
Ottawa, Parliamentary Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
Ottawa Post Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
Ottawa River Ry. Co.'s B. No. 81 (Mr. Pichè) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4597 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 79.)
Ottawa River Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).
——— Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— Wharf at Riviere du Lievre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 143 (Mr. Telford) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4978 (iii) ; in Com. and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 144.)
Owen Sound Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv), 9600 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound P. O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v) .
Owens : *See* 'David,' &c.
Oxford and London Elections, Resignation of Mr. D. D. McKenzie : Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. on B. 69, 8474 (v).
Oxford, N., Electoral District, Vacancy, Issue of Writ ; Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6046 (iv).
——— Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 8177 (v).
——— Notification to Mr. Speaker (Mr. Sproule) 5961 (v).
——— Issue of Writ : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6135 (iv).
See 'London,' &c.
Oyster Culture, Protection *re* : in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Pacific Bank B. No. 175 (Mr. Galliher) 1° m., 7420 ; 2° m., 7625 (iv) ; in Com., and 3°*, 8146 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 145.)
Pacific Cable Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7239 (iv).
——— Statement Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 7276 (iv).
Packing of Apples : *See* 'Staple Commodities.'
Papal Ablegate : *See* 'Man. Boundaries.'
Paper Goods Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 68 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1421 ; 2°*, 1541 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2715 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 146.)
Parent, Hon. S. N., Appnmt. to G.T.P. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 699 (i).

Paris Agency, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).

Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).

Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).

Parlour and Dining Cars, I.C.R., Profits, &c., *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2254 (ii).

Parole Office, W. T. Archibald, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6721 (iv).

Parole System for Convicts : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).

Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

——— Landing Pier Addition : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

Parry Sound Buoy Contract : Statement read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2856 (ii).

Parry Sound Gas Plant, Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2712, 2725 (ii).

Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Paspebiac and Gaspe Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).

Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).

Passenger Stations and Freight Sheds, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1977 (i).

Passes issued, &c., I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 2257 (ii).

Passes over I.C.R. for Legislators of Quebec Prov.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) in Com. of Sup., 1922, 1925 ; Reply (Mr. Emmerson) 1925 (i).

Patent Act Amts. *re* Relief Bills : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 6559 (iv).

Patent Examiners Salary Increases : in Com. of Sup., 9056 (v).

Patent Medicines, Inspection of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 1725 (i).

'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

'Patent Record' supplied to Members : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com., of Sup., 1827 (i).

Patterson, T. W., Sale of Dom. Lands, B.C., Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4371 (iii).

Paul, Jos., Compensation *re* Injuries : in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).

Pay and Allowance *re* Militia : in Com. of Sup., 6510 (iv).
See 'Militia,' &c.

Payne, J. L., Salary Increase : in Com. of Sup., 9062 (v).

Pearson, Geo. Relief B. No. 153 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 5919 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 ; in Com., 7623 ; 3° m., 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 147.)

Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).

Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).

Pemberton Band of Indians B.C., Purchase of Land : in Com. of Sup., 9339 (v).

Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).

Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Penetanguishene Harbour Dredging, Name of Owner of Boat : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2063 (ii).

Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 478 (i).

Penitentiaries, General Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 465 (i).
See 'Justice,' &c.

Penny Banks, Charters, Stmnt. *re* Business, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 687 (i).

Pensions, Compensation in Lieu of Land : in Com. of Sup., 6956 (iv).

Pension Scheme I.C.R., for Old Age : Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2492 (ii).
See 'Employees,' &c.

Pensions : in Com. of Sup., 6956 ; conc., 6961 (iv).

Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).

Pere Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (i).

——— Employees : Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).

Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Permanent Force, Recruiting Points, Total Number, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 5977 (iv).
See 'Militia,' &c.

Personal Explanation *re* Voting in Ottawa (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).

Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).

Peterborough Immigrant Homes, Inspection *re* : Remarks (Mr. Cochrane) in Com. of Sup., 7694 (iv).

Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).

Petitions, Presenting, Endorsement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 2490 (ii).

Petition *re* Separate Schools in Autonomy Bill : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2319 (ii).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.

Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).

Petite Riviere, Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).

Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

'Petrel.' Repairs to Boilers : in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).

Petroleum Bounties, Payments, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7220 (iv).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Photographs : *See* 'Copyright.'
Pictou Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
Pictou Cattle Disease, Investigation *re* Cause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 9079 (v).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
See 'Pub. Works,' &c.
Pilotage Service : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Pinette Customs Officer, Mr. H. D. Morrison : Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2330 (ii).
Pitblado, Isaac Relief B. No. 185 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 7906 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9049 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 148.)
Plains of Abraham, Number of Acres purchased by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 436 (i).
Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Plunkett, Geo., Contract *re* Coal for Kingston Penitentiary : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 478 (i).
Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Toronto P.O.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Cost, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Pointe au Baril Route, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).
Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).
Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Police Patrol Boats in Northern Waters : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Political Crisis in Quebec, Par. from 'Le Journal' : Read (Mr. Leonard) 753 (i).
——— Explanation asked for (Mr. Leonard) 822 (i).
'Political Debts, Payment of,' Ques of Order *re* Man. Boundaries : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3857 (ii).
Pollock, Mr. J. R., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Poonamalie Dam, Contribution *re* Repairs : Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
Port Arthur Dredging Contract, Advertisement *re* Tenders : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6875 (iv).
——— Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).
——— Tenders *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5963 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2263 (ii), 4921 (iii).
Port Arthur, Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret..* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).
Port Arthur, Fort William Telephone System, Cor. *re* Application to Board of Ry. Commissioners : M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies, 1391 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 595 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2203 (ii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell Work, Contractor, Prices paid, &c : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Port Colborne : in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Elevator, &c., Cor., Papers, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 2067 (ii).
Port Colborne, Deepening Summit Level : in Com. of Sup., 1232 (i).
——— Eastern Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 815 (i).
——— Elevator : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— Entrance Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1230 (i).
Port Credit Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871, 7555 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com., of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, N.S., Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).

Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Port Mulgrave and Bras D'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1760 (i).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).
Porter, Mr. Sydney, Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 190 (i).
Portland Cement bought at Quebec : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 435 (i).
Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Postage on Newspapers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).
Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204
Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).
Postal Map Engraving : in Com. of Sup., 9060 (v).
Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).
Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).
Postmaster, Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup. 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE :
Alberta District Postal Business, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).
Ashcroft and Cariboo Mail Service, Tenders *re* Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3670 (ii).
Benrier, Mr. J. P., Postmaster at St. Claud, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. (Mr. Staples) for Cor.*, 1397 (i).
Bisonnette vs. Crown, Illegal Stamping of Letters in Montreal P.O., Cor. read : in Com. of Sup., 194 (i).
Boissevain Postmaster, Mr. A. McKnight, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 2327 (ii).
Brantford Letter Carriers : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) in Com. of Sup., 217 (i).
Cairns, A. W., Salary as P. O. Inspector : in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Campaign Literature and Franking Privileges: Remarks (Mr. White) 1809 (i).
See 'Franking.'

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Canadian Fast Mail Service and SS. 'Virginian' : Tel. Read (Mr. Emmerson) 9279 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) 9773 (v).
Chesley Postmaster, Vacancy, Appnmt., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Barr) 9081 (v).
Civil Servants' Guarantees *re* P. O. Dept. : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 1758 (i).
Coldwater and Lovering Mail Service, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1848 (i), 2594 (ii).
Country Postmasters, Increases in Salaries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 143 (i).
Detective Service, P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 209 (i).
Dobey, J. B.: *See* 'Thessalon Postmaster.'
Doutre, Mr., Dismissal as Postmaster from Beauharnois : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6247 (iv).
Dundas, Ry. Mail Clerk, Reinstatement : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
Farmington and Wilmot Mail Contract, Guarantee, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2330 (ii).
Franking Privilege, Abuse of *re* Circulars of Dental Institute : Remarks (Mr. Ames) 1807 (i).
——— Circular issued by Jacques Cartier Club, &c.: Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) on M. for Ways and Means, 9798 (v).
——— Regulations after Prorogation : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 9395 (v).
——— Use of Rubber Stamp : Remarks (Mr. Barr) 5134 (iii), 5963 (iv).
See 'Campaign,' &c.
Fredericton Post Office, Equipment, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Crocket) 170 (i).
Free Mail Delivery, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).
Glenn Ross P. O., Abolition of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 1149 (i).
Goderich Mail Contract, Tender *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2493 (ii).
Green, Samuel H., Postmaster at Kaslo, B.C., Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).
Hamilton Cove, P. O. Mail Service and Revenue : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7421 (iv).
Hamilton and Kilbride Mail Contractor, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).
H. of C. Post Office, Locked Boxes, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 8387 (v).
International Postal Supply Co., Rent of Stamping Machines : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).
Inverness, N.S., Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 8885 (v).
Kaslo, Dismissal of Mr. S. H. Green as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Kent, Miss A., Dismissal as Postmistress at Kent, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 2331 (i).

Kentvale Postmaster Sureties, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5977 (iv).

See 'Thessalon,' &c.

Killarney and Little Current Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 3669 (ii).

Kingston, N.B., and Jubilee Station Mail Contract, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).

Lakeville and North Lake Mail Service, Complaints *re* : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 9612 (v).

Lawson, Mr. Henry, Postmaster at Stanhope, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

——— Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

See 'Stanhope.'

Lefebvre, A. P., Dismissal from Markstay Post Office, Investigation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 7096 (iv).

Lennoxville Post Office, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4373 (iii).

Lesser Slave Lake Post Office, Establishment, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 7018 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. on B. 69, 8163 (v).

Letter Carriers, Bonuses, &c., Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 215 (i).

——— Contract *re* Boots, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 211 (i).

——— Payments on Sick Leave, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 173-6 (i).

——— Uniforms, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 207 (i).

Leverette, Geo. Milton, Postmaster, Kitley District, Partisan Conduct as Ret. Officer : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Lowville to Milton Mail Contract, Distance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 9080 (v).

Maccan Mail Contract, Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 188 (i).

Magog Post Office, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).

Mail Bags, Locks, Repairs, &c., Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 205 (i).

Mails carried free by Rys.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 185 (i).

Mail Contracts, Tenders, Competition, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Mail Delivery, Free System, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 729 (i).

Mail Service, P.O. in Com. of Sup., 219 (i), 6629 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mail Service, Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).

——— System of Payments : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Mail Subsidies *re* Newfoundland Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

Melbourne and Upper Melbourne Mail Contract, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4372 (iii).

Melfort Mail Service, Complaint from Saskatchewan Board of Trade *re* Delays : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9789 (v).

Mileage *re* Mail Service, Additional : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 184 (i).

Money transmitted through Mail, Par. in papers *re* Legislation : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 4807 (iii).

Montreal Post Office, Charges *re* Registered Letters : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 183 (i).

——— Illegal Stamping of Letter for Election Matters : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 194 ; Cor. read (Sir William Mulock) 194 (i).

——— Improvements, New Station : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 222 (i).

See 'Pneumatic.'

——— St. Catherine St. Branch, Unsanitary Condition : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 182 (i).

——— Stealing of Cheques, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 198 (i).

Musquodoboit Postmaster, Dismissal (remarks) on M. for Sup. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6224 (iv).

——— Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9613 (v).

Newfoundland Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 177 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c.

Newpapers, Postage : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 179 (i).

Pneumatic Tube Installation in Montreal P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).

——— in Toronto P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

See 'Toronto.'

Postage Stamps and Bank Notes, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 204 (i).

Postal Business, Alberta District : M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 599 (i).

Postal Contracts, &c., Patronage for Hamilton, Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 6228 (iv).

Postal Rates, Increases, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 221 (i).

Postmasters acting as Political Partisans, Charges *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6240 (iv).

Postmasters Reduction of Salary : Remarks (Mr. Miller) in Com. of Sup., 6863 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Post Office, Dept., Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 95. 165 (i), 6240 (iv), 9058 (v).
——— Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 144 (i).
——— Outside Service : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
——— Provisional Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 166 (i).
Post Office, Assessment System, Collections *re* : Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3671 (ii).
——— Official, Compassionate Allowance to P. Callery : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (ii).
——— Regulations to Postmasters *re* Distribution of Packages : Remarks (Mr. Barr) on M. for Sup., 6834 (iv).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Barr) 6961 (iv).
——— Rep. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Offices in N.W.T., Establishment of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 223 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Wheatley.'
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 280 (i.)
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Dundas.'
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c. (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653 (iv).
St. James Division Branch P. O. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
See 'Montreal.'
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
——— Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Stamping Machines : *See* 'International,' &c.
Stanhope, P.E.I., Postmaster, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).
——— Cor., Reps., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).
POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Stanhope Postmaster, Dismissal, Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 4810 (iii).
See 'Lawson.'
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
——— Dismissal of W. J. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
——— Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6332 (iv).
——— further papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
——— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
'Virginian's' Trip : *See* 'Canadian Fast Mail,' &c.
Waverley Postmaster, Duties and Residence, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
Waverley, Postmaster, Personal Duties, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Power.'
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'Marine,' 'P.E.I.'
Yukon, Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
——— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
Poultry Raising on Experimental Farm : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6183 (iv).
Pound Net Licenses issued by Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
Pound Net Licenses, Little Current, Cor. between A. E. Dyment and Govt. *re* : M. for copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1399 (i).
Powers, Jas., Postmaster at Wheatley River, P.E.I., Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 4374 (iii).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Presbyterian College of Halifax B. No. 123 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 2681 ; 2°*, 3136 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 149.)

Prescott Lighthouse report, Total Area, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1148 (i).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Salary, &c. : Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 452 (i).
——— Immigration Office G.B., Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
——— Visit to Canada : Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 451 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Value of Imports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 152 (i).
See 'Customs,' &c.
Preventive Service, *re* Excise : in Com. of Sup., 1688 (i).
Prime Minister, Salary Increase : *See* 'First Minister.'
Prince Albert, Court Room : in Com. of Sup., 124 (i).
——— Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
P.E.I. and Great Britain SS. Subsidy, Claims of SS. Cos. : in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. Communication with Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) Tel. read, &c., 831 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 448 (i).
P.E.I. Fisheries, Supervision, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1762 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Communication, Train Service : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 280, 697 (i).
P.E.I. Mail Service, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1152 (i).
——— Letter from Mr. Pottinger : Read (Sir William Mulock) 1153 (i).
P.E.I. Delay in Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2203, 2261 (ii).
——— Explanation (Sir William Mulock) 2261 (ii).
P.E.I. Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions, Res. from Mar. Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 907 (i).
P.E.I. Steam Communication, Contract with Steam Nav. Co. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5316 (iii).
P.E.I. Steam Communication with Mainland, Delays, &c. : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1595 (i).
——— Snow Blockade and Delay in Mails : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) 1753 (i).
P.E.I. Subsidy, Additional Grant, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 3205 (ii).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
P.E.I. and W. Indies SS. Subsidy, Amount paid, Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 591 (i).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Delegation *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 6644 (iv).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Claims of Travellers *re* Refund of Expenses on account of Delay : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4807 (iii).
——— Cor., &c., since Confederation : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
——— Investigation *re* Soundings, Tunnel, &c. : M. for Cor. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2778 (ii).
——— Str. 'Stanley,' Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 1338 (i).
——— Inspection of Str. 'Stanley' : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 687 (i).
P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).
P.E.I. Railway : in Com. of Sup., 2025, 2027 (ii), 8692 (v).
——— Bloomfield Agent's House : in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
——— Branch Lines, Survey and Construction, Cor., &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Copies*, 916 (i).
——— Cardigan to Montague Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9482 (v).
——— Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. Kemp) 383 (i).
——— Georgetown Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9486 (v).
——— Land Expropriations, Papers laid on Table (Mr. Emmerson) 8528 (v).
——— Murray Harbour Branch Extension to Jan. 1st, 1905 : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 106 (i).
——— Murray Harbour Branch : in Com. of Sup., 7494 (iv), 9488 (v).
——— Stanley Bridge, &c., Surveys *re* : Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).
——— Water Service Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 2170 (ii).
——— West Cape Branch Surveys : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 589 (i).
——— Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 6901, 6908 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.,' &c.
P.E.I. Tel. Co. : *See* 'Anglo-American.'
Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
——— Enlargement of and Outside Printing : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6948 (iv).

Printing Bureau, New Machinery Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).

Printing, Miscellaneous : in Com. of Sup., 6723, 6901, 6948, 6957 (iv).

Prisoners, Maintenance of in N.W.T. : in Com of Sup., 122 (i).

Private Bills Pets., Extension of Time : (Mr. Grant) M. *re* Report, 318, 448 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Debating (Mr. Speaker) 318 (i).

——— M. to extend Time (Mr. Galiher) 4375 (iii).

——— M. (Mr. Gervais) 2203 (ii).

Private Bills, 12th Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Grant) 2491 (ii).

Private Cars, I.C.R., Number, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 2258 (ii).

See 'Ry. Commission,' &c.

Privileges, Ques. of *re* Separate Schools : (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).

Privy Council Office : in Com. of Sup., 71 (i).

Privy Councillors : *See* 'Cabinet Ministers.'

Prohibitionist Principles, Charges by P.M.G. : Personal Explanation (Mr. Foster) 842 (i).

Prorogation, Date of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9790 (v).

——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. : Read (Mr. Speaker) 9815 (v).

Protection to Women and Children, Amt. to Criminal Code *re* Wife Beaters : Ques. (Mr Ames) 591 (i).

'Protestants driven out of Quebec,' Ref. to in Autonomy Bill Speech (Mr. Lemieux) 3305 ; Reply (Mr. Sproule) 3306 (ii).

'Protestant Govt.,' Ref. to in Speech on Autonomy Bill : (Mr. Fielding) 3006 (ii).

Protestant Schools, Ref. to by Mr. Fielding : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Speech on Autonomy Bill, 3462 (ii).

Provident Savings Association incorp. B. No. 134 (Mr. Gervais) 1°*, 4370 ; 2°*, 4598 (iii) ; in Com. 5974 ; 3°*, 5976 (ii Sen. Amts., 9078 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 151.)

Provincial Autonomy *re* N. W. Ters., Cor. between Govts. : M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 599 (i).

See 'Autonomy,'

Provincial Rights, Par. in 'Le Soleil' : (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn. 1745 (i).

Provincial Stocks in G. B. : *See* 'Colonial Stock Act.'

Provincial Subsidies, Discussion *re*, in Com. on Autonomy Bill, 5434 (iii).

Provincial Subsidies, Readjustment *re*, Memoranda, &c. : M. for Copies (Mr. Carvell) 2100 (ii).

Pryor, J. A., Relief B. No. 127 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 3091 ; 2°*, 3400 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 150.)

Public Accounts Com. : M. (Mr. McIsaac) 582 (i).

Public Accounts Com., Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 7100 (iv).

——— Calling Meeting, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 403 (i).

Public Accounts Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 97 (i).

Public Accounts, Reporting Evidence, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).

——— Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).

Public Buildings, Comparison with U. S. System of Rentals : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1024 (i).

Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).

——— Erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).

——— Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. of Sup., 1027 (i).

Public Functionaries, Salaries : *See* 'Lt. Governors.'

Public Works Act Amt. B. No. 54 (Mr. Hyman) 1° m., 819 ; 2°*, 1679 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 32.)

Public Works Health Act : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).

Public Health, Organized Districts Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS :

Actonvale Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

Alexandria P. O., Contract *re*, Delay, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).

Aliens employed on Govt. Works at Sault Ste. Marie : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 1412 (i).

Allandale Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).

Amherstburg Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).

Amherst Pier, N.S., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4371 (iii).

Anderson and Kennedy's Lake Outlets : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

Annapolis, Queen's Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).

Anse à Beaufils Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).

Anse aux Gris Fonds Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7285 (iv).

Anse St. Jean Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7286 (iv).

Anse L'Ilot Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).

Antigonish Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Apple River Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Arbitration and Awards *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Architects for Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 424 (i).
Architects for Public Works, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
Arichat (west) Landing Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Armouries, Generally, Construction of : in Com. of Sup., 1649 (i).
Armouries, Supervision and Control, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 423 (i).
Ashcroft and Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7720 (iv).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Banff, N.W.T., Water Works and Sewage Construction : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).
Barachois Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7396 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Barrie (Allandale) Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9595 (v).
Barrington Passage Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Barry's Wharf, Madawaska River : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Bass River Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Batiscan Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7322 (iv).
Battery Point Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Battleford Bridge, N.W.T., Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7587 (iv).
Bayfield Pier, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
Bear Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Beaujeu Bank Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Beckerton Public Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Belle River Dredging Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7546 (iv).
Belle River Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Belleville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i).
Beloeil Guide Piers and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Bersimis to Godbout Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7608 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf at Pointe à Coté : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
——— Land purchased from P. Ross, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1850 (i).
Blanche River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Blind River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6870 (iv).
Boisdale Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Bowmanville Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1549 (i).
Bracebridge Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7547 (iv).
Brandon Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Breakwaters, &c., N.S., Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9553 (v). 9553 (v).
Breton Cove Boat Landing : in Com. of Sup., 7397 (iv).
Bridges, Dominion, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7592 (iv).
Bridgeburg Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1550 (i).
Bridgewater Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove, Harbour Works : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
——— Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Bronte Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Bryson Bridge Reconstruction : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
——— Renewals, Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Buildings, Generally, Fuel, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Inspection by Architects, Clerks, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1670 (i).
Buildings, Manitoba : in Com. of Sup., 1633 (i). 9549 (v).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i), 7284 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 846, 1015 (i).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i), 6734 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 1547 (i), 9547 (v).
——— Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
See 'Ottawa.'
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1101 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Buildings, Quebec, Renewals, Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1107 (i).
Burford Armoury : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com., 1649 (i).
Cacouna Wharf, Expenditure *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7096 (iv).
Calgary, Land Titles Office : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
——— Post Office Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Campbellton, Public Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1048 (i).
——— Wharf, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i).
Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Canso Public Building in Com. of Sup., 1023 (i).
Canton Fabre Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7288 (iv).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Carillon Work, Emplymt. of Labourers, Affidavit read *re* Political Influence : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6856 (iv).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Carlos Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Cascumpec Sandhills Channel, P.E.I., Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2773 (ii).
Chambord Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7289 (iv).
Champlain Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
Chance Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
Chateauguay River Dredging and Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 6847, 7322 (iv).
See 'St. Louis,' &c.
Chateau Richer Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7290 (iv).
——— Expenditure by Govt. for Public Works: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Morin) 109 (i).
——— Public Works, Dates of Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 3202 (ii).
——— Removal of Obstruction : Remarks (Mr. Morin) 1154 (i).
——— Wharf, Expenditure by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Montmorency.'
Chatham Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1551 (i).
——— Contract, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Chezzetcook (east) Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1106 (i).
Chilliwack Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks from Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Clifton Breakwater Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7497 (iv).
Cobourg, Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1554 (i).
——— Piers, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6879 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7549 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Country Harbour, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7398 (iv).
Court Houses, &c., N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Cow Bay, Fort Morien Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Creosoted Timber for Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Crowe's Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Culloden Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7401 (iv).
Cunningham Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dams across Rivers, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Depot Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7552 (iv).
Descente Des Femmes, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
——— Tel. Lines : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Desjardins Wharf, Allumette Island : in Com. of Sup., 7298 (iv).
Devil's Island Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 912 (i).
Disraeli Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 1729 (i).
Doucet's Landing, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Dredges employed at Port Arthur, Expenditure, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
Dredges, Govt., Built at Toronto : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 2456 (ii).
Dredges used in Govt. Works, Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 795 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Dredging, B.C., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Dredging Contracts, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1419 (i)
Dredging Plant, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
——— Man., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
——— Number of Vessels, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6890 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— working expenses : in Com. of Sup. 7579 (iv).
——— P.E.I., New Plant : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
——— New Vessel : in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Dredging Vessels, Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6890, 7576 (iv).
Drill Hall, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 729 (i).
Durham Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Eastern Channel, St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
East Templeton Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7300 (iv).
Echo Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Economy Pile Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Edmonton Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Edmonton and Qu'Appelle Tel. Lines : in Com of Sup., 7633 (iv).
Eel Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Escoumain Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Fairford River Bed Outlet : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Fernie, B.C., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1641 (i).
Fort Lawrence Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 6838 (iv).
——— Name of Contractor, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5034 (iii).
Fort William Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Ft. William and Port Arthur Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6900 (iv).
See 'Port Arthur,' &c.
Fraser River Ship Channel Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7574 (iv).
Fraserville Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Fredericton Military Buildings, Tender *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Freeport Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Frude's Point Wharf Enlargement, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Gabarus Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Gatineau Point Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Gatineau River Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7630 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7402 (iv).
Georgian Bay, Canal Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).
——— Survey via French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Surveys, Engineers Reps., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Brabazon) 192 (i).
Georgian Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
Gimli Wharf, Lake Winnipeg : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9577 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1034 (i).
——— Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 9697 (v).
Goderich Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
——— Delay in Building, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1344 (i).
Grand Mechins Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7303 (iv).
Grand Piles Dam, St. Maurice River : in Com. of Sup., 7326 (iv).
Grand River, Ont., Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6873 (iv).
Grand Rivière de Beaupré Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Great Salmon River Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Greece's Point Wharf, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 7301 (iv).
See 'Carillon.'
Grondine's Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Grosse Isle, Hospital Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).
——— Marconi System : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
——— Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
——— Quarantine Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Guelph Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1555 (i).
Haileybury Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887, 7556 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Half Island Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9584 (v).
Halifax, Detention Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1037 (i).
——— Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
——— Immigrant Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1036 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1559 (i).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Harbours, Docks and Slides, Working Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 7632 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, Generally : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Man. : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
——— N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1744 (i), 7497 (iv), 9588 (v).
——— N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i), 6837, 7237, 7395 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv), 9602 (v).
——— general repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
——— Ont. : in Com. of Sup., 6729, 6869, 7546, 7555 (iv), 9595 (v).
——— P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i), 9585 (v).
——— Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6436, 6839, 7285 (iv), 9590 (v).
Harrigan Cove Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Hawkesbury Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Higgin's Shore Pier, P.E.I. : in Com. of Sup., 1734 (i).
Honora Wharf Freight Shed : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Honora Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6887 (iv).
Howard's Cove, P.E.I., Surveys *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4703 (iii).
Hull Wharf, Total Cost, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2064 (ii).
Huot, Mr. J., Payments to *re* L'Ange Gardien Beach : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
Indian Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour Wharf : Pet. *re*, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8178 (v).
Inverness Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1040 (i).
Inverness Mines Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Isle Bizard Wharf Butments, Expenditure *re* : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2067 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Janvrin's Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup.,' 7406 (iv).
'J. I. Tarte,' Dredge, Defective Boilers, Accident, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2466 (ii).
Kamloops, Lower Nicola Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (iv).
Kelly's Cove Breakwater, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9582 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
'Kingsford,' Dredge, Cost of Operating : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 801 (i).
Kingston, Military Stables : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
——— Royal Military Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Lachute Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1111 (i).
Lake Dauphin, Lowering : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, Guide Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Lake St. John Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Lake St. Peter Permanent Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Lake Temiscaming Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7559 (iv).
Lambert's Pier, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 4373 (iii).
Langly Wharf Protection Bank : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
L'Ardoise Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's River Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lavaltrie Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7306 (iv).
Levis Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1112 (i).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Point of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Lindsay Drill Hall, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).
Litchfield Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Current Channel, Georgian Bay : in Com. of Sup., 6886, 7859 (iv).
Little Judique Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Little Pabos Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7307 (iv).
Little Rock Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7407 (iv).
Lloydminster Immigrant Building, N.W.T: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
London, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Electric Wiring : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, Sale of, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Elson) 8384 (v).
——— Military Stores, Magazine, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1562 (i).
——— Post Office Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
Longueuil Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1113 (i).
Lotbiniere Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Louisburg, Old Fort, C.B., Preservation of : in Com. of Sup., 9170 (v).
Louise Embankment, Quebec Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i).
Lunenburg Dredging Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
McPherson's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Mabou Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 7408 (iv).
Magdalen Island Breakwaters and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
Magog Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1114 (i).
Mahone Bay Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7403 (iv).
Mail Distributing Station, Montreal, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 915 (i).
Main a Dieu Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove Channel Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Manitoba Public Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) in Com. of Sup., 857 (i).
Manitoulin Island, Silver Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Marble Mountain Wharf, N.S. : in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7409 (iv).
Margaretville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Maskinonge River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6842, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
Matchedash Bay Channel Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
——— M. A. Pigott's Claims : in Com. of Sup., 9599 (v).
Medicine Hat Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Megantic Lake Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Meteghan Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Midland Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9601 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Midland Harbour, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Military Buildings, Fredericton, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 728 (i).
Mill Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Mille Vaches Landing Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
——— Contract *re* Repairs : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1350 (i).
——— Dredging, Commencement of Work : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3834 (ii).
Miscou Harbour Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7498 (iv).
Mistook Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7310 (iv).
Montmagny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls Cribwork : in Com. of Sup., 7311 (iv).
Montmorency, Wharf Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 6852 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1015 (i).
See 'Chateau Richer.'
Montreal, Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1118 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Harbour, Raising of Sunken Elevator : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).
——— Inland Revenue Building : in Com. of Sup., 1119 (i).
——— Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1125 (i).
——— Post Office, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1127 (i).
——— P. O., Pneumatic Installation, System : in Com. of Sup., 1131 (i).
——— Postal Station : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1128 (i).
Montreal, Quebec, &c., Harbours, Dues and Charges *re* Transportation Problem : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
Mount Stewart, P.E.I., Wharf : Remarks : (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9585 (v).
Mud Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Narrows Lake, Quarry Channel : in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
New Campbellton Ballast Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
New Carlisle Wharf, Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7312 (iv).
Newcastle Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Neepawa Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
New London, P.E.I., Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 1735 (i).
Newport Breakwater Extension, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Newport Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Nicolet Pier Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7313 (iv).
Noel Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
North Bay Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1563 (i).
North Thompson River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
——— Improvements *re* Navigation, Expenditure, &c. : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5783 (iii).
Notre Dame du Portage Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Ogden's Pond Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7413 (iv).
Oliphant Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Orillia Public Building, Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
Otonabee River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Ottawa, Alexandra Bridge, Lighting, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7586 (iv).
Ottawa Bridges : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7585 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 603, 754 (i), 6814 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Additions to Eastern Block : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
——— Archives Building, Erection of : in Com. of Sup., 603 (i).
———Art Gallery : in Com. of Sup., 7618 (iv).
——— Astronomical Observatory, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Buildings leased by Govt., Location, Taxes paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 379 (i).
——— Carpets purchased, Quantity, Value, Duty paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 8266 (v).
——— Clerks of Works, Salaries, &c., Dom. Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
——— Coal Sheds : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— Corry Block, Rental, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6818 (iv).
——— Deptl. Buildings, Purchase of Site, &c. (Stmnt.) : in Com. of Sup., 9605 (v).
——— Drill Hall, Increased Accommodation : Ques. (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) 271 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Elevator Attendance : in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6916 (iv), 9551 (v).
——— Engineers, Draughtsmen, &c., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv), 9382 (v).
——— Engineers, Firemen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6822 (iv).
——— Furniture, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Geological Museum : in Com. of Sup., 754 (i).
——— electric lighting, contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 760 (i).
——— Grounds, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Heating, Engineers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
——— H. of C., Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
——— House of Commons, Remodelling, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— ventilation of Chamber : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
——— Library Accommodation in Archives Building : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
———Library, Extension : in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 604 (i).
——— Lighting Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 6816 (iv).
——— Lighting Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).
——— Major's Hill Park, Maintenance : in Com. of Sup., 6817 (iv).
——— Mint Building : in Com. of Sup., 606 (i).
——— Parliament Buildings, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9542 (v).
——— Parliament Grounds, Paving Contract, &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) to adjn., 5785 (iii).
——— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
——— Post Office, Restoration and Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1573 (i).
——— Printing Bureau, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 6818 (iv).
——— Rentals : List read (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 1663 (i), 9605 (v).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6815 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall, Improvements, Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
——— Steel Shelving : in Com. of Sup., 1564 (i).
———Telephone Service : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
——— Treasury Vaults : in Com. of Sup., 6825 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Buildings, Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).
Ottawa River Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7612 (iv).
Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
——— Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— P.O., Site *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1029 (i).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Parker's Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9552, 9576 (v).
Parrsboro, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
——— Landing Pier Addition: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Parry Sound Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Peel Head Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Pelee Island Cable Line : in Com. of Sup., 7609 (iv).
Pembroke Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pembroke Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Penetanguishene Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Penitentiary Coal Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com.of Sup., 478 (i).
Perce (North Cove) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Peribonca (Petite Riviere) Removal of Snags: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
Peterborough Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
Petewawa Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7562 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).
Petite Riviere Improvements, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9580 (v).
Phinney's Cove Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Pierreville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Piers and Bridges, General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Piers and Breakwaters, P.E.I., Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1737 (i).
Pleasant Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Plympton Breakwater Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Pointe du Chene Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Point Edward Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6869, 7563 (iv).
Point Prim Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1736 (i).
Poirierville Landing Pier, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Port Arthur and Ft. William Dredging Contract, Tender of Conmee & Bowman : M. (Mr. Bennett) to adjn., 4458, 4645 (iii).
——— Fort William and Kaministiquia Harbours, Amount of Expenditure : M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1398 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1065 (i).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2685 (ii).
——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4921 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 784 (i).
Port Bruce Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
——— Contractor, Prices paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
——— Dredging Contract, Purchase of Dredge, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 8656 (v).
Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6871 (iv).
Port Dover Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Porter's Lake Boat Channel to Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9583 (v).
Port Greville Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7414
Port Hawkesbury Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6837 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour, Northern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7414 (iv).
——— Breakwater, Estimated Cost, Approval, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5132 (iii).
Port Hope Piers and Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Port La Tour Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Portneuf Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Port Perry Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 1760 (i).
Prince Albert Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).
P.E.I. Dredging, Number and Names of Harbours, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1148 (i.)
P.E.I. Mount Stewart Shipping Facilities, Wharf Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1763 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Public Buildings in Towns, Erection of, Amounts first voted, Population, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1398 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4751 (iii).
Public Buildings erected since Confederation, Cost, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Lavergne) for Ret.*, 1398 (i).
——— Govt. Policy *re* Construction : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 852 (i).
Public Works, Balance of Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 7628 (iv).
——— Clerical Assistance : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv), 9605 (v).
——— Contracts, Names of Tenderers, &c.: M. (Mr. Lewis) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
——— Deptl. Rep., Date of Issue, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 755 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
——— Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731 (i).
Public Work Labourers, Political Partisans : Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6859 (iv).
Public Works and Marine Dept., Line of Demarcation *re* Works : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Public Works, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Public Works, Portfolio, Appnmt. of Minister, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5961, 6047 (iv).
——— Acting Minister, Unconstitutionality of: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1936 (i).
——— Cabinet Vacancy : M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to adjn., 5471 (iii).
——— Minister, Rumoured Resignation : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5035 (iii).
——— Returns : Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 9688 (v).
——— Supervision, Charges, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7588 (iv).
——— Technical Books, Purchase, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
——— Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec, Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quebec, Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching: in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement, Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.,: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina Post Office Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel, Inquiry for O.C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 1738
Rimouski Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
River Hebert Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Rivière du Lièvre, Little Rapids Dam: in Com. of Sup., 7325 (iv).
——— Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6839 (iv).
Ottawa River Wharf at Rivière du Lièvre : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière du Loup Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Rivière Ouelle Pier Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Rivière aux Renards Breakwater Pier : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Rivière Verte Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa : in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Works, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
Rosseau Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Round Hill Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. Andrè de Kamouraska Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Charles Borromèe Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidele Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Francois de Sales Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gèdèon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Geneviève Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
——— Detention Building : in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
——— Harbour, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
——— Harbour Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
——— River Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Johns, P.Q., Military Hospital, Contract *re* Repairs, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5687 (iii).
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dredging, St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Suction Dredge, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).
——— Description Read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Louis River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
See 'Chateauguay,' &c.
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Simeon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Therèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup. 7376 (iv).
St. Timothèe Wharf, Repairs, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
Sacrè Coeur Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377 (iv).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Dredging Govt. Dock, Total Amount expended, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie, Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
——— Wharf : Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re*: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Sorel, Deep Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).
——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).
——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).
——— Shipyard, Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).
——— Shipyard, Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).
Souris Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).
Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).
Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).
Sydney Mines P.O.: in Com. of Sup. 1045 (i).
Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044 (i).
——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Taché, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).
Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).
Telegraph Lines, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).
——— N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
——— Que: in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).
Telegraph Service, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Pères Wharf: in Com. of Sup. 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thornbury Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto, Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
——— Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
——— Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Harbour, Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
——— Harbour Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv)
——— Harbour, Straightening of Don River: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Harbour Works, Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
——— Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
——— Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— Post Office, Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
——— Post Office, Land, Pneumatic Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 7637 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Transportation Problem and Wharf Buildings : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Victoria Beach Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Wallace Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Wharfs Construction : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
Whitby Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williams Head Quarantine Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
——— Ownership of Land, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
Yamaska River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Yukon Buildings, Maintenance, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Yukon Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
Pugwash, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Quaco Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs to : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
Qu'Appelle and Edmonton Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).
Quarantine, Cattle : in Com. of Sup., 6690; conc., 6911 (iv).
Quarantine, Health of Animals : in Com. of Sup., 2309 (ii).
Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
Quarantine Officers, Instructions *re* Examination of Ships : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2304 (ii).
Quarantine, Organized Districts, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2302 (ii).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec Bridge and G. T. Pacific Construction : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2296, 2298 (ii).
Quebec Centre Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 110 (i).
Quebec Drill Hall, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1145 (i).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. No. 37 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°, 582 ; 2° m., 1242 ; in Com., 1243 ; 3°*, 1244 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 33.)
Quebec Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Works, Transfer to Mar. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 771 (i).
Quebec Immigration Pier : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
Quebec Military School, Improvement of : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9162 (v).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Quebec Port and Pilotage B. No. 171 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 7018 ; 2°*, 7440 ; in Com., 7440 ; 3°*, 7444 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 34.)
Quebec Trachoma Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Questions answered by Ministers : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1067 (i).
Quinquennial Census, Alberta and Saskatchewan : in Com. of Sup., 9608 (v).

Railway Act (Express Cos.) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1°*, 9 ; on Order for 2°, 109 (i) ; Remarks, 3246 ; wthdn., 3743 (ii).
Railway Act (crossings) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) 1°*, 9 ; 2° m., 281 ; M. to ref. to Ry. Com., 312, agreed to (Y. 85, N. 45) 315; in Com., 1780 (i). 3223 (ii).
Railway Act (ry. comn., chairman, &c.) Amt. B. No. 36 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 319 ; M. for Com., 493, 535 ; in Com., 563 ; 1°*, of B., 582 ; 2° m., 745 ; in Com., 1596 ; 3° m., 1802 ; Amt. (Mr. Lennox), Neg. (Y. 47, N. 93) 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 35.)
——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 320 (i).
——— Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) *re* Express Companies, 1619 ; Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Maclean) 1621 (i); Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 1632 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dept. of, B. No. 53 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 817 ; 2°*, 1673 ; in Com., 1673 ; 3°*, 1806 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 37.)
Ry. Act (express Companies) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. Maclean) on M. to adjn. : Remarks, (Mr. Maclean) 3246 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 109 (i).
Railways and Canals, Dep. Minister, Appnmt. of Mr. Butler and Superannuation of Mr. Schreiber, Duties assigned to, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9678 (v).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 908 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 93, 1219 (i), 9061 (v).
——— Extra Clerks, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
——— Miscellaneous Expenditure : in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret.*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands. B.C., Settlement *re* Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Private Car : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Lennox) 2007, 2685 (ii) 6136 (iv).
——— Maintenance, Appnmts., &c. : in Com. of Sup., 1524 (i).
——— Names of Employees, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Perley) 403 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 684 (i).
——— Salaries paid, Private Secs., &c. : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 687 (i).
——— Official Cars, Legal Expenses, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
Railway Commission, Re-hearing of N. W. Cases : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).
——— Rental of Rooms : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Railway Commission Rep., Opinion of Min. of Jus. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Non-Production of, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 6233 (iv).
——— Report : Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 6346 (iv).
——— Staff Salaries and Rep. of Mr. Blair : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1539 (i).
Railway Mail Clerks : in Com. of Sup., 139 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Railway Passes, Certificate of Identification for Members : M. (Mr. Bergeron) 7249 (iv).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Rys.—Freight.'
Railway Rep., Delay in bringing down : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 601 (i).
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway and Steamboat Accidents, 1904, Investigation *re* Causes, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Martin) 1397 (i).
Ry. Surveys for Joliette Co., Total Expenditure, &c., *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
RAILWAYS :
Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co.'s Claims for Damages, Amounts paid, &c. Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2063 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) 7021 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9382 (v).
Canada Atlantic Ry., Purchase : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Haggart) 2685 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Haggart) 69 (i).
See 'C. A. Ry.'
Canada Eastern Ry. Improvements of Roadbed : Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 1978 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 734 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 4811 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1922 (i).
C. P. R. Land Taxation, *re* Municipalities, Judgment of Sup. Court : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 2022 (ii).
Caplin and Paspebiac Ry., Payments *re* Subsidy : M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 3203 (ii).
Crow's Nest Pass Ry. Co., Passenger Rates, Ref. to Ry. Commission : Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6836 (iv).
Freight Rates, Advancement of Rebate : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1545
——— Discrimination, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 890 (i).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*
Gratuities to Ry. Employees : in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Jacques Cartier Survey, Costs, Reports, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 593 (i).
James Bay Ry., Deviation of Line, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Grant) 9697 (v).
——— Maps or Plans *re* Location, Filing of : Ques. (Mr. Grant) 2190 (ii).
Joliette Co., Ry. Surveys, Total Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1346 (i).
See 'Ry. Surveys.'
McGill University, Grant to Ry. Transportation School : in Com. of Sup., 9381 (v).
Madoc and Eldorado Ry. Bonus, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 7261 (iv).
National Transcontinental : *See* 'G. T. P.'
New Brunswick Southern Ry., Negotiations *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 584 (i).
Passenger and Freight Rates, Advancement of, Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1542 (i).
Père Marquette Ry., Emplymt. of Aliens, Rep. *re* : Laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Ingram) 7916 (iv).
Railways and Canals, Subsidized by Govt., Amount expended, &c.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret*, 916 (i).
Railway Belt Lands, B.C.. Settlement *re*, Abuses under Crown Timber Regulations : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9295 (v).
Railway Rates, Discrimination *re*, on M. (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) to conc. in 4th Rep. of Agriculture Committee, 4984 (iii).
See 'Freight Rates.'
Railway Statistics : in Com. of Sup., 1521 (i).
Railway Surveys in Joliette Co., Engineers, Salaries, Instructions, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2065 (ii).
Tariff *re* Freight Rates Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i).
Rama Wharf on Lake Couchiching : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Ramsay and New Ross Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 9696 (v).
Rapide Plat Enlargement Upper Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
Ray's Creek, N.S., Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9576 (v).
Receipts and Expenditures, I. C. R., Total Amount : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 688 (i).
Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 6249 (iv).
Red Deer Court House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Red Deer Valley Ry. and Coal Co.'s B. No. 76 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1671 ; 2° m., 1757 (i) ; in Com., 2325 ; 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 152.)
Red Point Wharf, P.E.I.: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 9586 (v).
Regina and Hudson's Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2325 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 153.)
Regina Jail : in Com. of Sup., 481 (i).
Regina Post Office, Customs House, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Reid, Capt., Rep. *re* Submarine Signals : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2886 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Repentigny Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Reports, Deptl. Delay in Printing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1575 (i).
REPORTS :
Agriculture : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 321 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s, Part I : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 109 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 271 (i).
Census (1901) : Presented (Mr. Fisher) 50 (i).
Civil Service Examiners : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Civil Service Insurance Act, Statement : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 54 (i).
Civil Service List : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 51 (i).
Dom. Police Commissioner's Report : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 54 (i).
Geographical Board of Canada : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 625 (i).
Indian Affairs : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 111 (i).
Inland Revenue : Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 51 (i). 4085 (iii).
Interior : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 453 (i).
Justice (Penitentiaries) : Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 271 (i).
Marine and Fisheries : Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 111 (i).
Militia, King's Regulations and Orders : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Post Office : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
Public Works : Presented (Mr. Hyman) 731
Secretary of State : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5428 (iii).
Trade and Commerce : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Reptile Fund, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1576 (i).
Resignation of Conservative Ministers in 1896 : Personal Explanation (Messrs. Foster, Haggart and Taylor) 841 (i).
Resignation of Hon. C. Sifton : *See* 'Sifton,' 'Autonomy.'

Restigouche Bridge, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 9385 (v).
Returns and Reports: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1242 (i).
——— Delay in Producing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1594 (i).
Returns: Inquiry for, 2262 (ii), 4751 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 5600 (iii).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. S. Hughes) 5209 (iii).
Ret. Officers' Dep., Delay in Payments to, Letter from Mr. Walker: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6560 (iv).
Returning Officers for Mackenzie and Dauphin, Man., Special Reps., Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1336 (i).
Returning Officers, Forms and Instructions *re* Dom. Elections: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 697 (i).
——— Instructions *re* Form of Oath at London and Oxford Elections: M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 7331 (iv).
Revenue Collections, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 2204 (ii).
Revenue collected in N. W. Ters., Customs and Inland Rev.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 600 (i).
Revenue Cruisers for Customs: in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).
Richelieu Bridge at Sorel: Inquiry for O. C., &c. (Mr. Foster) 8098 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 8268 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 6960 (iv).
Richelieu River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
Richibucto, Extension Pier: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6730 (iv).
——— explanation (Mr. Fielding) in Com. of Sup., 6813 (iv).
Richmond Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 1738
Richmond and Drummond Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. Tobin) 1°*, 2184; on Order for 2°, 2296; 2°*, 2297; in Com. 3669; 3°*, 3669 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 154.)
Rideau Canal Extension: in Com. of Sup., 1333 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1523 (i).
Rideau Hall, Grounds, Renewals, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
——— Improvements, Grounds, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6823 (iv).
See 'Ottawa,' &c.
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundaries, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9298 (v).
Rifle Associations, Grants: in Com. of Sup., 444 (i), 9169 (v).
Rimouski Pier: in Com. of Sup., 7320 (iv).
Ritchie, James, Inspection of Masonry *re* Trent Canal, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
See 'Canals.'
River Hebert Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).
Riviere du Lievre, Little Rapids Dam, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6839, 7325 (iv).
Riviere du Loup Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7323 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 7375 (iv).
Riviere Ouelle Spur Line, Extension, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 1981 (i).
Riviere aux Renards Breakwater Pier: in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Riviere Verte Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Roads and Bridges, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6889 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances (Alberta and Saskatchewan) B. No. 195 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 9075; 2° m., 9525; in Com., 9526; 3°*, 9529; Sen. Amts., 9819 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 38.)
Robert & Co., Lumber purchased, Prices, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2711 (ii).
Robertson, Mr. D., Appnmt. as Harbour Master for Moncton: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2329 (ii).
Rolled Oats: in Com. on Customs Bill, 9763 (v).
——— in Com. on Ways and Means, 8984 (v).
Rolling Stock Equipment, I.C.R., Number added 1900-4: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 736 (i).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 6428 (iv).
——— Stmnt. of Estimated Cost: Read in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Rosseau Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Ross Rifles, Examination of, &c.: Remarks (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9123 (v).
Ross Rifle Factory, Tank on Martello Tower: Remarks (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 431 (i).
Round Hill Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).
Rouse, Mr. David, Appnmt. as Customs Collector, Salary, &c.: Ques. Mr. U. Wilson) 452 (i).
Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills.'
Royal Military College Act Amt. B. No. 169 (Sir Frederick Borden) Res. prop., 6904; in Com. on Res., 6966; 1°* of B., 6984; 2°*, 7262; in Com., 7262; 3°*, 7262 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 39.)

Royal Military College : in Com. of Sup., 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
——— Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Royal Mint : *See* 'Mint.'
Royal Scots Armoury, Military Properties : in Com. of Sup., 9169 (v).
Royal Trust Co., Ref. to in Com. on B. 99 (Mr. Fielding) 3651 (ii).
Running Time, I.C.R., Connections at Montreal: Remarks (Mr. Morin) 6831 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery, Establishment in Can., Probable Cost, &c.: M. for Reps., &c., (Mr. Lennox) 2067 (ii).
Rural Mail Delivery System : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 220 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Rustico Harbour, Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1738 (i).
——— Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1593 (i).
Ryan, Heber W., Emplymt. by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 4458 (iii).
St. Abdon Post Office, Establishment of, Recommendation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6653. (iv).
St. Alexis, Ha Ha Bay Pier : Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Alphonse de Bagotville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
St. Alphonse Wharf, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Angel Harbour Dredging, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1759 (i).
St. Anicet and Ste. Barbe Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7380 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier Reconstruction: in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Boniface, Hospital : in Com. of Sup., 1846
——— Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
St. Catharines Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. Charles Borromée Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Ry. Line : in Com. of Sup., 1969 (i).
St. Fabien Subway, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1980 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharfage Dues, Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1150 (i).
Ste. Famille Wharf, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1149 (i).
——— Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Fidèle Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Flavie I.C.R., Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9390 (v).
St. Francis de Sales Wharf : in Com of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis, Isolated Block : in Com. of Sup., 7391 (iv).
St. Francis Lake (Beauce) Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9591 (v).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. François Wharf, Expenditure *re* in Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1904 : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1343 (i).
St. Fulgence Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7392 (iv).
Ste. Genevieve Piers : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
Ste. Genevieve and Isle Bizard, Expenditure *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 601 (i).
St. George, Mr. P. W., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 152 (i).
St Ignace Channel Dam, Plan, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 592 (i).
St. James Division Branch P.O.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 218 (i).
St. Jean des Chaillons Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9592 (v).
St. Jean d'Orleans Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. John Detention Building . in Com. of Sup., 1050 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Resolution from Moncton Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John Drill Hall. N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John: Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and Yarmouth SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John Harbour, Improvements : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup., 775 (i).
——— Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Harbour and Transportation Commission, Reps. *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Daniel) 9698 (v).
St. John Harbour, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 9588 (v).
St John, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 9389 (v).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i).

St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1052 (i).
St. John River, Tidal Water, Contribution *re* Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 9590 (v).
——— Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
——— Tributaries : in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. John's, P.Q., Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1143 (i).
St. Joseph's Pier, Lake Huron, Delay *re* Completion : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2774 (ii).
St. Lambert and Belœil, Double Tracking: in Com. of Sup., 2183 (ii).
St. Lawrence Canals, Deepening Shoals: in Com. of Sup., 6289 (iv).
St. Lawrence Channel, Aids to Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2858 ; Res. from Montreal Board of Trade : Read, 2859 ; Res. from Allan SS. Owners : Read, 2860 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. of Sup., 2891 (ii).
——— Lights, Buoy Service, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2703 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
St. Lawrence Navigation, Aids to : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 891 (i).
——— Channel, Dredging, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2448 (ii).
——— 'Montcalm,' Ice Breaker, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2451 (ii).
——— St. Mary's Current : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, New Dredge Plant : in Com. of Sup., 9171 (v).
St. Lawrence (lower) Removal of Rock : in Com. of Sup., 7308 (iv).
——— Suction Dredge, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
——— description read (Mr. Préfontaine) in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Total Expenditure, &c., *re* Supplies, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2455 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ice Blockade, Damages *re* : Remarks (Mr. Broder) 280 (i).
St. Lawrence Islands, Govt. Control *re* Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6477 (iv).
St. Louis, Capt., Certificate *re* Reinstatement : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 591 (i).
St. Louis Exhibition : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
St. Louis Lake, Buoy and Light Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 2704 (ii).
St. Louis River, Feeders and Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 7379, 7380 (iv).
Ste. Marguerite Postmaster, Dismissal of L. Laflamme : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 6477 (iv).
St. Mary's and Western Ontario Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 15 (Mr. McIntyre) 1°*, 317 ; 2°*, 415 ; in Com., and 3°*, 864 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 155.)
St. Mary's Current, St. Lawrence Channel, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 814 (i).
St. Mary's Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1578 (i).
St. Maurice River Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6851, 7326 (iv).
St. Maurice District Slides and Booms : in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
St. Maurice Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 173 (Mr. Bureau) Pet. presented, 6826 ; M. to receive Pet., 7017 ; 1°*, 7175 ; 2°*, 7261 (iv) ; in Com. and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 156.)
St. Moïse Station Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1976 (i).
St. Ours Canal, Booms and Piers : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Landing Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
St. Paul Land and Hydraulic Co.'s Lease, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2777 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
St. Peter's Breakwater, P.E.I., Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 5035 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
St. Regis Lockup : in Com. of Sup., 237 (i).
St. Siméon Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
St. Thérèse Island, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7376 (iv).
St. Timothée Wharf, Repairs, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 7305 (iv).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary : in Com. of Sup., 480 (i).
Sabbath Day Legislation, Reference Expenses : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).
Sackville Railway Station, Tenders *re* Erection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 5133 (iii).
Sacre Cœur Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7390 (iv).
Saguenay River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7377
Salmon Canning Fisheries, B.C., Suspension, &c., Representations *re* : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 269 (i).
See 'Fisheries,' &c.
Salmon, Capt., Resignation *re* 'Canada,' &c., Collision : M. (Mr. Ames) for Cor., 384 (i).

Salmon, Capt., Rep. *re* Accident to 'Lurcher,' Laid on Table, 2878 (ii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Salmon Hatcheries and Provincial Fishing Licenses : Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 2905 (ii).
Salmon River, B.C., Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Salvation Army Colonies, Rider Haggard's Rep.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 6188 (iv).
See 'Immigration.'
Sandwich Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1579 (i).
Sarnia, Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7564 (iv).
——— Post Office Building : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 862 (i).
Saskatchewan Bill, Conference *re* Boundaries : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8268 (v).
——— Papers *re* Population, &c., Laid on Table, 8267 (v).
Saskatchewan Boundaries, Addition to : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on B. 69, 5621 (iii).
Saskatchewan, Province of, Financial Clauses : prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2914 (ii).
——— Deb.: *See* 'Autonomy Bills.'
Saskatchewan Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 111 (Mr. Scott) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2773 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 157.)
Saskatchewan (North) River Survey : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saskaztchewan, Permanent Capital at Regina : Remarks (Mr. Lamont) 1596 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Issue of Patents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8267, 8655 (v).
Saskatoon Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Saugeen River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Saugeen River Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Bonded Warehouse *re* Soft Coal, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5688 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1334 (i).
——— Contracts *re* Construction : in Com. of Sup., 1406 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Celebration *re* Ship Canals : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal Dredging, U.S. and Canadian Contractors, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 589 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Govt. Dredging Dock, Total Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 5426 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6881 (iv).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Proposed Improvements: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3361 (ii).
Saw-logs, Export Duty, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Sup., 752 (i).
Sbarretti, Memorandum *re* Separate Schools : *See* 'Manitoba Boundaries,' &c.
Sshool Lands sold by Auction in N.W.T., Number of Acres : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 730 (i).
Schools of Navigation : in Com. of Sup., 2639
Schreiber, Mr. : *See* 'Railways and Canals.'
Schukin, Ivan, Claim of, Cor. with Int. Dept. and Dom. Lands Office at Yorkton, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. Lake) 2334 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
'Scotia,' Str., Certificates of Engineers, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8385 (v).
Scott's Bay Breakwater Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7415 (iv).
'Scout,' Str., Compensation Claims *re* Injuries, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 6463 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Coast Service : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 2700 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Explosion of Acetylene Gas, Appnmt. of Experts : Remarks, 4841 (iii).
——— Repairs, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c.
'Scurvy Politician,' Ques. of Order *re* Quotation : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3863 (ii).
Seaforth Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Gunn) in Com. of Sup., 858 (i).
Seamen's Act Amt. B. No. 38 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 583 (i) ; 2°*, 2114 ; in Com., 2115 (ii); wthdn. 4749 (iii).
——— B. No. 147 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1°*, 4750 (iii) ; 2°*, 7424 ; in Com., 7424 (iv), 9029 ; 3°*, 9031 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 40.)
——— Victoria Board of Trade Res. : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 7432 (iv).
See 'Shipwrecked,' 'Marine,' &c.
Secretary of State, Deptl. Employees, Salaries, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Belcourt) 8655 (v).
——— Number of Employees : Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8147 (v).
——— Deptl. Report : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier 5428 (ii).
——— Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Secret Service, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 6958 (iv).
Seed Grain, Advance to Settlers, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 9307 (v).
Seed Grain, Indians, Man and N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Indians, N.B. : in Com. of Sup., 6516 (iv).
Seeds, Sale and Inspection B. No. 7 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 52 ; in Com., 54 ; 1°*, 66 ; 2° m., 322 ; in Com., 322, 1155, 1788 ; 3°, m., 1868 ; 3°*, 1886 (i) ; Sen. Amts., 7583 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 41.)

Selkirk Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
Selkirk Ret. Officers, Occupation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1761 (i).
Selkirk Wharf Extension : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Semaphores, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1986 (i).
Senate and House of Commons (indemnity) B. No. 202 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9701 ; in Com. on Res., 9726 ; 1°* of B., 9733 ; 2°*, 9791 ; in Com., 9791 ; 3°*, 9792 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 43.)
Senate and House of Commons Conferences, Mess. from the Senate : Read (Mr. Fielding) 9028 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to conc., 9280 (v).
Senate Contingencies : in Com. of Sup., 6620, 6943 (iv).
Separate Schools, Circulars addressed to Orange Lodge : Remarks on prop. Res. (Mr. Hughes) *re* Imp. Parliament, 2405 (ii).
Separate School Pamphlet, Official Authorization for Distribution, Preparation, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2328 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2006 (ii).
Separate Schools, Pets. from E. Assa. : Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Sproule) 2412 (ii).
Separate Schools, Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Lake) 3649 (ii).
——— *See* 'Autonomy Bill,' 'Man. Boundaries.'
'Seguin,' Str., Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3834 (ii).
Sergeant-at-Arms, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 240 (i), 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons : in Com. of Sup., 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Sessional Messengers : in Com. of Sup., 6612 (iv).
Sessional Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Sessions of Parliament, Delays in bringing down Estimates, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9085 (v).
Settlers' Effects, Duty *re* : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8996 (v).
Severn River, Removal of Obstructions at Macdonald's Chute : in Com. of Sup., 9602 (v).
Seymour, Mr. D. G., Complaint *re* Homestead Location : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9033, 9294 (v).
Shadwell, Mr. J. B., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Shaw, Mr. J. B., Retirement, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Lake) 264 (i).
Shelburne Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Shelburne Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Cor. *re* : M. for Copies (Mr. Barr) 595 (i).
Shellmouth Bridge, N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 7591 (iv).
Shellmouth Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1043 (i).
Sherbrooke Armouries, Provision for Militia, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 266 (i).
——— Immediate Erection, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 5784 (iii).
——— Purchase of Land, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Worthington) in Com. of Sup., 427 (i).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 1139 (i).
Sherbrooke Postal Delivery Service : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 378 (i).
Sherbrooke Post Office, Improvements, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 191 (i).
Sheriff of Yukon, Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 132 (i).
Ships Safety B. No. 21 (Mr. Sinclair) 1°*, 319 ; 2°*, 601 ; in Com. 731 (i).
Shipwrecked Seamen : in Com. of Sup., 2688 (ii).
Sifton, Hon. Clifford, Resignation *re* Autonomy Bill : Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1851 (i).
Signal Service *re* Lighthouses : in Com. of Sup., 2760 (ii).
Silver Coins, Worn, &c., Redemption of : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 688 (i).
See 'Finance,' &c.
Silver Water, Manitoulin Island Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9597 (v).
Simcoe Military Camp, Establishment of : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9712 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Skinner's Cove Boat Channel and Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Slides and Booms, Facilities, Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
——— Revenue collected : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Small-Pox on American Ships, Expenditure *re* Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) in Com. of Sup., 2689 (ii).
Small-pox Epidemic in Man., Expenses *re* : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2306 (ii).
——— Prevention in N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i).
Smart, Jas. A., Dep. Min. of Interior, Resignation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 4370 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 115 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
Smelting Ore, Mines Branch : in Com. of Sup., 9303 (v).
Smith, Mr. E. D., Charges by Min. of Agr. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 874 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D., Statements *re* Cold Storage : Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 874 (i).

Snow Blockades, I.C.R., Delay in Service, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2028 (ii).

See 'I.C.R.', 'P.E.I.', &c.

Sorel, Deep Water Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9593 (v).

——— Dredge Building, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hugkes, Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 790 (i).

——— Ice Piers : in Com. of Sup., 6841 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Dredge Building: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Wages, Supplies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 1399 (i).

——— Purchase of Supplies : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2457 (ii).

Soulanges Canal Enlargement : in Com. of Sup., 1421 (i), 6290 (iv).

Souris Public Building, P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 1047 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Service, Dates of Sailing, Values, &c., of Exports : M. (Mr. A. Johnston) for Ret.*, 1397 (i).

S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).

S. A. War, King's Medals for Canadian Soldiers: M. for Cor.*, &c. (Mr. Worthington) 3204 (ii).

South Shore Ry. Co. and the Quebec Southern Co.'s B. No. 149 (Mr. Brown) 1°*, 5783 (iii) ; 2°*, 6868 (iv) ; M. to ref. back to Ry. Com., 9072 ; M. to place on Order Paper for Com., 9278 ; in Com., 9340, 9586 ; 3°*, 9587 ; Sen. Amts., 9815 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 158.)

Sovereign Fire Assurance Co. of Canada's incorp. B. No. 26 (Mr. E. F. Clarke) 1°*, 493 ; 2°*, 583 ; in Com., 1755 ; 3°*, 1757 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 159.)

Spanish River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Speaker, Election of : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2 (i).

Speaker, Dep.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to appoint, 50 (i).

Speeches of Members, Delay in Printing at Bureau : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7723 (iv).

Speech from Throne : *See* 'Address.'

Spirits in Bond, Age Limit, &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com. on B. 176, 8679 (v).

Standard Gauge, P.E.I. Ry., Cost of Construction : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2181 (ii).

Stanhope P. O., Dismissal of Mr. H. Lawson, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1062 (i).

See 'Post Office,' &c.

Stanley Bridge, P.E.I. Ry. Surveys, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 266 (i).

——— Total Cost, Claim for Damages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Martin, P.E.I.) 587 (i).

Staple Commodities Packing and Sale B. No. 121 (Mr. Fisher) M. for Com. on Res., 676 ; in Com. on Res., 681, 736 (i), 2413 ; 1°* of B., 2441 ; 2° m., and in Com., 2841 ; 3°*, 2850 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 44.)

——— Administration B. No. 155 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 5960 (iii) ; 2°*, 5979 ; in Com., 5979 ; 3°*, 5983 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 45.)

Staples, Inspection, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 9616, 9681 (v).

Station Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Statistical Year-Book : *See* 'Year-Book.'

Statistics, Collection, &c., Information *re* : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. on B. 5, 1003 (i).

Statutes, Revision Commission : in Com. of Sup., 8672 (v).

——— Indexing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 8673 (v).

——— Completion of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 745 (i).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. McCarthy) 1°*, 58 ; 2° m., 315 ; Ref. to Sel. Com., 316 (i).

Steamboat Inspection, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2695 (ii), 6628 (iv).

Steel Rails, Fastenings, &c., I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).

Steel Sheds, Montreal Harbour, Approval of Plans, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 151 (i).

See 'Montreal,' &c.

Stenographers, N. W. Ter. Sup. Court : in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Sterling Bank of Canada B. No. 182 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 7810 (iv) ; M. to place on Orders for 2°, 8001, 8096 ; 2°*, 8146 ; in Com., and 3°*, 8655 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 160.)

Stevens, Douglas, Answer to Capt. Salmon's Rep. *re* 'Lurcher' accident : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2878 (ii).

Stevens, Mrs. Douglas, Gratuity : in Com. of Sup., 6628 (iv).

Steward for Speaker's Rooms, Appnmt. of : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 240 (i).

Stewart, Mr. J. Sprott, Charges *re* Dismissal : Letter read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9613 (v).

See 'Musquodoboit.'

Stokes Bay Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9598 (v).

Stoney Indians, Depleting Game, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 6548 (iv).

Stony Mountain Penitentiary, School Fees : in Com. of Sup., 9684 (v).

Storm Signals at Headlands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 9176 (v).

Stratford Armoury : in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Strathcona Horse Barracks : in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

Submarine Signal Apparatus : Remarks (Mr. Ganong) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).

Submarine Signal Bells. Installation : in Com. of Sup., 2871 (ii).
——— reps. of U.S., List of Stations : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2871 (ii).
Submarine Signal Co. of Boston, Cor. with Min. of Mar., &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies*, 917 (i).
Summerside Drill Hall : Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 1562, 1662 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 1739 (i).
Summerside Improvements, P.E.I. Ry : in Com. of Sup., 2176 (ii).
Summerville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Sunday Customs Collections, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Payment for Legal Services : in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
——— Govt. Legislation, *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8656 (v).
Superannuation Scheme, I.C.R. : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 2241 (ii).
See ' Employees,' &c.
Supply B. No. 168 (Mr. Fielding) Res. prop., 6966 ; 1°* ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 6966 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 1.)
——— B. No. 206 (Mr. Fielding) M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9798 ; in Com., 9800 ; 1°*, 2°*, 9801 ; in Com., 9801 ; 3°*, 9801 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 2.)
Supply : M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).

SUPPLY :
COMMITTEE :
Administration of Justice : *See* ' Justice.'
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics :
Aid to Agricultural Societies, 1829 (i).
Archives, 1823 (i), 6679 (iv).
Criminal Statistics, 1473 (i).
Dairying Interests, To promote, 6938, 7014 (iv).
Dairying Interests, Live Stock, &c., 6932 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, New Westminster, 9608 (v).
Exhibitions, 1831 (i), 6269 (iv).
Experimental Farms, 6165 (iv), 9608 (v).
For Renewing Can. Exhibit at Imp. Institute, 1836 (i).
Fumigating Stations, 1831 (i).
General Statistics, 1827 (i), 6274 (iv).
Historical Data *re* Acadians, 1830 (i).
Live Stock Records, 6680 (iv).
Patent Record, 1472 (i).
Printing, &c., of Bulletins, 6926 (iv).
Quinquennial Census, Man., Saskn. and Alta., 9608 (v).
Year Book, 1474 (i).
Charges of Management :
General Vote, 69 (i), 6249 (iv), 8691, 9052 (v).
Civil Government :
Agriculture, 91 (i), 9053-57 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 77, 90 (i), 6721 (iv).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 75 (i), 6249 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Civil Government—*Con.*
Contingencies :
Agriculture, 92 (i), 9057 (v).
Auditor General's Office, 6721 (iv).
Finance, 118 (i), 6268 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 6248 (iv).
Interior, 116 (i).
Justice, 73 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 105 (i), 2442 (ii), 6265 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 9068 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 6240 (iv), 9060 (v).
Privy Council Office, 72 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i).
Railways and Canals, 94 (i).
Secretary of State, 75 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 9034 (iv).
Customs, 78 (i), 9069 (v).
Depts. Generally, 121 (i), 6268 (iv).
Finance, 119 (i), 6268 (iv), 9060 (v).
Geological Survey, 122 (i), 6248 (iv).
Governor General's Secretary's Office, 70 (i), 9053 (v).
High Commissioner's Office, 120 (i).
Indian Affairs, 116 (i).
Inland Revenue, 89 (i), 9069 (v).
Interior, 114 (i), 6264 (iv), 9070 (v).
Justice, 72 (i).
Labour, 100 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 102 (i), 6265 (iv), 9050 (v).
Militia and Defence, 112 (i), 9067 (v).
North-west Mounted Police, 78 (i).
Post Office, 95 (i), 9058 (v).
Privy Council Office, 71 (i).
Public Printing and Stationery, 76 (i).
Public Works, 94 (i), 6724 (iv), 9071 (v).
Railways and Canals, 93 (i), 9061, 9066 (v).
Secretary of State, 74 (i), 6248 (iv), 9071 (v).
Trade and Commerce, 96 (i).
Culling Timber, 7236 (iv).
Customs :
Gratuity to Jeffrey Foot, 6434 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late J. B. Shadwell, 6435 (iv).
Gratuity to Widow of Late John Turner, 6435 (iv).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 256, 405 (i).
Salaries, Travelling Inspectors, Expenses, &c., 405 (i).
Dominion Lands :
Contingencies, 6406 (iv), 9292 (v).
Mines Branch, Iron Ore Electric Smelting, 9303 (v).
Salaries, &c., 9251 (v).
Extra Clerks, &c., 9289 (v).
Surveys, &c., 6406 (iv), 8671, 9306 (v).
Timber Lands Protection of, 9297 (v).
Dominion Police :
General Vote, 137 (i).
Excise :
Adulteration of Food, 1699, 1710 (i).
Extra Duty Pay *re* Overtime, 1688 (i).
Methylated Spirits, 1690 (i).
Preventive Service, 1688 (i).
Provisional Allowances to Officers, 1690 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Excise—*Con.*
Salaries, &c., 1679 (i).
To pay Collectors of Customs Allowance for Duty collected, 1689 (i).
To pay L. A. Fréchette for Translation, 1690 (i).
Travelling Expenses, Rent, Fuel, &c., 1689 (i), 6724 (iv).
Weights and Measures :
Metric System, 1698 (i).
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 1695 (i).
Salaries, &c., 1692 (i).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 1696 (i).
Fisheries :
Bait Freezers, 9620 (v).
Commission on Fisheries, 9172 (v).
Fog Fish, Reduction Works *re* 9173 (v).
Fish-breeding Establishments, &c., 2904 (ii), 6635 (iv).
Fishing Bounty, Expenses *re*, 6636 (iv).
Fish-curing Establishments, 9173 (v).
Honorarium to R. N. Venning, *re* Russian Seizures, 6630 (iv).
New Boilers, &c., Cruiser 'Petrel,' 6630 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 2911 (ii).
Protection Service, 2907 (ii).
Salaries to Overseers, &c., 2878 (ii), 6630 (iv).
Geological Survey :
Books for Library, 8671 (v).
Compiling of Field Notes, &c., 8670 (v).
General Vote, 8669 (v).
Metallurgical, Petrographical Assistance, 8671 (v).
Special Surveys in B.C. and Yukon, 8669 (v).
To pay Frank Nicolas, 9249 (v).
Govt. of Northwest Territories :
Land Titles Offices, Expenses, &c., 9249 (v).
Govt. of Yukon Teritory :
Additional Living Allowance, Major Z. T. Wood, 9250 (v).
General Vote, 7716 (iv), 9622 (v).
Grant for Local Purposes, 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
Immigration :
Agents' Salaries, Can., G. B. and Foreign Countries, 7684 (iv), 9226, 9308 (v).
Contingencies in Canada, British and Foreign Countries, 6384, 7709 (iv).
Indians :
British Columbia :
Dom. Exhibition at New Westminster, 9339 (v).
Industrial Schools, &c., 6556 (iv), 9339 (v).
Medical Attendance, &c., 6555 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 9339 (v).
Pemberton Reserve, 9339 (v).
Travelling Expenses, 6556 (iv).
Generally :
P. H. Bryce, Medical Inspector, 6558 (iv).
Printing and Stationery, 6558 (iv)
Manitoba and N.W.T.:
Annuities, 6538 (iv).
Implements, 9336 (v).
Live Stock, 6539 (iv).
Provisions, &c., 6550 (iv), 9338 (v).
Seeds, 6539 (iv).
Surveys, 6552 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
New Brunswick :
Medical Attendance, 6516 (iv).
Miscellaneous and Unforseen, 6517 (iv).
Relief and Seed Grain, 6516 (iv).
Salaries, 6516 (iv).
Supt.'s Salary, 9336 (v).
Nova Scotia :
General Vote, 6514 (iv).
Ontario and Quebec :
Blankets, &c., 226 (i).
General Legal Expenses, 237 (i).
Grant for Agriculture Society, Munceys, 237 (i).
Indian Treaty No. 9, Expenses *re*, 9336 (v).
Land Management Fund, 236 (i).
Legal Expenses, 9335 (v).
Medical Attendance, 223 (i).
Park in Thousand Islands, 9335 (v).
Salaries of Chiefs, &c., and Agent Oka, 235 (i).
Schools, 225, 230 (i).
St. Regis Lockup, 237 (i).
Surveys of Reserves, 236 (i).
P.E.I.:
Medical Attendance, 6537 (iv).
Yukon :
Inspection of Staples :
Further Amount, Wages and Contingencies, 6901 (iv), 9616, 9681 (v).
Inspector's Salaries, &c., 7224 (iv).
Justice :
Atlin District, Judge's Allowance, 9683 (v).
Exchequer Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Judges' Travelling Expenses, 122 (i).
Miscellaneous, including N.W.T., 101, 102 (i), 6721 (iv).
Prince Albert, Court House, &c., 124 (i).
Remuneration of N.W.T. Stenographers, 125 (i).
Salary, County Court Judge, N.S., 124 (i).
Supreme Court :
General Vote, 125 (i).
Three Rivers, Judge, 9682 (v).
Yukon :
Fees, &c., 135 (i).
Judges' Travelling Allowances, 126 (i).
Law Books, 136 (i).
Living Allowances, &c., 132 (i).
Maintenance of Prisoners, 134 (i).
Miscellaneous Expenditure, 137 (i).
Legislation :
General :
Printing and Binding, 6948 (iv).
Printing, &c., of Laws, 6948 (iv).
Voters' Lists, 6897, 6954 (iv).
House of Commons :
Committees, 6594 (iv).
Contingencies, 239 (i).
Debates, 239 (i), 6592 (iv).
General Vote, 6268 (iv).
Salaries, 238 (i).
Sergeant-at-Arms Estimate, 240 (i).
One Additional Messenger, 6613 (iv).
Pages, 6613 (iv).
Sessional Messengers, 6610 (iv).
Sessional Clerks, 239 (i), 6595 (iv).
Stationery, 6594 (iv).
Telephone Com., Expenses *re* Translation, 9621 (v).
Voters' Lists, &c., 6897 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Legislation—*Con.*
Library :
Books, 6944 (iv).
Salaries, 6944 (iv).
Senate :
Further Amount for Contingencies, 6620, 6943 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 2705 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, &c., 2758, 2850 (ii), 9175 (v).
Expenses *re* Late Fall Navigation, Upper Lakes, 6645 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 2706, 2725 (ii), 6636 (iv), 9035 (v).
Marconi Stations, 2869 (ii).
Montreal Pilot Commissioner's Court, 2760 (ii).
Parry Sound, Buoy Depot, 9175 (v).
Repairs to Str. 'Scout,' 6643 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 2697 (ii), 9175 (v).
Salaries of Temporaries, Draughtsmen, &c., 2760 (ii).
Signal Service, 2760 (ii).
Submarine Signals, 2871 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :
Amount authorized by Statute, 7094 (iv).
Annapolis and Hull, 966 (i), 9622 (v).
Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, 934 (i).
Canada and G.B., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico, 895 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and New Zealand, 7094 (iv).
Canada and South Africa, 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie, 934 (i), 9616 (v).
Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac, 944 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Quebec, 926 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, 922 (i).
Halifax and Canso, 937 (i).
Halifax and Nfld., via Cape Breton Ports, 906 (i).
Halifax, Nfld. and Liverpool, 902 (i).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 906 (i).
Manchester and Canada, 932 (i).
Petit du Grat and Mulgrave, 966 (i).
Murray Bay and River Ouelle, 938 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp, 935 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes, Ports, 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso, 935 (i).
Pictou, &c., and Montague Bridge, 926 (i).
Port Essington and the Queen Charlotte Islands, 9616 (v).
P.E.I. and G.B., 927 (i), 7088 (iv).
P.E.I., Cape Breton and Nfld., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon, 936 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Murray Bay, &c., 938 (i), 7091 (iv).
Quebec and Natashquan, &c., 967 (i).
St. John and Annapolis Basin, &c., 966 (i)
St. John and Digby, 904 (i).
St. John, Dublin and Belfast, 902 (i).
St. John and Glasgow, 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London, 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
St. John, Halifax and W. I. and South America, 7087, 7176 (iv), 8691 (v).
St. John and Halifax, via Yarmouth, 923 (i), 6901 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions—*Con.*
St. John and Minas Basin, &c., 926, 971 (i), 8691 (v).
St. John, Westport, &c., 966 (i).
St. Stephen, Campobello and Black Bay, 936 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 937 (i).
Tadousac and St. Catherine's Bay (winter) 948 (i).
Victoria and San Francisco, 906 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway, 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver Island Ports, 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant on St. Lawrence River, 957 (i), 7094 (iv).
Marine Hospitals :
Care of Sick Seamen in Mar. Provs. and Repairs, 2686 (ii).
St. John, N.B., Grant to Fernhill Cemetery 6628 (iv).
Shipwrecked and Distressed Seamen, 2688 (ii).
Yarmouth, Marine Hospital, 9172 (v).
Militia :
Annual Drill, 441 (i), 6512 (iv).
Armoury, 5th Royal Scots, 9169 (v).
Arms, &c., Purchase of Lands, 9105 (v).
Dominion Arsenals, 445 (i), 7012 (iv), 9170 (v).
Salary, Lt.-Col. F. M. Gaudet, 6513 (iv).
Esquimalt Defences, 9170 (v).
Grants to Rifle Associations, &c., 444 (i). 9169 (v).
Louisburg, Preservation of Old Fort Site, 9170 (v).
Militia Stores, 6513 (iv).
Military Survey, 439 (i).
Pay and Allowances, 415 (i), 6510 (iv).
Royal Military College, 7000 (iv), 9170 (v).
Transport and Freight, 6513 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Academy of Arts, 6959, 7238 (iv).
Army and Navy, Remission of Customs, Duty *re*, 6724, 6812 (iv).
Assav Office, Vancouver, 7720 (iv).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 7719 (iv).
Banff Park, Construction of Roads, &c., 6423 (iv).
Water Works, &c., 9306 (v).
Can. Bank of Commerce, Compensation *re* Yukon, 9615 (v).
'Canada Gazette,' 6723 (iv).
Canada Temperance Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Canadian Mining Institute, 7247 (iv)
Champlain, Monument at St. John, N.B., 9340 (v).
International Boundary Line Wire Fence, 8672 (v).
Keewatin, Maintenance of Lunatics, 7720 (iv).
'Labour Gazette,' 7511 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6723, 7247, 7720 (iv).
Litigated Matters between Dom. and Provs., 6959 (iv).
Maps, Lithographing, &c., 6424, 7721 (iv), 9307 (v).
Naturalization Act, Expenses *re*, 6957 (iv).
Pacific Cable, 7239, 7276 (iv).
Paris Agency, 6958 (iv).
Printing, 6723, 6901, 6957 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—*Con.*
Printing Bureau, Plant, 9614 (v).
Public Accts. Com., Expenses *re*, 9616 (v).
Quebec City, Contribution *re* International Congress of Americanistes, 9621 (v).
Relief for Distressed Canadians, 7247 (iv).
Revised Statutes, Commission, 7241 (iv), 8672 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie Canals, Celebration *re*, 9621 (v).
Seed Grain, 9307 (v).
Sunday Observance Legislation, Legal Services *re*, 6722 (iv).
Tariff Commission, 9614 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of, 7248 (iv).
Unforseen Expenses, 6958 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Roads, &c., 7719 (iv).
Mounted Police :
General Vote, 6957 (iv), 8657 (v).
Yukon :
Pay of Force, 8662 (v).
Ocean and River Service :
Allowance to Capt. J. Harrison *re* SS. 'Grecian,' 6466 (iv).
Coast Service and Surveys, N. W. Coasts of Canada, 6468 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance, &c., and Ice Breakers, 2595 (ii), 6463 (iv), 9034 (v).
Additional Ice Breakers, 9617 (v).
Honorarium to A. P. Low, 6473 (iv).
Ice Boats, New, Vc., 9177 (v).
Masters' and Mates' Examination, 2623 (ii).
Naval Militia, 9178 (v).
New Boilers, &c., Str. 'Aberdeen,' 6464 (iv).
Patrol Boat, N.W.M.P. in Hudson's Bay, 9178 (v).
Patrolling Northern Waters, &c., 9177 (v).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs, 9171 (v).
Removal of Obstructions in Navigable Waters, 2647 (ii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 2624 (ii).
School of Navigation, 2639 (ii).
Tidal Service, 2647 (ii).
Winter Mail Service, 2648 (ii), 6467 (iv).
Wrecks, Investigations into, 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, Mar. Provs., &c., 9177 (v).
Penitentiaries :
B.C., To pay W. A. Duncan, 9684 (v).
Dorchester, 480 (i).
Edmonton Jail, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
General, 465 (i).
Salary of W. P. Archibald, Parole Officer, 6721 (iv).
Manitoba, 481 (i), 9684 (v).
Prince Albert Jail, 481 (i).
Regina Jail, 481 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul, 480 (i).
Pensions :
Compensation in Lieu of Land, 6956 (iv).
Fenian Raid, 6956 (iv).
Rebellion of 1885, &c., 6957 (iv).
Post Office :
A. W. Cairns, P. O. Inspector, Salary, 6629 (iv).
Compassionate Allowance to Family of the late P. Callery, 6628 (iv).
Mail Service, 176 (i), 6629 (iv), 9609 (v).
Miscellaneous, 194 (i).
Outside Service, 138, 165 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Astronomical Observatory, 9542 (v).
Dom. Archives, 603 (i).
Eastern Building, 9547 (v).
New Block, 9605 (v).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions to Main Block 9542 (v).
Royal Mint, 606 (i).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 754 (i).
Western Deptl. Block, Addition, 765 (i).
Harbours and Rivers :
Ontario :
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 784 (i), 6729, 6900 (iv).
Port Colborne, Harbour Improvements, 815 (i).
Quebec :
Dredge 'J. Israel Tarte,' Explosion, Compensation *re*, 6463 (iv).
Montreal Harbour, St. Mary's Current, 814 (i).
Permanent Piers, Lake St. Peter, &c., 6453 (iv), 9171 (v).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 770 (i), 6724 (iv).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2448 (ii).
New Dredge below Quebec, 6436 (iv), 9171 (v).
Transportation Facilities :
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, 7637 (iv), 9547 (v).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue :
Collection of Slide and Boom Dues, &c., 7629 (iv).
Gatineau River, Use of Booms at Cascades, 7630 (iv).
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 7632 (iv).
Repairs and Working Expenses, Harbours, Slides, &c., 7632 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, B.C., 7635 (iv).
N.W.T., 7633 (iv).
P.E.I., 7632 (iv).
Yukon Territory (Ashcroft-Dawson) 7635 (iv).
Telegraph Service Generally, 7636 (iv).
To pay Upper Ottawa Improvement Company, 7629 (iv).
To pay J. C. Taché, 6897 (iv).
Public Works—Income :
Buildings :
British Columbia :
Dom. Buildings, Renewals, &c., 1641 (i), 6735 (iv).
Fernie, Public Building, 1641 (i).
New Westminster, Public Building, 1641 (i).
Vancouver, Public Building, 1642 (i).
Generally :
Armouries, Construction, 1649 (i).
Salaries to Resident Clerks, &c., 1642 (i).
Manitoba :
Brandon Drill Hall, 1633 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Improvements, 1634 (i).
Neepawa, Public Building, 9549 (v).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Selkirk, Public Building, 1634 (i).
Virden, Drill Hall, 1634 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Winnipeg, District Military Stores Building, 1635 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 9549 (v).
Immigration Building, 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
Military Buildings, Quarters, 1635 (i).
New Postal Office, 1636 (i).
Postal Station, 9549 (v).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Public Building, 1048 (i).
General Vote, 7283 (iv).
Richibucto, Public Building, 6730, 6813 (iv).
St. John, Drill Hall, 1049 (i), 7503 (iv).
Immigration Detention Building, 1050 (i).
Quarantine, Partridge Island, 1052 (i).
Woodstock Armoury, 1057 (i).
Northwest Territories :
Barracks for Strathcona Horse, 1637 (i).
Calgary, Public Buildings, 1638 (i).
Land Titles Office, 1638 (i).
Court Houses, &c., 1638 (i).
Edmonton, Dom. Lands Office, 9550 (v).
Immigrant Building, 9550 (v).
Jail, 1638 (i).
Public Building, 9550 (v).
Lloydminster, Immigrant Building, 6734 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Prince Albert, Public Building, 1638 (i).
Red Deer, Court House, 1639 (i).
Regina, Public Buildings, 1639 (i).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 1640 (i), 9550 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Antigonish, Public Building, 846, 1015 (i).
Canso, Public Building, 1023 (i).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 1034 (i).
Halifax, Dom. Building, 1036 (i).
Immigrant Building, 1036 (i).
New Public Building, 1037 (i).
Inverness, Public Building, 1040 (i).
Shelburne, Public Building, 1043 (i).
Sydney, Public Building, 1044 (i).
Sydney Mines, Public Building, 1045 (i).
Ontario :
Belleville, 1547 (i).
Bowmanville, 1549 (i).
Brantford Drill Hall Addition, 1549 (i).
Bridgeburg, Public Building, 1550 (i).
Chatham Armoury, 1551 (i).
Cobourg Armoury, 1554 (i).
Guelph Armoury, 1555 (i).
Hamilton Drill Hall, 1559 (i).
Hawkesbury, Public Building, 1560 (i).
Kingston Military Barracks, R.C.F.A., 1560 (i).
Military Buildings for Field Battery, 1561 (i).
Military College, Addition to Drill Hall, 1561 (i).
——— Servants' Quarters, 1561 (i).
——— Stable, 1561 (i).
London Drill Hall, 6732 (iv).
Military Magazine, 1562 (i).
New Stores Building, 1562 (i).
Post Office, 1563 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
North Bay, Public Building, 1563 (i).
Orillia, Public Building, 9549 (v).
Oshawa, Public Building, 1564 (i).
Ottawa Deptl. Buildings :
Fittings for Savings Bank Branch, 9549 (v).
Improvements in Main Building, 1565 (i).
New Coal Shed, 1565 (i).
Pavement on Wellington St., 1571 (i).
Post Office Repairs, &c., 1573 (i).
Printing Bureau, Additions, &c., 1575 (i).
Steel Drawers, &c., 1564 (i).
Owen Sound Public Building, 9547 (v).
Peterborough Armoury, 1578 (i).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, 1578 (i).
St. Mary's, Public Building, 1578 (i).
Sandwich, Public Building, 1579 (i).
Simcoe Public Building 1581 (i).
Stratford Armoury, 1581 (i).
Toronto, Customs House, 1581 (i).
Drill Hall, 1581 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1583 (i).
Military Buildings, Barracks, 1589 (i).
Post Office, Additions, Pneumatic Plant, 1590 (i).
——— Additional P. O. Station, 1591 (i).
——— Postal Station 'C,' 1592 (i).
Prince Edward Island :
Souris, Public Building, 1047 (i).
Quebec :
Actonvale, Public Building, 1101 (i).
Chicoutimi, Public Building, 1106 (i).
Dom. Buildings, Repairs, &c., 1107 (i).
Grosse Isle, Quarantine Station, 1108 (i), 6734 (iv).
Lachute, Public Building, 1111 (i).
Levis, Public Building, 1112 (i).
Longueuil, Public Building, 1113 (i).
Magog, Public Building, 1114 (i).
Montmagny, Public Building, 1117 (i).
Montreal, Barracks for Permanent Corps, 1118 (i).
Examining Warehouse, 1119 (i).
Inland Revenue Building, Addition, 1119 (i).
Military Buildings, New Stores Building, 1125 (i).
Post Office, Improvements, 1127 (i).
Post Office, Pneumatic Tube System, 1131 (i).
Quebec :
Hospital, 1138 (i), 9547 (v).
Immigrants Buildings, Generally, 1138 (i).
St. Johns Public Building, 1143 (i).
Sherbrooke, Public Building, 1139 (i).
Valleyfield, Public Building, 1143 (i).
Rents, Repairs, &c. :
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c., 1663 (i), 6822 (iv).
Fuel, 6822 (iv).
Furniture, 6817 (iv).
Rents, 6818 (iv).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings :
Additional Fittings, Treasury Vault, 6825 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Rents, Repairs, &c.—*Con.*
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings—*Con.*
Elevator Attendance, 667 (i), 6816 (iv), 9551 (v).
Fuel, 1670 (i).
Grounds, 6817 (iv).
Heating, Engineers' Salaries, &c., 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Lighting, 1667 (i), 6816 (iv).
Major's Hill Park, 6817 (iv).
Post Office Fittings and Supplies, 9551 (v).
Removal of Snow, 6823 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Repairs, &c., 6815 (iv).
Rideau Hall, including Grounds, 6823 (iv), 9550 (v).
Telephones, 1669 (i), 6814 (iv).
Rents, 1663 (i).
Yukon :
Yukon, Public Buildings, &c., 1666 (i).
Dredging :
British Columbia :
General Vote, 7579 (iv).
To replace Snag Boats, &c., 7578 (iv).
General Dredge Repairs, 6890, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Generally, 7579 (iv).
New Plant :
Generally, 7578 (iv), 9604 (v).
Manitoba, New Tug, &c., 7577 (iv).
Mar. Provs., 6891, 7578 (iv).
Ont. and Quebec, 7577 (iv).
Ont. and Que.:
Generally, 7579 (iv).
P.E.I.:
New Dredge and Scows, 6891, 7576 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers :
British Columbia :
Anderson and Kennedy Lake, Clearing Outlets, 7573 (iv).
Chilliwack, Wharf, 7573 (iv).
Columbia River, General Improvements, 7573 (iv).
Above Revelstoke, Obstructions, 7573 (iv).
Below Revelstoke, Improvements, 7574 (iv).
Improvements above Golden, 7574 (iv).
Improvements below Golden, 7574 7574 (iv).
Fraser River, Ship Channel, 7574 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers, and Bridges, General Improvements, 7575 (iv).
Langley, Protection Works, &c., 7575 (iv).
North Thompson River, 7575 (iv).
Salmon River, Removal of Obstructions, &c., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, &c., 7575 (iv).
Williams' Head, Quarantine Station, 7576 (iv).
Generally, 7576 (iv).
Manitoba :
Lake Dauphin, Lowering, 7569 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Outlet, 7572 (iv).
Quarry Channel at Narrows, Lake Manitoba, 7572 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Manitoba—*Con.*
Selkirk, Wharf Extension, 7573 (iv).
Wharf on Lake Winnipeg at Gimli, 7573 (iv).
White Mud River, Dredging, 7573 (iv).
Winnipegosis, Mossy River Channel, 7573 (iv).
New Brunswick :
Campbellton, Wharf Extension, 1744 (i).
Cape Tormentine, Harbour Improvements, 7497 (iv).
Chance Harbour, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Clifton, Breakwater, 7497 (iv).
Dipper Harbour, 7498 (iv), 9588 (v).
Durham Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Great Salmon River, Groyne and Breakwater, 7498 (iv).
Miscou Harbour, Wharf, 7498 (iv).
Mud Cove, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Petit Rocher, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Pointe du Chêne, Breakwater, 7500 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, Improvements, 7501 (iv).
Richibucto, Pier Extension, 7501 (iv).
River St. John Tributaries, 7501 (iv).
Wharfs, &c., 7502 (iv).
St. John Harbour, 7503 (iv), 9588 (v).
Northwest Territories :
General Repairs, 7573 (iv).
North Saskatchewan River, Surveys, 9602 (v).
Nova Scotia :
Annapolis, Repairs to Queen's Wharf, 9576 (v).
Apple River, Wharf, 1727 (i), 7395 (iv).
Baddeck, Wharf, 7396 (iv), 9585 (v).
Barachois, Boat Harbour, 7396 (iv).
Barrington Passage, Wharf, 9581 (v).
Bass River, Wharf Repairs, 7397 (iv).
Battery Point, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Bay St. Lawrence, Boat Harbour, 7397 (iv).
Bear Cove, Breakwater, 7397 (iv).
Beckerton, Public Wharf, 7397 (iv).
Boisdale, Wharf, 9585 (v).
Bourgeois Inlet, 9581 (v).
Breton Cove, Boat Landing, 7397 (iv).
Bridgewater, Dredging, 7398 (iv).
Broad Cove Marsh, Wharf Repairs, 7398 (iv).
Carlos Cove, Breakwater, 7398 (iv).
Clark's Harbour, Removal of Rocks, 7398 (iv).
Country Harbour, Improvements, 7398 (iv).
Cow Bay (Port Morien), 7399 (iv).
Cow Bay Run, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Culloden, Breakwater, 7401 (iv).
Cunningham's Point, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Devil's Island, Breakwater, 7402 (iv), 9551 (v).
Digby Pier, Repairs, 7402 (iv).
East Chezzetcook, Breakwater, 7402 (iv).
Economy, Wharf, 9579 (v).
Fort Lawrence, Landing Pier, 6838 (iv).
Freeport, Landing Pier, 7402 (iv).
Frude's Point, Wharf, 9581 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Gabarus, Harbour Improvements, 7402 (iv).
General Vote, 7237 (iv).
Georgeville Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements, 9577 (v).
Habitant River, Wharf, 7402 (iv).
Half Island Cove, Breakwater, 9584 (v).
Harrigan's Cove, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Indian Harbour, Wharf, 7403 (iv).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour, Repairs, 7403 (iv).
Irish Cove, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Janvrin's Island, Wharf, 7406 (iv).
Jersey Cove (Eel Cove), Wharf, 7407 (iv).
Kelly's Cove, Wharf, 9582 (v).
L'Ardoise, Breakwater Extension, 6838, 7407 (iv).
Larry's Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Litchfield, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Brook, Breakwater, 7407 (iv).
Little Judique, Boat Harbour, 7407 (iv).
Lunenburg, Dredging Harbour, 7408 (iv).
Mabou Bridge, Breakwater, 7408 (iv).
Mahone Bay, Dredging, 7408 (iv).
Main-à-Dieu, Breakwater, 7409 (iv).
Malignant Cove, Harbour, 7409 (iv).
Marble Mountain, Wharf, 9580 (v).
Margaree Harbour, Improvements, 7409 (iv).
Margaretsville Harbour, Repairs, &c., 7412 (iv).
Meteghan Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
Mill Cove, Breakwater, 7413 (iv).
New Campbellton, Ballast Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Newport Landing, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Noel, Wharf, 7413 (iv).
Ogden's Pond, Channel Protection, 7413 (iv).
Parker's Cove, Breakwater, 9552, 9576 (v).
Parrsboro Harbour, 9578-9 (v).
Pembroke, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Phinney's Cove, Breakwater, 9552 (v).
Petit Rivière, Improvements, 9580 (v).
Pleasant Bay, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Plympton, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Poirierville, Landing Pier, 9581 (v).
Porter's Lake, Channel, 9583 (v).
Port Greville, Breakwater, 7414 (iv).
Port Hastings, Wharf, 7414 (iv).
Port Hawkesbury, Wharf, 6837 (iv).
Port Hood, Pier Repairs, 7414 (iv).
Port La Tour, Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Pugwash, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Ray's Creek, Wharf, 9576 (v).
River Hebert, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Round Hill, Wharf, 9552 (v).
Scott's Bay, Extension Breakwater, 7415 (iv).
Shelburne Harbour, Dredging, 7418 (iv).
Skinner's Cove, Boat Channel, 7418 (iv).
Summerville, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Sydney Quarantine Station, Wharf, 9578 (v).
Tatamagouche, Wharf, 9579 (v).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Nova Scotia—*Con.*
Three Fathom Harbour, Protection Works, 7418 (iv).
Toney River, Boat Harbour, 9581 (v).
Victoria Beach, Wharf, 7418 (iv).
Wallace Harbour, Repairs, 7419 (iv).
West Arichat, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
White Head, Wharf, 7419 (iv).
Wolfville Wharf, Reconstruction, &c., 7419 (iv).
Yarmouth Harbour, Protection Works, 7419 (iv).
Ontario :
Amherstburg, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Barrie, Pier, 9595 (v).
Barry's Bay, Madawaska River, 6873 (iv).
Bayfield, North Pier Extension, 7546 (iv).
Beaverton, Harbour, 7546 (iv).
Blanche River, 7547 (iv).
Blind River, Dredging, 6870 (iv).
Bracebridge Wharf, 7547 (iv).
Bronte, Harbour Improvements, 7547 (iv).
Cobourg, Pier Repairs, 7548 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour Improvements, 6879, 7548 (iv).
Crowe's Landing, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Depot Harbour, Breakwater, 7552 (iv).
Echo Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Georgian Bay and Point au Baril Route, 6888 (iv).
Goderich Harbour Improvements, 7553 (iv).
Grand Bend, Breakwater, 7553 (iv).
Grand River, Dredging, 6873 (iv).
Haileybury, Wharf, 6887, 7556 (iv).
Hamilton, 7556 (iv).
Harbours, Rivers and Bridges, General Improvements, 7555 (iv).
Honora Wharf, 6887 (iv), 9597 (v).
Kincardine Harbour, 7558 (iv).
Lake Temiscaming, Wharf, 7559 (iv).
Little Current, Channel Improvements, 6886, 7559 (iv).
Matchedash Bay, Channel Improvements, 7560 (iv).
Meaford Harbour, Improvements, 7560 (iv), 9599 (v).
Midland Harbour, 7560 (iv), 9601 (v).
Newcastle Pier, 7561 (iv).
Oliphant, Wharf, 7561 (iv).
Oshawa, Harbour, 9600 (v).
Ottawa, Wharf at Foot of Rideau Canal 7561 (iv).
Owen Sound, Protection Works, 7561 (iv), 9600 (v).
Dredging, 6886 (iv).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Pembroke, Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Penetanguishene, Dredging, 7563 (iv).
Petewawa Wharf, 7562 (iv).
Point Edward, Dredging, 6869, 7563 (iv).
Port Bruce, Wharf, 7563 (iv).
Port Burwell, Improvements, 7563 (iv)
Port Dover, Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Port Hope, Repairs, &c., 7564 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Ontario—*Con.*
Rama, Wharf, 9602 (v).
River Otonabee, Dredging at Peterborough, 6886, 7564 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements, 7564 (iv).
Rosseau, Wharf, 9600 (v).
Sarnia, Dredging, 7564 (iv).
Saugeen River, Improvements, 7565 (iv), 9602 (v).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6881 (iv).
Severn River, 9602 (v).
Silverwater, Wharf, 9597 (v).
Spanish River, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Stokes Bay, Wharf, 9598 (v).
Thessalon Breakwater, 7565 (iv).
Thornbury, Dredging, 7565 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 7565 (iv).
Extension of Island Breakwater, 7567 (iv).
Trenton, Dredging, 9600 (v).
Whitby Harbour, 6880 (iv).
Wiarton, Dredging, 7569 (iv).
Prince Edward Island :
General Vote, 9585 (v).
Higgin's Shore Pier, Reconstruction, 1734 (i).
McPherson's Cove, Wharf, 1735 (i).
Miminegash Harbour Works, 1735 (i).
New London, Breakwater, 1735 (i).
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 1736 (i).
Repairs to Piers, &c., 1737 (i).
Creosoted Timber, 1737 (i).
Richmond Bay, Grand River Wharf, 1738 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater (South Entrance), 1738 (i).
St. Peter's Bay, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Summerside Harbour, Breakwater, 1739 (i).
Wood Islands, Breakwater, 1743 (i).
Quebec :
Anse à Beaufils, Pier, 7285 (iv).
Anse aux Gris Fonds, Improvements, 7285 (iv).
Anse à L'Ilot, Pier, 9591 (v).
Anse St. Jean, Pier, 7286 (iv).
Baie des Pères, Wharf, &c., 7287 (iv).
Barachois de Malbaie, Breakwater, 7287 iv).
Belœil Guide Piers, &c., 7287 (iv).
Bic Harbour, Wharf, 7287 (iv).
Canton Fabre, Wharf. 7288 (iv).
Chambord, Wharf, 7289 (iv).
Champlain, Wharf, 7290 (iv).
Château Richer, Harbour Improvements, 7290 (iv).
Desjardins, Allumette Island, Wharf, 7298 (iv).
Disraeli Wharf, 9593 (v)
Doucet Landing, Dredging, 6849, 7298 (iv).
Douglastown, Isolated Block, 9592 (v).
East Templeton, Wharf, 7300 (iv).
English River, Removal of Obstructions, 9591 (v).
Escoumains, Pier, 7303 (iv).
Gatineau Point, Wharf, &c., 7303 (iv).
Grands Méchins, Breakwater, 7303 (iv).
Grande Rivière Beaupré, 9592 (v).
Grondines, Wharf, 9592 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Grosse Isle, Extension Pier, &c., 9608 (v).
Harbours and Rivers, General Repairs, 6868, 7305 (iv).
Lake Megantic, Piers, 9591 (v).
Lake St. Francis, Wharves, 9591 (v).
Lake St. John, Dredging, 7306 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, and Protection Walls, 7306 (iv), 9590 (v).
Lavaltrie, Pile Wharf, &c., 7306 (iv).
Le Tableau, Wharf, &c., 7307 (iv).
Little Pabos, Harbour Improvements, 7307 (iv).
L'Ile d'Alma, Removal of Rocks, 7307 (iv).
Lotbinière, Wharf Improvements, 9592 (v).
Lower St. Lawrence, Removal of Rocks, 7308 (iv).
Magdalen Islands, Breakwater and Piers, 7308 (iv).
Mille Vaches, Landing Pier, 7309 (iv).
Mistook (Deslisle) Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Mont Louis, Wharf, 7310 (iv).
Montmagny, Wharf, 7311 (iv).
Montmorency Falls, Cribwork, &c., 6852, 7311 (iv).
New Carlisle, Wharf, 7312 (iv).
Newport Breakwater, 9592 (v).
Nicolet River, Dredging, &c., 7312 (iv).
Notre Dame du Portage, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Peel Head Bay (Missisquoi Bay), Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Petit Rivière Peribonka, Removal of Snags, 9591 (v).
Percé Wharf, 9592 (v).
Pierreville, Wharf, 6868 (iv).
Portneuf, Wharf. 7314 (iv).
Repentigny, Wharf, 7314 (iv).
Rimouski, Pier Extension, 7320 (iv).
River Batiscan, Dredging, 7322 (iv).
River Chateauguay, Dredging, 6847, 7322 (iv).
Enlargement at Discharge into St. John River, 7322 (iv).
River du Loup, (en haut), Dredging &c., 7325 (iv).
(Fraserville), Harbour, 7323 (iv).
River Lièvre, Dam Reconstruction, &c., 6839, 7325 (iv), 9590 (v).
River Maskinongé, Dredging, 6842, 7325 (iv).
River Ottawa, Wharf at Lièvre River, 7375 (iv).
River Ouelle, Pier, 7325, 7375 (iv).
River Renards, Breakwater, 9592 (v).
River Richelieu, St. Thérèse, Dredging, 7376 (iv).
River Saguenay, Dredging, 7377 (iv).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 7379 (iv).
River St. Louis, Feeders, &c., 7380 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Channel, 7326 (iv).
River St. Maurice, Dam, 7326 (iv).
——— Dredging Eastern Channel, 6851, 7330 (iv).
River Verte, Improvements, 7390 (iv).
Sacre Cœur, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. Alexis, Pier, 7390 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
St. Alphonse de Bagotville, 6868 (iv), 9591 (v).
St. André de Kamouraska, Wharf, &c., 7390 (iv).
Ste. Anne de la Pocatière, Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Charles Boromée, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
Ste. Famille, Extension Pier, 7390 (iv).
St. Fidèle, Wharf, 7390 (iv).
St. François, Isolated Block Approach, 7391 (iv).
St. François de Sales, Wharf, &c., 7391 (iv).
St. Fulgence, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Gédéon Islands, Wharf, 7392 (iv).
St. Genevieve, Piers, 9592 (v).
St. Jean, Wharf, 7393 (iv), 9592 (v).
St. Siméon, Wharf Extension, 7393 (iv).
Sorel, Ice Piers, 6841 (iv).
Deep Water Wharf, 9593 (v).
Terrebonne, Wharf, &c., 7394 (iv).
Yamaska River, Dredging, 7394 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, Payment *re*, 7611 (iv).
Authorized Works, Balances *re*, 7628 (iv).
Cement Testing Laboratory, 7613 (iv).
Chief Architect's Office, Salaries, &c., 7618 (iv).
Chief Engineer's Office, Salaries, &c., 6895 (iv).
Deep Waterways Commission, 6894 (iv).
National Art Gallery, 7618 (iv).
Survey of Head Waters of Ottawa River, 7612 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 7611 (iv).
Technical Books of Reference, 7627 (iv).
Telegraph Service, Staff, 7620 (iv).
Temporary Clerical Assistance, &c., 7620, 7626 (iv), 9605 (v).
Transportation Commission, 7627 (iv), 8692 (v).
Roads and Bridges :
Battle River, Bridge at Battleford, 7587 (iv).
Bryson Bridge, 7585 (iv).
Colonization Roads in Man. and N. W. T., 7594 (iv).
Dom. Traffic Bridges, Generally, 7592 (iv).
Ottawa City, Dufferin and Sappers' Bridges, &c., 6889, 7585 (iv).
Ordinary Repairs, &c., 7585 (iv).
Shellmouth Bridge over Assiniboine River, 7591 (iv).
Slides and Booms :
St. Maurice River, 7579 (iv).
Telegraph Lines :
British Columbia :
Kamloops—Lower Nicola, 7610 (iv).
Nanaimo—Parksville, Alberni, &c., 9604 (v).
Vancouver Island—Salt Spring Island Telephone, 7610 (iv).
Mar. Provinces :
Mabou, Cheticamp, &c., to Bay St. Lawrence, 7606 (iv).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Telegraph Lines—*Con.*
North-west Territories :
Qu'Appelle, Edmonton and Moosejaw, 6893 (iv), 9604 (v).
Ontario :
Pelee Island and Mainland, 7609 (iv).
Quebec :
Bersimis to Godbout, 7608 (iv).
Descente des Femmes to Sacré-Cœur, 9604 (v).
Grosse Isle, Marconi, 9604 (v).
Yukon :
Ashcroft-Dawson, 9605 (v).
Quarantine :
Cattle Quarantine, 6690 (iv).
Health of Animals, 2309 (ii).
Organized Districts, Salaries, &c., 2301 (ii).
Public Health, &c., 1841 (i).
Public Works Health Act, 1845 (i).
Steamer for Service at Grosse Isle, 1838, (i).
Steamer for Service at William Head, 1841 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 1845 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 1846 (i).
Railways and Canals :
Canals :
Beauharnois, Repairs, 6307 (iv).
Chambly :
Denault's Farm, Culvert, 6301 (iv).
Macadamized Road, 9378 (v).
Strengthening Banks, 9378 (v).
Cornwall :
Concreting Apparatus, 6298 (iv).
Enlargement, 1219 (i).
Filling in between old and new Locks, 1494 (i).
Improvements, 9381 (v).
Reducing Shoals West of Cornwall, 6289 (iv).
Farran's Point, Acetylene Gas Plant, 6308 (iv).
Galops, Enlargement, 1220 (i).
Removing Shoals below Lock 28, 9354 (v).
To stop Leak in Bank, 1492 (i).
Galops Rapids, To complete Channel, 1230 (i).
Generally :
Staff and Repairs, 1546 (i).
Sunday Service, 1547 (i).
Grenville, Guide Piers, Greece's Point, &c., 1499 (i), 6305 (iv).
Lachine, Atwater Avenue Bridge, 1240 (i).
Electrical Installation, 1240 (i), 9354 (v).
Enlargement and Improvements, 6294 (iv).
Lock Gates, 6300 (iv).
Machinery for Shops, 1240 (iv).
Paving Mill St., 6301 (iv).
Power House, Flume, 6299 (iv).
Rebuilding Wall, Basin No. 2, 1421 (i).
Rebuilding Wharf below Dock, 1421 (i).
Repairs, 6306 (iv).
Slope Walls, 6294 (iv).
Underpinning Wall, Basin No. 2, 6298 (iv).
Walls, St. Gabriel Basin, 9378 (v).
Widening Tail Race, 6299 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Murray, To rebuild Piers, &c., 1495 (i).
North Channel, Dam, &c., 1230 (i).
Rapide Plat, Upper Entrance Enlargement, 6289 (iv).
Rideau, Extension, 1333 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Construction, 1334, 1406 (i).
St. Ours, New Boom and Pier, 1499 (i).
Wharf, 6302 (iv).
St. Peter's, Dredging, 6303 (iv).
Repairs, 6308 (iv).
Soulanges :
General Repairs, &c., 1421 (i).
Steel Bridge at Power House, &c., 6290 (iv).
Trent :
Construction, 1420, 1471, 1476 (i).
Dams, Surveys *re*, 9376 (iv).
Holland River, Surveys, 9359 (v).
Improvements, 1499 (i).
Lowering Floor of Lock, 6302 (iv).
McLaren's Creek, Road, 9379 (v).
Staff on Dams, 9383 (v).
Survey of Routes, &c., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
To complete New Dam, Peterborough, 6303 (iv).
To pay Geo. Matthews Co. Claim, 6303 (iv).
Welland, Electric Light Power Plant, 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
Lowering Head of, Lock No. 1, 6309 (iv).
Port Colborne, Elevator, 1266, 1288 (i).
Improvements at Entrance, 1230 (i).
Removing Obstructions, 1231 (i).
Retaining Wall, Rock Cut, 1499 (i).
Stone Protection to Banks of New Canal, 1496 (i).
Summit Level Deepening, Port Colborne to Thorold, 1232, 1283 (i), 6290 (ii).
To make Survey, 1234 (i).
To pay Stephen Vanderburg, 6305 (iv).
To rebuild bridges, &c., Niagara and Queenston Streets. 1234 (i).
Williamsburg Steam Hoist and Pump, 1494 (i).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, 1508 (i).
Costs of Litigation, 1521 (i).
Railway Commission, Board of, 1524, 1541 (i).
Railway Statistics, 1521 (i).
Salaries of Engineers, &c., 1521 (i), 9382 (v).
Salaries of Extra Clerks, 1521 (i), 6306 (iv).
School of Ry. Engineering, McGill, Contribution, 9381 (v).
Sunday Work on Canals, 9383 (v).
Surveys and Inspections, Canals, 1509 (i).
Surveys and Inspections, Railways, 1520 (i).
Railways :
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry., Surveys, &c., 2277, 2298 (ii), 6427, 7496 (iv), 9489 (v).
Construction, 9498 (v).
Terminals and Right of Way, 9498 (v).
Intercolonial Railway :
Additional Sidings, Facilities, &c., 1970. (i), 6428, 6431 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Intercolonial—*Con.*
Amherst, Increased Accommodation, 1983 (i).
Antigonish, Increased Accommodation, 1967 (i).
Belœil and St. Lambert, Double Tracking, 2183 (ii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 1963 (i).
Cape Road Crossing, Elimination, 6432 (iv).
Double Tracking, 1933 (i), 2027 (ii), 9290 (v).
Drummondville, Accommodation, 1960 (i).
General Vote, 2204 (ii), 7445 (iv).
Gratuity to Family, Late C. J. Carter, 2183 (ii).
Halifax, Dredging at Deep Water Terminus, 2026 (ii).
Improving Grades, 1987 (i).
Increased Accommodation, 2031 (ii), 9391, 6429 (iv), 9432 (v).
Indiantown and Blackville, Maintenance, 9482 (v).
Machinery for Shops, 6428 (iv).
Memramcook, Accommodation, 1977 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, 1940 (i).
Moncton Accommodation, 1946 (i), 9391 (v).
New Castle, Improvements, 1967 (i).
Original Construction, 1912 (i).
Pictou, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
River du Loup, Engine House, 9389 (v).
Rolling Stock, 1986 (i), 2037 (ii), 9482, 9501 (v).
St. Cyrille, Diversion of Public Road, 1969 (i).
St. Fabien, Subway, 1980 (i).
St. Flavie, Increased Accommodation, 9390 (v).
St. John, Increased Accommodation, 9389 (v).
St. Moïse, Station, 1976 (i).
Semaphores at Stations, 1986 (i).
Steel Rails, 1988 (i), 2038 (ii).
Strengthening Bridges, 1912 (i), 9384 (v).
Sydney Accommodation, 1912 (i).
Sydney Mines Extension, 1987 (i)
Truro, Increased Accommodation, 9391 (v).
Water Supply, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv), 9384 (v).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Air Brakes, &c., 2178 (ii).
Bloomfield, Agent's House, 6432 (iv).
Branch Line, Cardigan to Montague Bridge, 2171 (ii), 9482 (v).
Branch Line to Vernon River Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 2024 (ii).
Extension along Water Front, 6433 (v).
Freetown, Agent's House, 2180 (ii).
Georgetown, Increased Accommodation, 2179 (ii), 9486 (v).
Kensington, Increased Accommodation, 2178 (ii).
M. C. B. Couplers, 2178 (ii).
Morrell River Draw Bridge, 2177 (ii).
Murray Harbour Branch, &c., 2038, 2127, 2204 (ii), 8692 (v).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Railways—*Con.*
Prince Edward Island Ry.—*Con.*
Summerside, Improvements, 2176 (ii).
Water Service, 2170 (ii).
Working Expenses, 6901 (iv).
Scientific Institutions :
Hydrographic Surveys, 2679 (ii), 6623 (iv), 9172 (v).
Steamer for Atlantic Coast, 9172 (v).
Meteorological Service, 2679 (ii).
Observatory, Salaries, &c., 9248 (v).
Steamboat Inspection :
Inspection of Dom. Steamers, 2695 (ii).
To pay the Widow of Douglas Stevens, Esq., 6628 (iv).
Trade and Commerce :
Administration of Chinese Immigration-tion Act, 981 (i), 7204 (iv).
Bounties on Iron and Steel, &c., 7216 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 9037 (v).
General Vote, 7218 (iv).
Unprovided Items :
Generally, 6902 (iv).
Concurrence :
Archives, 6918 (iv).
Cattle Quarantine, 6911 (iv).
Civil Govt., Interior Dept., 6909 (iv).
Fenian Raid Pensions, 6961 (iv).
Geological Survey, 9685 (v).
Immigration, Salaries, Can., G.B., &c., 9769 (v).
Militia, Ordnance, Lands, &c., 9689 (v).
National Transcontinental Ry., Surveys, &c., 6910 (iv).
Post Office, Mail Service, 9772 (v).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (salaries) Amt. B. No. 205 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 9705 ; in Com. on Res., 9760 ; 1°* of B., 9760 ; 2°* ; in Com., and 3°*, 9796 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 47.)

Supreme Court Bench, N.S., Vacancy, Appnmt., &c., Delay : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6837 (iv).

Supreme Court Judgeship, N.S., Vacancy *re* : Information asked for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5209 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).

Supreme Court Rep., Delay in Printing, Cor , &c. : M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 1398 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1341 (i).

Supreme Court Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 125 (i).

Surveys and Inspection *re* Public Works : in Com. of Sup., 7611 (iv).

Surveys, Dom. Lands : in Com. of Sup., 9306 (v).

Sussex Rifle Range, Inspector : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).

Sutherland, Hon. James, Decease of : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5316 (iii).

Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).

Sydney Harbour Pilots, Charges *re* Widows and Orphans Fund : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9036 (v).

Sydney, Increased Accommodation, I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1912 (i).

Sydney, Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1044

——— Quarantine Station Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 9578 (v).

——— Station, I.C.R., Collections for Freight, &c. : M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Ret., 1767 (i).

Sydney Mines, Extension of I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 1987 (i).

——— P. O. : in Com. of Sup., 1045 (i).

Tache, J. C., Special Remuneration *re* Tel. Service : in Com. of Sup., 6897 (iv).

Target Ranges : in Com. of Sup., 445 (i).

'Tampican,' SS., Grounding of : *See* 'Montreal Wharfs.'

Tariff Commission, Expenditure *re* : in Com. of Sup., 9614 (v).

Tariff *re* Freight Rates, Advancement : Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 1544 (i). *See* 'Rys,' &c.

Tatamagouche Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9579 (v).

Tay Canal, Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Haggart) 1301 (i).

Telegraph Lines in Canada, Americanizing of, in Violation of Alien Labour Act (Mr. Monk) to adjn., 7642 (iv).

Telegraph Lines, B.C. : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv).

——— Mar. Provs. : in Com. of Sup., 7606 (iv).

——— N.W.T. : in Com. of Sup., 6893 (iv).

——— Que. : in Com. of Sup., 9604 (v).

Telegraph Service Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 7620 (iv).

Telephone Grievances, Rep. of Telephone Com. Legislation, &c. : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 9523 (v).

Telephone Systems, Investigation *re* Committee: (Sir William Mulock) 2681, 2841 (ii).

——— M. (Sir William Mulock) to add Names, 4186 (iii).

——— Rep. Govt. Policy *re* : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9687 (v).

——— Translation of Evidence : in Com. of Sup., 9621 (v).

Telephone Lines, Pet. *re* Municipal Control : Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 1244 (i).

Telephone Service, Ottawa Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i), 6914 (iv).

Telephones : *See* 'Municipal,' 'Northwest Telephone B. 28.'

Telephone and Telegraph Lines, Govt. Construction, &c.: Ques. withdrn. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).

——— Govt. Control : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 187 (i).

Temiscamingue, Establishment of Experimental Farm : in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Barr) 6167 (iv).
Temiscaming Lake, Baie des Peres Wharfs : in Com. of Sup., 7287 (iv).
Terrebonne Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Thames River Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 6872 (iv).
Thames River, Ice Jam : Remarks (Mr. Clements) 1013 (i).
Thames River, Lake St. Clair, Survey, Completion and Cost : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 590 (i).
Thermograph Records *re* Cold Storage on Atlantic Steamers : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2778 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Henderson) for Copies, 1767 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 868 (i).
——— Ret. laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 7016 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Appnmt. and Sureties : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6105 (iv).
——— Dismissal of W. J. B. Dobie : M. for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 3202 (ii).
——— Irregularities, &c. : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 6192 (iv).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6232 (iv).
——— Further Papers laid on Table (Sir William Mulock) 6646 (iv).
——— Salary Warrants Issued : Inquiry for (Mr. Boyce) 6239 (iv).
——— M. to reduce Salary (Mr. Foster) 9772 (v).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Thompson, Capt. Thos., Preventive Officer at Port Bruce, Dismissal, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 1763 (i).
Thornbury Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
Thousand Islands Park, Construction of Wharves, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 9335 (v).
Three Fathom Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Three Rivers, Additional Judge : in Com. of Sup., 9682 (v).
Three Rivers, Gas and Electric Light Inspection : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1760 (i).
Three Rivers, St. Maurice, Maskinonge and Champlain incorp. B. No. 57 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 986 ; 2°*, 1101 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 167.)
Tidal Service, Salaries, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 2647 (ii).
Ties, &c., I.C.R. : in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).
Tignish Breakwater, Tenders *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 7018 (iv).
Timagami Ry. Co.'s B. No. 91 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 2005 ; 2°*, 2062 ; in Com., 3135 ; 3° m., 3136 (ii). (5 Edward VII., c. 161.)
Timber on Indian Lands, Procedure *re* Sale of : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 9280 (v).
Timber Lands, Sale or Lease of, since 1896, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 9698 (v).
Timber Limits, Sale in N.W.T. and Man., Advertisements *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 7097 (iv).
Time Table, I.C.R., Changes and Delays : on M. for Sup., 6827-9 (iv).
——— Printing in English and French : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 6827 (iv).
Tison, B. Aimé, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Desjardins) 6475 (iv).
Title Guarantee and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 99 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 ; in Com., 3651 (ii) ; 4680 ; 3° m., 4964 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 162.)
Tobacco and Cigars imported from U. S., Duties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 5687 (iii).
Tobacco Industry, Inspection *re*, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1681 (i).
Todd, James, Dismissal from Burritt's Rapids Locks : Ques. (Mr. Reid) 8384 (v).
Toney River, N.S., Boat Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 9581 (v).
Toronto Centre, Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 4370 (iii).
——— Issue of Writ, Registration, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2777, 3251 (ii).
——— Issue of Writ : Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3362 (ii).
——— notification (Mr. Speaker) 2841 (ii).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).
Toronto Drill Hall, Additional Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) in Com. of Sup., 1657 (i).
Toronto Examining Warehouse, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 1583 (i).
Toronto and Hamilton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 48 (Mr. Calvert) 1°m., 817 ; 2°*, 909 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 163.)
——— B. No. 110 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 164.)
Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 79 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i) ; in Com., 4259 ; 3°*, 4259 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 165.)
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance : in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).
——— Expenditure from 1880 to 1904 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 403 (i).
——— Fog Horns, Nuisance *re* Testing : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 9281 ; Cor., &c. (read) 9282 (v).
——— Fog Signals, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 7565 (iv).

Toronto, Island Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 7567 (iv).
——— Straightening of Don River : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 6888 (iv).
——— Tender *re* Breakwater at Eastern Gap : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1761 (i).
Toronto Meteorological Building, Erection of : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1149 (i).
Toronto Military Buildings, Barracks, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1589 (i).
Toronto Pneumatic Postal Service, Contract *re* : Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 5921 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Trench (Mr. Foster) 5922 (iii).
——— Plant, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
——— Pneumatic Service : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5807 (iii).
Toronto Postal Station 'C' Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).
——— remarks (Sir William Mulock) 1584 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Additional Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 1591 (i).
——— Erection of a new Building : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for Sup., 6833 (iv).
Toronto Trades and Labour Council, Memo. *re* Immigration in G.B.: Read (Mr. Osler) in Com. of Sup., 9309 (v).
Tracadie Lazaretto, Quarantine : in Com. of Sup., 1845 (i).
Trachoma Hospital, Halifax, Disposal of to Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2303 (ii).
Trachoma Hospitals in Quebec : in Com. of Sup., 1138 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE :
Annapolis Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Annapolis and G. B. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9622 (v).
Atlantic Fast SS. Service : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 892 (i).
See 'Post Office,' &c.
Baddeck and East Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Campbellton and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Canada and France SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and G. B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 891, 1560 (i), 9622, 9680 (v).
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., conc., 6909 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 66 (i).
Canada and New Zealand SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Commercial Agencies in Can., Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Martin) 403 (i).
Commercial Agencies : in Com. of Sup., 7208 (iv).
——— Letter *re* Mr. Jackson's ability (read) in Com. of Sup., 7210 (iv).
Davie, Geo. T., Co., Wrecking Plant *re* Ship Channel : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 2479 (ii).
Furness, Withy & Co., Contract *re* S. African Trade : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Gaspé Basin and Dalhousie SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Grain Survey Boards, Pets., Memorials, &c., *re* : M. (Mr. Ames) for Copies, 1763 (i).
Grand Manan and Mainland, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 922 (i).
G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 864 (i).
Halifax and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Halifax and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Halifax, St. John's Nfld. and Liverpool Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
Halifax and W. Indies SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7087 (iv).
'King Edward' and 'St. Lawrence' Strs. SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
Magdalen Island SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Mail Subsidies, &c., Information *re* System, Utility, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 923 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 864, 919, 932 (i), 6901, 7176 (iv), 8691, 9616, 9680 (v).
——— conc., 6909, 7087 (iv).
Mexico Steamers, Subsidy *re* : Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1560 (i).
Montreal and G.B., St. John and Manchester, SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Murray Bay and Rivière Ouelle SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Paspebiac and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 944 (i).
Petit de Grat SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
Pictou and Cheticamp SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).
Pictou and Montague Bridge SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 9616 (v).
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or Lakes SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 934 (i).
Port Mulgrave and Canso SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 935 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
P.E.I. and G.B. SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7088 (iv).
——— Claims of SS. Cos.: in Com. of Sup., 927 (i).
——— Statement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7088 (iv).
P.E.I. and Mainland SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 919 (i).
P.E.I. and Newfoundland SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 940 (i), 7092 (iv).
Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i), 9617 (v).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926 (i).
Quebec and Natashquan SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 967 (i).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
St. François and Quebec SS. Subsidy, Requests *re* : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1504 (i).
St. John and Digby SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 904, 966 (i).
——— Res. from Moncton Board of Trade : Read (Mr. Daniel) 904 (i).
St. John, N.B., Dublin, Belfast Winter Service : in Com. of Sup., 902 (i).
St. John, Halifax and London SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 903 (i), 7087 (iv).
——— Memorial from Board of Trade, St. John : Read (Mr. Daniel) 903 (i).
St. John, Halifax and W. Indies Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 7176 (iv).
——— Res. from Montreal Corn Exchange : Read (Mr. Ames) 7178 (iv).
St. John and Halifax via Yarmouth SS. Subvention : in Com. of Sup., 923 (i), 6901 (iv).
St. John and Minas Basin SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 926, 971 (i)
St. John River, Mail Subsidy paid to Star Line : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 181 (i).
St. John and St. Martins, N.B., Mail Contract : Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2776 (ii).
St. John and W. Indies and S. America, Mail Subsidies : in Com. of Sup., 8691 (v).
St. John and Westport SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 966 (i).
St. Stephen and Black Bay SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 936 (i).
S. Africa and Canada SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 971 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 937 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Salaries, Deptl. Contingencies, &c. : in Com. of Sup., 96 (i), 9034 (v).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions : in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona' Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant, St. Lawrence : in Com. of Sup., 7094 (iv).
Trade and Navigation, Deptl. Rep. : Presented (Mr. Paterson) 50, 321 (i).
Trading Stamps, Abolition of, Legislation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7684 (iv).
——— Res. *re* Abolition of : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 6903 (iv).
——— Legislation *re*, &c. : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7020 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* Suppression : Ques (Mr. Stockton) 5425 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5134 (iii).
See 'Criminal Code B. 196.'
Traffic Arrangements I.C.R. with Foreign and Can. Rys., Amounts received : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 4703 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 1915 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 2228 (ii).
Train Service, I.C.R., Stalled by Snowstorms, Tel.: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 695 (i).
——— Explanation (Mr. Emmerson) 726 (i).
Trans-Canada Ry. Co., Claims for Surveys along G. T. Route : Remarks (Mr. O. E. Talbot) in Com. of Sup., 9494 (v).
Transcontinental Commission, Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7916 (iv).
Transcontinental Railway Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv) ; conc., 6910 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. : *See* 'G. T. Pacific,' &c.
Transportation Commission : in Com. of Sup., 7627 (iv).
——— Appnmt. of Chairman : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 404 ; Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 492 (i).
——— Complete Membership and Reps. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 321 (i).
——— Constitution and Progress, &c. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9679, 9687 (v).
——— Expenditure : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 8692 (v).
——— Interim Rep. *re* St. John Harbour : Inquiry for (Mr. Daniel) 2595 (ii).
——— Preliminary Rep : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 731 (i).
——— Rep. of Mr. Bertram : Read (Mr. Emmerson) 1288 (i).
——— Rep. *re* C. A. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. on B. 45, 4225 (iii).

Transportation Commission: Progress *re* Works. &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
See 'Waterways,' &c.
Transportation Facilities, Georgian Bay Survey : in Com. of Sup., 7637 iv).
——— I.C.R., *re* Fish Trade, Mar. Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Gervais) 1930 (i).
Transportation Problem *re* Waterways : in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
——— and Wharf Building : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, Inspectors of Weights and Measures : in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Treadgold Concessions, Instruction to Commissioners : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7101 (iv).
——— Rep. of Judge Britton : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 821 (i).
Tree Culture and Forest Protection, Man., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9297 (v).
Trelawney, Agnes Hedevig Helga Salusbury, Relief B. No. 198 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 9278 ; 2°*, 9587 ; in Com., and 3°*, 9760 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 166.)
Trent Valley Canal, Claims for Damages, Mr. Jas. Clark, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Ward) for Copy, 1395 (i).
Trent Canal, Construction, 1420 (i).
——— Dismissal of J. Ritchiel, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Incomplete Return : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4750 (iii).
See 'Canals,' &c.
——— Geo. Matthews Co., Claim *re* Damages by Flood : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 1499 (i).
——— Lowering Floor of Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
——— McLaren's Creek Bridge : in Com. of Sup., 9379 (v).
——— Peterborough Dam : in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
——— Ref. to in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Lennox) 1311 (i).
——— Staff on Dams, Taken by Dom. Govt.: in Com. of Sup., 9383 (v).
——— Surveys : in Com. of Sup., 1471, 1476 (i).
——— Letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier to Mr. Aylesworth : Read (Mr. Ward) 1476 (i).
——— Surveys, Completion : in Com. of Sup., 6291 (iv), 9354 (v).
——— Surveys of Dams taken by Dom.: in Com. of Sup., 9376 (v).
——— Surveys, Rice Lake, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 153 (i).
Trenton, Dredging Trent River : in Com. of Sup., 9600 (v).
Truro, Dining Room, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 2255 (ii).
Truro, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 9391 (v).
Tuberculosis, Prevention of : prop. Res. (Mr. Perley) 1351 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) for Special Com., 8636 (v).
——— Rep. of Joint Com.: Presented (Mr. Perley) 9392 (v).
——— M. (Mr. Perley) to conc., 9522 (v).
Tuberculosis Grant : in Com. of Sup., 7248 (iv).
Turner, Mrs. J., Gratuity to : in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
Turriff, J. G., Employment by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 8266 (v).
Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644 ; 2°*, 4977 (iii); in Com., and 3° m., 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 169.)
——— Patent No. 69772 Relief B. No. 146 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 4644; 2°*, 4977; in Com., and 3°*, 6383 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 168.)
Uniforms for Customs Officers : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 413 (i).
——— for Letter Carriers, Contracts *re* : Remarks in Com. of Sup., 206 (i).
——— Militia, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) in Com. of Sup., 438 (i).
Union Labour Labels B. No. 10 (Mr. Smith, B. C.) in Com. on Res., 272 ; 1°*, 279 ; 2°*, 601; in Com., 918, 1770 ; 3°, 1780 (i).
U.S. Tariff Drawbacks on Raw Materials, &c.: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 746 (i).
Unprovided Items : in Com. of Sup., 6902 (iv).
Upper Ottawa Improvement Company : in Com. of Sup., 7629 (iv).
Valleyfield Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1144 (i).
Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 131 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 4081 ; 2°*, 4414 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 171.)
Vancouver Dry Dock : Personal Explanation (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 1317 (i).
Vancouver Island and Salt Spring, Telephone Line : in Com. of Sup., 7610 (v).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 1642 (i).
Vancouver, Victoria and Eastern Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 139 (Mr. D. Ross) M. to receive Pet., 3743 ; 1°*, 4550 ; 2° m., 4700 ; 2°*. 4977 (iii) ; in Com., 8315, 8637 ; 3° m., 8818, 9040 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 172.)
Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 42 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 625 ; 2°*, 864 ; in Com., and 3°*, 1541 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 173,)
Vanderburg, Stephen, Claims *re* Injuries on Welland Canal : in Com. of Sup., 6305 (iv).

Vats for dipping Quarantined Cattle, N.W.T.: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 2312 (ii).
Vegetables, Canned, Preserved, &c., Value of Imports: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 279 (i).
Venning, R. N., Honorarium to: in Com. of Sup., 6630 (iv).
Ventilation in the House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1565 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 7812 (iv), 8695 (v).
Verdun, Damage by Floods, Cor. from Board of Trade, Montreal: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 457 (i).
Vernon River Bridge Branch Line, P.E.I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 2177 (ii).
See 'I.C.R.—P.E.I. Ry.', &c.
Vessels, List of: Rep. Presented (Mr. Préfontaine) 6907 (iv).
Veterans of 1886 and 1870, Grants of Lands, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6047 (iv).
Veterinary Inspectors employed by Govt., *re* Hog., &c., Diseases: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1933 (i).
Vibert, Philip, Relief B. No. 172 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 7095; on Order for 2°, 7218; 2° m., 7261; in Com., and 3°*, 7624 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 174.)
Victoria Beach Wharf; in Com. of Sup., 7418 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Victoria Harbour Mail Contracts: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2191 (ii).
Victoria and San Francisco SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 906 (i).
Victoria and Vancouver SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).
Victoria, Vancouver and Skagway SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7091 (iv).
Virden Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1634 (i).
'Virginian,' SS. and Landing of Mails at Sydney: *See* 'Post Office,' &c.
Voters' Lists, Algoma, East and West, Revision, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 594 (i).
Voters' Lists *re* Edmonton Election, Preparation of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 6622 (iv).
Voters' Lists Electoral Atlas: in Com. of Sup., 6722 (iv).
Voters' Lists for Macdonald, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Staples) 697 (i).
Voters' Lists for Man., Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 60 (i).
Voters' Lists for Unorganized Ters., Cor. *re* Instructions, &c.: M. (Mr. Boyce) for Copies*, 1397 (i).
Voters' Lists in N. W. Ters., used in Dom. Elections, 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 601 (i).
Voters' Lists, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6897, 6954 (iv).
Voting in Ottawa Provincial Elections: Personal Explanaion (Mr. Logan) 562 (i).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. McKenzie, Bruce) 1°*, 493; 2°*, 583; in Com., and 3°*, 1101 (i). (5 Edward VII., c. 175.)
Wallace Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Walsh, Maj. John, Superannuation, and Appnmt. of Mr. Binks: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 8146 (v).
Walton, Mr. R. M., Arrest by U. S. Authorities in the South: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4199 (iii).
Water Meters, Inspection B. No. 188 (Mr. Brodeur) Res. prop., 8385; in Com. on Res., 8674; 1°* of B., 8676; 2°*, 9409; in Com., 9409; 3°*, 9524; Sen. Amts., 9816 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 48.)
Water Rights Reservations, N.W.T., Rep. of Mr. Burley, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1398 (i).
Waterways and Transportation Problem: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).
See 'Transportation,' &c.
Watson, Mr., Customs Collector, Collingwood, Superannuation, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 408 (i).
Waverley Postmaster,, Duties and Residence &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5427 (iii).
—— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5807 (iii).
Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Mr. Paterson) 50 (i).
—— M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6966 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Budget, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
—— Resolutions moved, 8914 (v).
Weights and Measures Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 1692 (i).
Weights and Measures Standards: in Com. of Sup., 1695 (i).
Welland Canal, Deepening, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 588 (i).
—— Deepening Long Level: in Com. of Sup., 6290 (iv).
—— Deepening Summit Level at Port Colborne, 1263 (i).
—— Electric Power Plant: in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i), 9377 (v).
—— Employees during Oct., Nov.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 453 (i).
—— Emplymt. of Labour, Political Influence: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 6855 (iv).
—— Lowering Head of Lock No. 1: in Com. of Sup., 6309 (iv).
—— Port Colborne: in Com. of Sup., 1263 (i).
—— Port Colborne Elevator: in Com. of Sup., 1266, 1288 (i).

Welland Canal, Removal of Obstructions : in Com. of Sup., 1231 (i).
——— Removal of Piers and Bridge Building : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Stone Protection Works : in Com. of Sup., 1496 (i).
——— Survey : in Com. of Sup., 1234 (i).
——— Surveys : Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1520 (i).
——— Water Power Leases, Names, Quantity, &c. : M. for Ret. (Mr. German) 2097 (ii).
Wellington Street Pavement : in Com. of Sup., 1571 (i).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. No. 135 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 4555 ; 2°*, 4700 (iii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5976 (iv). (5 Edward VII., c. 176.)
Western Deptl. Block, Addition to : in Com. of Sup., 766 (i).
Western Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 108 (Mr. Adamson) 1°*, 2184 ; 2°*, 2298 (ii) ; in Com., 4684 ; 3°*, 4700 (iii). (5 Edward VII., c. 74.)
Westinghouse Brakes, P.E.I. Ry. : in Com. of Sup., 2178 (ii).
Wharf Building, Policy of Govt. : Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 7314 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1727 (i).
Wharfs in N.S., Expenditure *re* : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 2611 (ii).
Wharfs, Piers, Docks, constructed by Govt. since 1896 : M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2777 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 8178 (v).
Wharfs in Tidal Waters : in Com. of Sup., 7393 (iv).
Wheatley River Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. James Power, Cor., &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 9698 (v).
See 'Post Office.'
Whitby Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 6880 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Christie) 2190 (ii).
White Head Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
White Lead : in Com. on Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
——— Amt. *re* Customs Act : in Com. on Bill, 9761 (v).
White, Mr. O., Dismissal, &c. : M. for Cor. *re* (Mr. Crocket) 193 (i).
——— Dismissal as Station Agent, I.C.R. : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 107 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) in Com. of Sup., 2205 ; Cor. (read) 2206 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 2235 (ii).
White Mud River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Wiarton Harbour Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7569 (iv).
Williamsburg and Cornwall Canals, Water Power Leases, Dates, Rentals, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 4809 (iii).
Williamsburg Canal, Steam Hoist : in Com. of Sup., 1494 (i).
William's Head Quarantine Station : in Com. of Sup., 1841 (i), 7576 (iv).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s incorp. B. No. 101 (Mr. Costigan) 1°*, 2108 ; 2°*, 2297 (ii).
Winding Ledges Power and Boom Co.'s B., Cor., &c., *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. Costigan) 9697 (v).
Wines, &c. : in Com. of Ways and Means, 8983 (v).
Wines, Preferential Tariff : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. on Customs Bill, 9762 (v).
Winnipeg, Customs Examining Warehouse : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Hospitals : in Com. of Sup., 1846 (i).
Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i), 9550 (v).
——— Military Buildings, N.C.O. Quarters : in Com. of Sup., 1635 (i).
——— Postal Station : in Com. of Sup., 9549 (v).
——— Post Office, Land and Building : in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Winnipegosis Channel Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Winter Communication, P.E.I. and Mainland : Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 6643 (iv).
Winter Mail Service, P.E.I., Ice Boat : in Com. of Sup., 2648 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2649 ; Res. from P.E.I. Delegates : Read (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2651 (ii).
——— Statement of Trips of Ice Boats : Read (Mr. Préfontaine) 2675 (ii).
Winter Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 6467 (iv).
See 'P.E.I.', &c.
Wire Fencing, Inspection by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 585, 685 (i).
Wire Fencing *re* N.W.T., Boundary Line, Contract *re* Erection : M. (Mr. Clements) to adjn., Cor., read, &c., 5578 (iii).
See 'N. W. T. Boundary,' &c.
Wireless Telegraphy Regulation B. No. 186 (Mr. Préfontaine) 1° m., 8177 ; 2°*, 9031 ; in Com., 9031 ; 3°*, 9032 (v). (5 Edward VII., c. 49.)
Wolfville Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Woodill, Seymour, Emplymt. on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2191 (ii).
Wood Island, Protection to Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 1743 (i).
Wood, Major Z. T., Additional Living Allowance *re* Yukon : in Com. of Sup., 9250 (v).

Woodstock Armoury, N.B., Ownership of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4920 (iii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 1057 (i).
Woodstock and Lake Huron Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 1°*, 1671 ; 2°*, 1758 (i).
Woodstock Rifle Range, Purchase of Land : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 5132 (iii).
Working Expenses, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 6907 (iv), 9384 (v).
Worthington, Mr., M.P., Disqualification for H. of C., as Medical Officer of Militia : Remarks and Cor. read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 9149 (v).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Wrecks, Investigation *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6466 (iv).
Wrecking Plant, B.C., Subsidies to : in Com. of Sup., 9177 (v).
Wrecking Plant *re* Life-Saving Stations : in Com. of Sup., 2624 (ii).
Wrecking Plant, 'Lord Strathcona,' Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
Wrecking Plant *re* St. Lawrence Channel : in Com. of Sup., 2476 (ii), 7094 (iv).
Wright Electoral District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1846 (i).
——— Vacancy : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 98 (i).
'W. S. Fielding,' Completion, &c., of New Dredge : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 6891 (iv).
Yamaska Lock : in Com. of Sup., 6868 (iv).
Yamaska River Dredging : in Com. of Sup., 7394 (iv).
Yarmouth Bank of N.S., Investigation, Punishment of Offenders : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 9690 (v).
Yarmouth Harbour Retaining Walls : in Com. of Sup., 7419 (iv).
Year-Book : in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i).
——— Statistics, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. on B. 5, 997 (i).
'Yellow Dog,' Attack on Orangemen by Quebec Newspapers : Ref. to in Com. on B. 69, 8350 (v).
See 'Autonomy,' &c.
Yoho Park Reserve, N.W.T.,: in Com. of Sup., 7719 (iv).
Yonge Street Bridge, Toronto, Order *re* Construction, Tel. *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 586 (i).
Young, Thos., and G. C. McNab, Dom. Officials and Political Organizers : Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 9154 (v).
Yukon Ter., Annexation to Provs., &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 6509 (iv).
Yukon-Ashcroft-Dawson Tel. Line : in Com. of Sup., 7635 (iv), 9605 (v).
Yukon, Buildings, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
——— Commissionership, Vacancy *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5036 (iii).
——— Court Fees : In Com. of Sup., 137 (i).
——— Customs, Living Allowance : in Com. of Sup., 411 (i).
——— Elections for Dom., Delay in opening Ballot Boxes : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 987 (i).
——— Election, Cor. *re* Returning Officer : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1254 (i).
——— information *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1152 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 453 (i).
——— return of Member Elect : Telegrams read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1066 (i).
Yukon Govt. Administration, Living Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 126 (i), 7716 (iv).
——— Grant to Local Council : in Com. of Sup., 7718 (iv), 9250 (v).
——— Judge's Allowances : in Com. of Sup., 126 (i).
——— Law Books : in Com. of Sup., 136 (i).
——— Legal Adviser, Appnmt. of Mr. Congdon, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thompson) 7020 (iv).
Yukon Mail Service : in Com. of Sup., 203 (i).
Yukon, Orders-in-Council, Regulations, &c., Approval of, &c.: prop. Res. (Mr. Oliver) 9725 9784 (v).
——— Ordinances : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).
——— Post Office Officials, Salaries, Living Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 214 (i).
——— Prisoners, Maintenance of : in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).
——— Reforms *re* Government, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) on M. for Sup., 7021 (iv).
——— Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 6896 (iv).
——— Territorial District, Certificate of Election : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 2322 (ii).
——— Witnesses Fees, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 135 (i).